

OREGON BENCHMARKS

SETTING MEASURABLE STANDARDS
FOR PROGRESS

Report to 1991 Legislature

Oregon Progress Board

January 1991



OREGON BENCHMARKS

Setting Measurable Standards for Progress

Report to the 1991 Oregon Legislature

Oregon Progress Board

January 1991

Oregon Progress Board
775 Summer Street, N.E.
Salem, Oregon 97310
(503) 373-1220

Gov. Neil Goldschmidt, Chair
John D. Gray, Vice Chair
Robert W. Chandler
Irv Fletcher
Gussie McRobert
Matthew W. Prophet
Peggi Timm
Ed Whitelaw
Diane Williams
Fred Miller, *ex officio*

Duncan Wyse, Executive Director

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Summary of Critical Benchmarks	5
3. Exceptional People	9
4. Outstanding Quality of Life	21
5. Diverse, Robust Economy	29

Appendix

Endnotes: Benchmarks for Exceptional People	A-1
Endnotes: Benchmarks for Outstanding Quality of Life	A-9
Endnotes: Benchmarks for a Diverse, Robust Economy	A-19
Acknowledgements	A-26

1. Introduction

Welcome to the initial publication of *Oregon Benchmarks*! This is the first of what we hope will be many biennial reports on Oregon's progress as a place and as a people. As tangible measures of achievement, the benchmarks are much like a road map of progress. They give us a means to see where we are and where we would like to be in the two decades ahead. As those years approach and go by, the benchmarks allow us to see whether or not we are meeting our own expectations.

The opportunity. These benchmarks were proposed and extensively discussed by hundreds of Oregon citizens before their adoption by the Oregon Progress Board in December 1990. The benchmarks grow directly from *Oregon Shines*, a 20-year strategic vision for Oregon developed in 1989. *Oregon Shines* suggests that we have an exceptional opportunity in the next two decades to achieve sustained economic prosperity while enhancing our widely-heralded quality of life. By the year 2010, we can distinguish Oregon as one of the few places that has maintained its natural environment, built communities on a human scale, and developed an economy that provides well-paying jobs to its citizens.

The urgency. At the same time, we must cope constructively with far reaching changes. Due to our attractive location and quality of life, many of our communities will undergo rapid growth and the stress that it places on infrastructure and services. In contrast to such growth, other communities in our state will feel the hardship of shrinking timber harvests and job losses in the forest products industry. And all of our enterprises will face unprecedented global competition. We will be hard pressed to keep our livability in the face of growth and economic dislocation while we also strive to keep our people well educated and globally competitive. The scale of these challenges underscores the urgency of pursuing the benchmarks.

A shared agenda, measurable standards. The benchmarks are truly an Oregon innovation. They begin with the premise that Oregon will have the best chance of achieving an attractive future if

Development and Review of *Oregon Benchmarks*

The creation of *Oregon Benchmarks* began in January 1990 when the Oregon Progress Board formed six steering committees to propose benchmarks important to Oregon's progress.

The steering committees presented preliminary benchmark recommendations to the Progress Board in mid April. Based on Board review, the benchmarks were revised and reviewed by Oregonians in 12 statewide meetings from May through October. In addition, the Board received written comments from more than 200 organizations and individuals.

From October through December, the Board shaped and adopted the benchmarks in this report to the Legislature. This report is substantially different from the public review draft. It reflects the Board's own judgment about important benchmarks for Oregon as well as hundreds of suggestions that evolved from public review of the first benchmarks draft. Although not all ideas for benchmarks could be incorporated in this document, all were considered. A summary of the comments which led to revisions in this draft is available from the Progress Board.

Oregonians agree clearly on where we want to go and then join together to accomplish those goals. By keeping track of whether we are measuring up, we are more likely to sustain the support and energy that will be required to bring our dreams to fruition. Until now, no state has defined its strategic vision in measurable standards that can keep key institutions pointed towards critical priorities over an extended period of time -- and in a way that assigns accountability for results.

This makes the benchmarks a remarkable set of instruments. The benchmarks enable Oregonians to think about the future in concrete terms. They enable governments and institutions to consider the costs of pursuing (or not pursuing) specific goals, and they give policymakers a means of allocating scarce resources. They enable the Oregon Progress Board to fulfill its mission of keeping Oregon focused and on track, and, ultimately, enabling citizens to hold themselves and their institutions accountable for well defined results.

The benchmarks in this document do not simply extend existing trends. They aim high, assuming that Oregonians want to seize the opportunities before them to keep and enhance Oregon's prosperity and livability. Achievement of the benchmarks in this document will call for investments which, in many instances, will involve tough choices and trade-offs. Some of these investments and trade-offs will be financial. Others will be structural, suggesting a need for new missions, approaches, and alliances among our institutions.

Over time, the Progress Board will consider strategies to achieve many of the benchmarks recommended here. Strategies for Exceptional People are contained in a companion document, *Achieving Benchmarks for Exceptional People*.

This report contains nearly 160 measurable benchmarks to guide us and to keep track of our progress over the next 20 years. In view of that timeline, it is well to bear in mind that these benchmarks are intended to outlive current leaders, administrations, and policymakers. The benchmarks proposed here, are truly a legacy to the next generation.

Where We Go From Here

The next formal step for the benchmarks is review by the 1991 session of the Oregon Legislature. In the statute creating the Progress Board, the Legislature reserved the responsibility to review and propose modifications to the document.

The Progress Board anticipates refining future versions of the benchmarks, based on direction from the Legislature and on comments received directly from Oregonians about how this report can be improved.

Oregon Benchmarks should be regarded as a living document, constantly improved by the collection of new ideas and new data.

Benchmarks Organization

Benchmarks in this report are organized in three basic categories.

- Exceptional people
- Outstanding quality of life
- Diverse, robust economy

Extracted from these categories and presented ahead of them is a Summary of Critical Benchmarks. Tables in this summary highlight what are called *lead benchmarks* and *key benchmarks*. Lead benchmarks are critical "short-list" benchmarks related to problems in which we must see progress in the next five years. (Teen pregnancy, which correlates strongly with children at risk, is a prime example.) If these benchmarks, leading indicators of others, are not achieved in the next five years, there is a very real danger that we will not achieve many of our other benchmarks 10 and 20 years out. Key benchmarks are long-term benchmarks, which, if achieved, will characterize a desirable Oregon future well into the 21st Century.

Each of the three basic categories of benchmarks was suggested by the strategic priorities identified in *Oregon Shines*. Another priority in *Oregon Shines*, which calls for an international orientation in commerce and culture, is not presented here as a category but is reflected in various benchmarks.

Each benchmark is a measure of progress at six intervals: 1970 and 1980 provide historical perspective, 1990 indicates current baseline performance, and 1995, 2000, and 2010 indicate the progress we hope to achieve in the next two decades.

For the most part, the tables which contain the benchmarks are self-explanatory. However, each set of tables is preceded by a brief narrative which explains the focus of the benchmarks, why they are important, where we stand in respect to the benchmarks at present, and where we want to be over the next two decades. Additional rationale, measurement criteria, and source information for the benchmarks are contained in endnotes in the appendix of this report.

How the Benchmarks Are Written

Focus on results. As much as possible, benchmarks in this document place a priority on measuring results (for example, adult literacy) rather than efforts (the amount of money spent on literacy education). Occasionally, however, input benchmarks (such as per capita expenditures on public infrastructure) provide a reliable indicator of how well Oregon is doing. In some cases (say, reducing the number of births to teen-age mothers and the number of drug-addicted newborns) particular benchmarks precede a chain of benchmarks that must be achieved to realize a larger objective (in this case, healthy, achievement-oriented children who will grow into competent, productive young adults in 2010). The Progress Board favors several other characteristics among

benchmarks. They should enable Oregon to be compared, as much as possible, with other states and countries. They should be reliable over time. They should be based on data which can be gathered periodically.

Types of measures. There are several kinds of benchmark measures. Some (such as violent crimes per 1,000 Oregonians per year) are derived from statistical data obtainable from official sources. Some are based on physical measurement against official standards (such as EPA ambient air quality). Other measures are based on surveys which test a sample of the Oregon population for particular knowledge and skills (such as geography and literacy). Still other benchmarks rely on the judgment of experts in particular fields (for example, assessments of traffic congestion or the attractiveness of scenic highway corridors).

Data collection. The Progress Board has attempted to gather data for as many benchmarks as possible, but this effort will take time, and, in some instances, money. Whenever feasible, the Board is utilizing data collected by others. Where necessary, the Board is directly researching new information. For example, the Board commissioned a statewide survey of adult literacy during 1990 for use in the benchmarks.

The reader will notice that columns for some benchmark years are left blank. Blank spaces for 1970, 1980, and 1990 indicate that data are not available now, and in some cases will never be available. Some data, especially for 1990, will be forthcoming, but were not available by press time for this report. For example, the Progress Board has not yet received the results of its statewide literacy assessment. Nor could data from the 1990 census be included. In other cases, data are not now being gathered. For this inaugural set of benchmarks, the Progress Board has elected to establish some benchmarks where data is not currently available in order to suggest priorities on data collection needs for the future. Ultimately, the Board may elect not to support particular benchmarks where the time and cost of collecting data may not be sufficiently beneficial.

In connection with its biennial reports to the Legislature, the Progress Board hopes to update data every two years so state policymakers have a clear picture of progress in achieving benchmarks. In some instances, however, data that is too expensive to collect every two years may be gathered less frequently.

The endnotes: further information about particular benchmarks. The appendix of this report contains endnotes with numbers that correspond to the benchmarks. Endnotes tell the reader more about the rationale for the benchmarks, the nature and source of the measurements, and standards which may be involved.

2. Summary of Critical Benchmarks

Among the 158 benchmarks contained in this document, a number will serve as critical measures of Oregon's human, environmental, and economic well being in the next 20 years. These fall into two categories: *lead benchmarks* and *key benchmarks*.

Lead benchmarks. Lead benchmarks are short-term, "short-list" benchmarks related to urgent problems in which we must see progress in the next five years. (Teen pregnancy, which correlates strongly with children at risk, is a prime example.) If these benchmarks, leading indicators of others, are not achieved in the next five years, there is a very real danger that we will not achieve many of our other benchmarks 10 and 20 years out.

Key benchmarks. Key benchmarks are long-term benchmarks. They are fundamental, enduring measures of Oregon's vitality and health. Year after year, if we are doing well on these particular benchmarks, we should be doing well overall as a state and as a people.

Lead Benchmarks (Short List of Priorities in the Next 5 Years)

Lead Benchmarks for People	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
Teen Pregnancy. Pregnancy rate per 1,000 females ages 10-17		24.7	19.5	9.8	8	8
Readiness To Learn. Percentage of children entering kindergarten meeting specific development standards for their age						
Drug-Free Babies. Percentage of infants whose mothers did not use illicit drugs during pregnancy			89%	95%	99%	100%
Drug-Free Teens. Percentage of 11th grade students free of involvement with illicit drugs in the previous month			68.2%	85%	98%	99%
Job Skill Preparation. Percentage of high school students enrolled in vocational/technical education programs		7.3%	9%	18%	35%	55%
Crime/Social Harmony. Hate Crimes per 100,000 Oregonians per year			12	5	2	1
Work Force Adaptability. Percentage of displaced workers reemployed within 24 months and earning at least 90% of previous income						

Lead Benchmarks for Quality of Life	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
Air Quality. Percentage of Oregonians living where the air meets government ambient air quality standards	33%	30%	89%	100%	100%	100%
Affordable Housing. Percentage of Oregon households below median income spending less than 30 percent of their household income on housing (including utilities)		53%		75%	90%	90%
Urban Mobility. Percentage of Oregonians who commute to and from work during peak hours by means other than a single occupancy vehicle			29%	40%	50%	60%
Health Care Access. Percentage of Oregonians with economic access to basic health care			84%	90%	100%	100%
Rural Health Care. Percentage of Oregonians living in geographic areas with access to basic health care			94%	96%	98%	99%

Lead Benchmarks for the Economy	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
Workers' Compensation Costs. Oregon's national ranking in workers' compensation costs			8th	20th-25th	20th-25th	20th-25th
Value Added Wood Products. Percentage of lumber and wood products manufacturing employees in "value-added" manufacturing		19%	28%	39%	45%	50%
Developable Industrial Land. Acreage of industrial sites identified in comprehensive plans that are actually suitable for development				75%	100%	100%
Tax Burden. Total taxes per capita as percentage of U.S. average			90%	90-100%	90-100%	90-100%
Public Infrastructure Investment. Capital outlay for public facilities as a percentage of gross state product	3.0%	3.0%	2.1%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%

Key Benchmarks
(Fundamental, Enduring Measures of Oregon's Well Being)

Key Benchmarks for People	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
Adult Health. Percentage of adults with good health practices			46%	52%	60%	75%
Basic Student Skills. Percentage of 11th grade students who achieve basic skill mastery						
Comparative Math Skills. Ranking of 12th grade students on international math assessment			12th of 15*			1st
Adult Literacy. Percentage of adults proficient at prose, document, and quantitative literacy skills			35%*			65%

Key Benchmarks for Quality of Life	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
Air Quality. Percentage of Oregonians living where the air meets government ambient air quality standards	33%	30%	89%	100%	100%	100%
Natural Resource Lands. Percentage of Oregon agricultural lands, forest lands, and wetlands in 1990 still preserved for those uses			100%	100%	99%	99%
Groundwater. Quantity of Oregon groundwater.						
Affordable Housing. Ratio of the price of a home that a median income Oregon household can afford to the median price of Oregon homes for sale				> 1.2:1	> 1.2:1	> 1.2:1
Crime. Overall crimes per 1,000 Oregonians per year		138	144	100	65	50

* These are rankings of the U.S. as a whole. Although Oregon is close to these norms, the state is developing current, specific data.

Key Benchmarks for the Economy	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
Personal Income. Oregon per capita income as a percentage of the U.S. average	96%	99%	92%	97%	101%	110%
a. Portland metro area	109%	112%	103%	106%	109%	115%
b. All other regions	86%	90%	85%	91%	96%	106%
Industrial Economic Diversity. Percentage of manufacturing employees outside of state's largest manufacturing industry	61%	68%	71%	72%	75%	80%
Manufacturing Exports. Percentage of manufactured goods sold outside the United States			22%	28%	35%	50%
Job Distribution. Percentage of Oregonians employed outside the Portland metropolitan area		55%	55%	55%	55%	55%

3. Exceptional People

Focus

Establish expectations for producing exceptionally competent, self-reliant, skilled, and globally knowledgeable Oregonians, and measure our progress toward those outcomes.

Why This Issue Is Important

The quality of Oregonians as a people will determine the fate of Oregon's 21st century economy. Our future as individuals and as a state will depend increasingly on able, skilled, and productive people. Oregon workers and employers must be able to respond effectively as low skilled jobs shift to developing countries and as global markets and technologies make new demands on work place skills and organization. Workers who cannot adapt to changing work place requirements will be vulnerable to economic dislocation. Employers who do not recognize and respond to changing technologies and competition will be at risk of failure. Oregon employers need more skilled people and are willing to pay them well. The ability to offer employers talented, productive people will make us attractive for advanced industry in the 1990s and beyond.

The quality of our future will also depend on the kind of people we are beyond the work place. A healthy social fabric will be defined by individuals who are competent and self-reliant in daily living, and physically and mentally healthy. It will be defined by families that are cohesive, functional, and nurturing, and particularly by mothers who give their babies a healthy start in the world. It will also be defined by the harmony of our social relations as we become more heterogeneous in both our neighborhoods and the work place, and as we become more interdependent -- and competitive -- with economies across the world.

Where We Are Now

We are well positioned to achieve a number of our goals for Oregonians as an exceptional people. Employers coming from out of state are impressed with the caliber of Oregon workers in specific industries. Overall, we have good educational systems. For the most part our adults have received more education than their counterparts in other states. Our institutions are beginning to work together to serve the various needs of individual Oregonians.

However, we also have serious concerns. Our skill levels as a whole are not adequate for the role we would like to assume in international economic competition. The U.S. ranks near the bottom on international math and science test comparisons, and it is unlikely that Oregon fares much better. Other countries are ahead of us in linking up business, labor, and education to provide vocational and technical education that yield greater productivity and higher wages for the work force.

Also, there are disturbing signs that all is not well in our social fabric, from early childhood through adulthood. The danger signals include the following:

- Declining wages for low-skilled labor
- Relatively high percentages of low-birth-weight babies
- Explosive growth in numbers of drug-addicted mothers
- Increased percentage of children in poverty
- High numbers of unresponsive first graders
- A large percentage of high school dropouts
- A sharp rise in juvenile delinquency
- Exploding prison populations and recidivism

Where We Want To Be

We want to be the best . . . *the best educated and trained people in America by the year 2000, and equal to any in the world by the year 2010.* During the next 20 years we will work toward this goal in three ways. First, we will raise Oregonians' fundamental skills. These will include our ability to read and understand, to solve problems, to learn, to function in the work place and to take advantage of occupation-specific training. Second, we will provide superior access to that occupation-specific training, and we will document the training and performance of our workers in key industries. Third, we will foster stable, nurturing families, good personal health practices, and other pursuits fundamental to our qualities as a people. The benchmarks proposed here set out challenging aspirations for all Oregonians as exceptionally competent people in all aspects of our lives.

Functional, nurturing families. Oregon's future must be founded on healthy families. We have grown to appreciate the importance of nurturing, functional families and the investment we must make in our children from the earliest stages of their lives. Our aim is to support stable, functional families, achieve universal adequate prenatal care by 2010, to eliminate the incidence of low birthweight and drug/alcohol affected babies, and to reduce dramatically both the share of births to teen mothers and the percent of children under 18 living in poverty.

Healthy, bright children. We want Oregon children to grow up healthier, both in preschool years and as they proceed through elementary and secondary education. Finally, we want the scholastic achievement of Oregon's children to improve. The rate at which young Oregonians graduate from high school or equivalent education must increase dramatically. In addition, the quality of their education, and ultimately the integrity of their diplomas, must improve as measured by national (and where possible international) norms.

Technical competence. The competence of Oregon workers in many industries will become more important as we face increasing competition from economies throughout the world. Our ability to measure up to international standards in key high-skill occupations and industries will measure both our current competitive position and the combined responsiveness of our employers and our education institutions.

Literacy. Over the next 20 years, we want to raise the literacy skills of Oregonians at all levels. Literacy not only is required of higher skilled, higher paying occupations, but is also critical to competent, self-reliant citizenship. As a corollary to this benchmark, we want to increase the educational attainment of Oregonians, particularly in technical fields.

Global awareness. As Oregon takes a greater role in the world economy, and as the Oregon work force itself becomes more diverse by race, ethnic background, and gender, Oregonians will have to become more knowledgeable and accepting of other countries and cultures.

Healthy adults. Good health enriches individual lives and reduces burdensome costs on business and society. Oregon must work to improve significantly our health practices. Risks caused by tobacco use, improper diet, drug and alcohol abuse, and accidents can be reduced by changes in individual behavior.

Equal opportunity and social harmony. Beyond our skills and abilities, our quality as a people will, in large part, be determined by the way we draw strength from our diversity and the degree to which we include *everyone* in a prosperous Oregon future. Fairness and compassion are hallmarks of exceptional people.

Benchmarks for Exceptional People

Nurturing Families, Thriving Children

Stable Home Life	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
1. Pregnancy rate per 1,000 females ages 10-17		24.7	19.5	9.8	8	8
2. Birth rate per 1,000 females ages 10-17			10.9	5.4	4	4
3. Percentage of children age 0-17 living above 100% of the federal poverty level			82%	88%	92%	100%
4. Number of children abused or neglected per 1,000 children under 18			12.3	9	6	2
5. Spousal abuse: domestic violence calls per 1,000 households			46.7	35	30	20
6. Percentage of children who are homeless						

Healthy Babies and Toddlers	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
7. Percentage of babies whose mothers received adequate prenatal care			93%	98%	99%	100%
8. Percentage of healthy birthweight babies	94%	95%	95%	96%	97%	98%
9. Percentage of infants whose mothers did not use:						
a. illicit drugs during pregnancy			89%	95%	99%	100%
b. alcohol during pregnancy						
c. tobacco during pregnancy						
10. Infant mortality rate per 1,000			8.8	7.5	6	5
11. Percentage of two year olds who are adequately immunized			63%	78%	90%	98%
12. Percentage of babies and toddlers receiving basic health care						

Preschoolers Ready To Learn	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
13. Percentage of children entering kindergarten meeting specific developmental standards for their age						

Success in School

Academic Achievement	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
14. Basic Student Skills: Percentage of Students Who Achieve Basic Established Skill Levels						
a. Third grade						
b. Fifth grade						
c. Eighth grade						
d. Eleventh grade						
e. Baccalaureate						
15. Percentage of high school graduates proficient in at least one language other than English						

K-12 Comparative Performance	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
16. Ranking on national assessments (geography, history, math, reading, science, and writing)						
a. Fourth grade					1st	1st
b. Eighth grade					1st	1st
c. Twelfth grade						1st
17. Ranking on international reading, math, and science assessments						1st

Student Health

Health Practices and Fitness	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
18. Percentage of students free of involvement with alcohol in the previous month						
a. Eighth grade			77.2	92	98	99
b. Eleventh grade			55.9	75	85	90
19. Percentage of students free of involvement with illicit drugs in the previous month						
a. Eighth grade			79.6	95	99	99
b. Eleventh grade			68.2	85	98	99
20. Percentage of eleventh grade students free of involvement with tobacco in the previous month			59.8	85	95	99
21. Sexually transmitted disease rate per 10,000 Oregonians ages 10-19			89.7	75	50	20
22. Percentage of K-12 children who meet national physical fitness standards						

High School to Postsecondary Educational Attainment

Current Transitions from Secondary Education	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
23. Percentage of high school students enrolled in vocational and technical education programs		7.3%	9%	18%	35%	55%
24. High school student enrollment in structured work experience programs			3%	18%	35%	55%
25. High school graduation rate			73%	83%	93%	95%
26. Percentage of 25-year-olds with a certificate granted in non-baccalaureate education and training programs						
27. Percentage of 25-year-olds with a baccalaureate degree						
28. Percentage of 30-year-olds with a post-baccalaureate degree						

Adult Education

Adult Formal Education Attainment	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
29. High school completion	60%	75%	87%	90%	94%	97%
30. Completion of at least one year of post-secondary education or training		38.5%	56%	65%	70%	75%
31. Baccalaureate degree	12%	18%	23%	25%	27%	30%
32. Post-baccalaureate degree			8%	9%	11%	15%
33. Certified apprenticeship program						

Ongoing Occupational Training and Education	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
34. Percentage of work force that has received at least 20 hours of education related to work skills and knowledge within the past 12 months						
35. Percentage of employer payroll dedicated to training and education			1.5%	2%	2.5%	3%

Work Force Adaptability	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
36. Percentage of displaced workers reemployed within 24 months and earning at least 90% of previous income						

Adult Skill Proficiency

Literacy Skills		1990	1995	2000	2010
37. Prose Literacy (understands text information)					
a. Basic	21-25 years: all adults:				95 % 85-90 %
b. Intermediate	21-25 years: all adults:	35 % *			95 % 55 %
c. Advanced	21-25 years: all adults:				95 % 50 %
38. Document Literacy (can understand and use graphs, text, maps, etc.)					
a. Basic	21-25 years: all adults:				95 % 85-90 %
b. Intermediate	21-25 years: all adults:	35 % *			95 % 65 %
c. Advanced	21-25 years: all adults:				95 % 50 %
39. Quantitative Literacy (can understand math and apply it)					
a. Basic	21-25 years: all adults:				95 % 85-90 %
b. Intermediate	21-25 years: all adults:	35 % *			95 % 55 %
c. Advanced	21-25 years: all adults:				95 % 50 %

*Estimate based on national data. Complete data for Oregon will be available early in 1991.

Multilingual Skills	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
40. Percentage of Oregon adults proficient in more than one language			14%	16%	20%	28%
41. Percentage of Oregon adults proficient in an Asian language			1%	2%	3%	5%
42. Percentage of Oregon adults proficient in Spanish			6%	9%	12%	18%
43. Percentage of Oregon adults proficient in a European language other than Spanish						

International Awareness	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
44. Scores of Oregonians on an assessment of basic geography knowledge						
45. People participating in cultural exchanges			X			Xx2

Adult Health

Health Practices (Percentage of adults who:)	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
46. Use vehicle safety restraints consistently			41%	80%	90%	95%
47. Have normal blood pressure			83%	85%	88%	92%
48. Maintain a recommended weight-to-height ratio			79%	83%	87%	91%
49. Exercise aerobically for 20 minutes at least three times a week			53.5%	65%	75%	90%
50. Drink alcohol only in moderation			85%	87%	90%	95%
51. Do not currently smoke tobacco			77%	82%	85%	95%

Other Health Indicators	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
52. Total deaths annually attributable to AIDS		0	206	1,000	206	100
53. Percentage of adults who abuse drugs						
54. Percentage of people with serious mental health problems who have access to public or private treatment			50%	58%	75%	100%
55. Drug and alcohol related death rate per 100,000 annually		17.1	18.1	15	12	5
56. Unintentional injuries per 100,000 annually			2,098	1,750	1,400	1,000
57. Suicide rate per 100,000 annually	14.5	14.7	16.4	14	12	10

Equal Opportunity and Social Harmony

Economic Participation	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
58. Income per capita as a percentage of Oregon median among:						
a. African-Americans		68.4%		75%	80%	90%
b. American Indians		63.2%		75%	80%	90%
c. Asians		75.2%		85%	90%	95%
d. Hispanics		58.3%		75%	80%	90%

Start in Life	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
59. Infant mortality rates per 1,000 live births among:						
a. African-Americans		16.6		10	7	5
b. American Indians		13.5		9	6	5
c. Asians		9.2		6	5	5
d. Hispanics		8.3		6	5	5
e. Whites		10.1		7	5	5

Civic and Occupational Participation (Relative to Subgroup Percentage of Adult Population)	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
60. Elected and appointed officials						
a. African-Americans						
b. American Indians						
c. Asians						
d. Hispanics						
e. Whites						
61. Business owners						
a. African-Americans						
b. American Indians						
c. Asians						
d. Hispanics						
e. Whites						
62. Participation in historically underrepresented occupations (e.g., building trades, teaching)						
a. African-Americans						
b. American Indians						
c. Asians						
d. Hispanics						
e. Whites						

Social Harmony in K-12 Schools	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
63. Percentage of schools which have culturally diverse curricula						
64. Percentage of schools which have conflict resolution curricula						

Social Harmony in the Community	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
65. Hate crimes (crimes against people or property motivated by intolerance) per 100,000 Oregonians			12	5	2	1
66. Civil rights complaints and violations						
67. Sexual harassment complaints and violations						
68. Reduction in crimes which result in incarceration						
a. Total population						
b. African-Americans						
c. American Indians						
d. Asians						
e. Hispanics						
f. Whites						

Adult Independence and Community Participation

Oregon Seniors	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
69. Percentage living independently or with minimal assistance			95	96	97	98
70. Percentage who are employed and/or who volunteer at least 15 hours per week						
71. Percentage living above the poverty level			82.6%	90%	95%	95%

Mentally Disabled Oregonians	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
72. Percentage living independently with minimal assistance			69.3%			
73. Percentage who are employed and/or who volunteer at least 15 hours per week			16.7%			

4. Outstanding Quality of Life

Focus

Measure whether Oregonians are taking the steps necessary to retain and improve the quality of life characterized by this state's special natural environment, vital communities, accessible services, and involved citizens.

Why This Issue Is Important

We Oregonians value our quality of life. We are especially keen to retain Oregon's special livability in the face of the great economic, technological, and social changes beginning to overtake Oregon along with the rest of the nation and the world. The quality of life in Oregon also gives the state a competitive economic advantage. It helps us retain and attract skilled and productive people to work in and build our economy, especially among knowledge-intensive industries where capable people make a critical difference. Oregon's special qualities, in particular its unspoiled natural beauty, are also an asset to the visitor industry.

Economic change and population growth in other states have tended to create a host of unwanted problems. These include increased pollution, resource depletion, urban sprawl, gridlock, skyrocketing housing prices, rising crime, overloaded public and private support systems, and political and social malaise. As Oregon undergoes population growth and economic diversification, Oregonians must work to retain the quality of life they value and that gives the state its long-term competitive advantage. This will be one of Oregon's fundamental challenges in the next 20 years.

Where We Are Now

Oregon's special natural environment, vital communities, accessible services, and involved citizens provide an overall quality of life that compares favorably to that of any other state -- and perhaps any other locale in any other country as well. Nonetheless, there are problems and opportunities that need attention.

Natural environment. Oregon has been blessed with a natural environment that is beautiful and amazingly varied. Today, this environment remains essentially untrammelled by development, relatively unpolluted, and readily accessible to Oregonians and visitors alike. However, our environment has not been spared from the effects of human use. For example, 11 percent of Oregonians breathe air that does not meet government air quality standards for at least some days each year. While most of Oregon's rivers remain clean, pollution of the Tualatin River south of Portland presents a major cleanup problem. Too little is known about the quality and quantity of Oregon's groundwater. Competing values in industrial forest use and habitat preservation pose a difficult public policy issue. And despite the accessibility of our outdoor recreational areas, Oregon has not built a new state park in 10 years and has not opened a new state campground in 18 years.

Communities. Oregonians generally live in attractive, workable, culturally rich communities of all sizes and types. Visitors from more populous states are often struck by the short commute times in the Portland metropolitan area, the comparative affordability of our homes, the physical attractiveness of most of our cities, and the strong sense of identity that the residents of our communities share. Nonetheless, traffic in parts of the Portland area is becoming increasingly congested, property crime rates in the state are among the highest in the nation, housing prices in some areas are rising dramatically, wildfires continue to threaten rural communities, and there is growing concern about the extent to which adequate park and open space land is being preserved in growing cities.

Accessible services. Oregonians generally enjoy accessible human services. Yet new needs are evolving for such services as nonparental child care, and some 450,000 Oregonians still cannot afford basic health care. In many rural areas, basic health care isn't readily available even to those who can afford it.

Where We Want To Be

Over the next 20 years, we want to keep Oregon's natural environment clean, beautiful, and accessible -- and improve it to the extent feasible. This will be increasingly difficult as population growth and development continue. We want to maintain and build Oregon communities that are attractive, workable, affordable, safe, and enriching places to live and work. As growth increases and societal issues continue to become more difficult, Oregonians know that maintaining and building vital communities will be a significant challenge. We also want to continue to provide Oregonians with good access to such critical services as child care and health care. As we move toward the next century, we want to continue Oregon's tradition of an active and involved citizenry.

Benchmarks for an Outstanding Quality of Life

A Clean, Beautiful, and Accessible Natural Environment

Clean Air, Water, and Land	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
1. Percentage of Oregonians living where the air meets government ambient air quality standards	33%	30%	89%	100%	100%	100%
2. Miles of Oregon's rivers and streams not meeting government in-stream water quality standards			1,540	1,000	750	500
3. Percentage of Oregon groundwater that is contaminated						
4. Percentage of Oregon hazardous waste sites cleaned up or being cleaned up				25%	75%	99%
5. Pounds of Oregon municipal solid waste landfilled or incinerated per capita per year	1,160	1,240	1,300	1,290	1000	750

Natural Resource Conservation	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
6. Percentage of development in Oregon per year occurring within urban growth boundaries						
7. Percentage of Oregon agricultural land in 1970 still preserved for agricultural use	100%	100%	96%	95%	94%	94%
8. Percentage of Oregon forest land in 1970 still preserved for forest use	100%	97%	90%	90%	90%	90%
9. Percentage of Oregon wetlands in 1990 still preserved as wetlands			100%	100%	100%	100%
10. Percentage of Oregon rivers and streams meeting in-stream flow needs			X	1.05X	1.2X	1.4X
11. Oregon groundwater quantity						
12. Number of native wildlife species listed as threatened, endangered, or extinct in Oregon	38	37	37	37	31	23

Outdoor Recreation	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
13. Acres of primitive and wilderness public land in Oregon (millions)			6.0	7.0	7.0	7.0
14. Acres of multi-purpose public land available for recreation in Oregon (millions)			24.8	24.8	24.8	24.8
15. Acres of Oregon parks and protected recreation land per 1,000 Oregonians			157	160	160	160
16. Investment in non-urban recreational facilities (campsites, picnic tables, boat ramps, etc.) in Oregon compared to Oregon's population						
17. Percentage of miles of major rural highway corridors in Oregon rated visually attractive						

Oregon Communities That Are Accessible, Affordable, Safe, and Enriching Places To Live and Work

Local Transportation	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
18. Percentage of Oregonians who commute (one-way) within 30 minutes between where they live and where they work			88%	88%	88%	88%
19. Percentage of Oregonians who commute to and from work during peak hours by means other than a single occupancy vehicle			29%	40%	50%	60%
20. Percentage of miles of limited access highways in Oregon urban areas that are not heavily congested during peak hours		93%	65%	60%	60%	60%
21. Transit hours per capita per year in Oregon metropolitan areas	.4	1.3	1.0	1.3	1.5	1.7

Access to Other Communities	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
22. Percentage of Access Oregon Highways built to handle traffic at a steady 55 mile-per-hour rate			42%	56%	66%	90%
23. Percentage of Oregonians living in communities with daily scheduled inter-city passenger bus, van, or rail service						
24. Percentage of Oregonians living within 50 miles of an airport with daily scheduled air passenger service			70%	70%	72%	75%

Adequate and Affordable Housing	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
25. Ratio of the price of a home that a median income Oregon household can afford over the median price of Oregon homes for sale				> 1.2:1	> 1.2:1	> 1.2:1
26. Percentage of Oregon households below median income spending less than 30 percent of their household income on housing (including utilities)		53%		80%	90%	100%
27. Number of Oregonians who are homeless			30,000	20,000	10,000	5,000

Drinking Water and Sewage Disposal	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
28. Number of Oregonians (in thousands) with drinking water that does not meet government standards			117			
29. Number of Oregonians (in thousands) with sewage disposal that does not meet government standards			200	134	67	0

Crime	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
30. Overall crimes per 1,000 Oregonians per year		138	144	100	65	50
31. Violent crimes per 1,000 Oregonians per year		13	17	13	10	10
32. Property crimes per 1,000 Oregonians per year		87	79	55	35	25
33. Juvenile crimes per 1,000 juvenile Oregonians per year		32	38	35	20	10
34. Percentage of Oregon felons returning to prison within three years after release		34%	54%	45%	30%	15%

Wildfire Loss	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
35. Property damage per year in Oregon due to wildfires (millions of 1989 dollars; 5-year rolling average)	\$5.23	\$2.84	\$3.73	\$7.5	\$10	\$12.8

Community Outdoor Recreation	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
36. Acres of community parks, designated recreation areas, and designated open space per 1,000 Oregonians living in communities			16	18	20	20
37. Investment in community recreational facilities (playgrounds and equipment, tennis courts, swimming pools, etc.) relative to the number of Oregonians living in communities						

Access to Cultural Enrichment	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
38. Number of arts events attended per capita in Oregon per year		1.4	1.7	2.0	3.0	5.0
39. Percentage of Oregonians served by a public library which meets minimum service criteria		45%	66%	70%	80%	90%

Access to Child Care and Health Care

Access to Child Care	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
40. Ratio of the supply of nonparental child care in Oregon to the demand for such care			1:1.2	1:1.16	1:1.1	1:1
41. Percentage of Oregon's nonparental child care capacity whose providers are licensed or registered in Oregon, listed with an Oregon resource and referral agency, or nationally accredited			29%	40%	75%	100%
42. Average percentage of household income spent on child care per year by Oregon households below median income						

Access to Health Care	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
43. Percentage of Oregonians with economic access to basic health care			84%	90%	100%	100%
44. Percentage of Oregonians with geographic access to basic health care			94%	96%	98%	99%

Community Involvement

Political Participation and Volunteerism	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
45. Percentage of adult Oregonians who vote	57%	56%	55%	60%	70%	80%
46. Oregon's ranking among states in percentage of adults who vote		15th	14th	10th	5th	1st
47. Percentage of Oregonians who volunteer at least 50 hours of their time per year to civic, community, or nonprofit activities						

5. Diverse, Robust Economy

Focus

Measure the state's progress toward a more diversified economy which generates productive jobs and higher incomes for all Oregonians -- and toward a business climate that fosters such an economy.

Why This Issue Is Important

A prosperous, diverse economy is important for Oregon's future in at least three ways. First, a healthy economy provides job opportunities for individual Oregonians. Second, businesses and individuals working in a healthy economy provide the revenues which fund schools, recreational and cultural attractions, public facilities, and services which all Oregonians enjoy. Third, the individual opportunities created by a healthy economy can reduce the rate of unemployment and poverty, reducing the costs of social programs.

Where We Are Now

Oregon's economy has been growing rapidly over the past five years, following a bruising recession in the early 1980s. Employment is now above the levels of the late 1970s. Unfortunately, the average personal income of Oregonians, which rose above the national average during the 1970s, fell to about 90 percent of the national average in the early 1980s and has not rebounded. While the state has rebounded in all regions, rural areas typically have grown less rapidly. They face significant hardship due to the loss of timber supply in the forest products industry, the major employer in many Oregon communities.

Oregon's economy has been diversifying since World War II. In manufacturing, forest products employment comprised 60 percent of the jobs in 1947. Today, forest products represents less than 35 percent of manufacturing jobs, with high technology and other diversified manufacturing substantially adding share. At the same time the state has experienced substantial growth in the professional services and tourism sectors, again expanding the economic base. Natural resource based industries will continue to be important to Oregon, but our economy will continue its transition toward reliance on a more balanced and diversified mix of manufacturing industries and services.

There are several conditions that will support this transition and foster economic health in the years ahead. The first two factors are developed in the previous sections: people and quality of life. Reaching goals in each of those areas will support economic growth and diversity in the future. In addition, a strong economy depends upon a quality public infrastructure, an environment where the costs of doing businesses are held down, regulations that are predictable and understandable, and a regulatory process that smoothly accommodates growth. Oregon has advantages in each of these areas, but also has room for improvement.

Where We Want To Be

Value-added products and skills. The benchmarks listed here envision an Oregon in which more value is added to the state's natural resources before they are exported. It also envisions an Oregon in which increasing industrial diversity reduces reliance on natural resources and increases reliance on the skills of our workers.

Per capita income. As Oregon develops a work force second to none in the world by the year 2010, our workers' per capita personal incomes should rise as well. We have set a statewide goal of 110 percent of U.S. per capita personal income by 2010, with regional goals of 115 percent in the Portland region and 106 percent in all other regions.

Diversification. Our efforts to diversify Oregon's economy will have the effect of reducing the importance of individual industries. In manufacturing, we should be able to increase the percentage of employment outside the largest single industry from 71 percent in 1990 to 80 percent in 2010. Moreover, our efforts should increase the value-added portion of the lumber and wood products industry and the value-added processing of our agricultural production. Growth in these sectors will help offset jobs lost in primary production.

Statewide growth. The state's employment and population growth should reflect statewide economic health. We have set a minimum goal of 55 percent of Oregon's employment outside the Portland region. This benchmark requires an effort to avert rural decline and to promote economic health in all regions of the state.

Regional employment should grow, *at a minimum*, enough to accommodate the net demand for jobs resulting from young Oregonians entering the work force as older workers retire. The intent is not to promote in migration and rapid job growth, although those will occur in many cases, but to provide enough jobs in all regions of the state for *Oregonians* to live and work.

A Climate that Fosters Growth and Diversification

To foster an environment for advanced companies that provide well paying jobs, Oregon's business climate needs to focus on four issues:

- ***Containing the cost of doing business in Oregon***, i.e., controlling critical costs such as health care and workers compensation and energy rates and service.
- ***Maintaining Oregon's capacity for expansion and growth*** by ensuring sufficient land, air, and water resources, and by streamlining the permitting process.
- ***Providing quality physical and knowledge infrastructure***. Public facilities and services provide the foundations for economic growth. Transportation, water, sewer and other capital

intensive facilities are necessary for industry and communities to function. In addition, for the advanced companies we hope to attract here, access to research and information can be equally important.

- *Establishing an effective public finance system* that raises sufficient funds to pay for important public services, and which holds taxes overall and taxes for business roughly at national averages.

Benchmarks for a Diverse, Robust Economy

Diverse Industry	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
1. Oregon's manufacturing employment (in relation to total Oregon employment) as a percentage of national manufacturing employment (in relation to total national employment)	89%	91%	101%	95% to 105%	95% to 105%	95% to 105%
2. Percentage of manufacturing employees outside the state's largest manufacturing industry	61%	68%	71%	72%	75%	80%
3. Percentage of lumber and wood products manufacturing employees in "value-added" manufacturing		21%	28%	39%	45%	50%
4. Percentage of agricultural gross state product in food processing			31%	32%	33%	35%
5. Small business startups per 1,000 population		2.3	2.9	3.0	3.2	3.5
6. Percentage of professional services exported (imported) relative to total Oregon industry demand			(17%)	(10%)	0	5%
7. Percentage of manufactured goods sold outside the United States			22%	28%	35%	50%
8. Total visitor industry expenditures by non-Oregonians (in billions of 1987 dollars)			\$1.07	\$1.66	\$1.97	\$2.29

Balanced Distribution of Jobs and Income	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
9. Percentage of Oregonians employed outside the Portland metro area		55%	55%	55%	55%	55%
10. Percentage of Oregonians not economically disadvantaged			82%	85%	90%	95%
11. Percentage of Oregonians in the middle income range		43%	44%	47%	50%	55%

Per Capita Income as a Percentage of the U.S. Average	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
12. State	96%	99%	92%	97%	101%	110%
a. Portland metro area	109%	112%	103%	106%	109%	115%
b. All other regions	86%	90%	85%	91%	96%	106%

Total Employment (000s)	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
13. State			1391.0	1476.1	1556.2	1674.5
a. Portland			644.8	677.1	709.6	762.7
b. Northwest			406.3	436.9	463.1	499.4
c. Southwest			197.0	210.0	221.7	235.6
d. Columbia			50.8	53.6	57.2	62.7
e. Central			50.7	54.4	57.9	63.4
f. Eastern			41.4	44.1	46.9	50.7

Containment of the Cost of Doing Business

Workers' Compensation	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
14. Oregon's ranking among states in workers' compensation costs			8th	20th-25th	20th-25th	20th-25th

Health Care	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
15. Oregon's ranking among states in health care costs						

Energy Rates and Services	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
16. Energy productivity: amount of money spent on energy to generate \$1 of personal income in Oregon as a percentage of the comparable average U.S. expenditure	106%	90%	104%	100%	95%	90%
17. Energy rates and services: Oregon average electricity rates as a percentage of the national average	58%	54%	68%	70%	75%	80%
18. Oregon average industrial electric rates as a percentage of national average	42%	43%	71%	71%	75%	80%
19. Oregon natural gas rates as a percentage of national average	137%	164%	127%	120%	115%	110%

Maintenance of Oregon's Capacity for Expansion and Growth

Land	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
20. Percentage of Oregon industrial site acreage identified in comprehensive plans that is actually suitable for development						
a. Portland Area						
b. North Coast						
c. Southwest						
d. Willamette Valley						
e. Central						
f. Eastern						
21. Ratio of Oregon's undeveloped, industrially zoned acreage to acreage under annual industrial development						
a. Portland Area						
b. North Coast						
c. Southwest						
d. Willamette Valley						
e. Central						
f. Eastern						

Water	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
22. Number of river miles not in compliance with government water quality standards and therefore unable to accommodate additional development			1,540	1,000	750	500

Air	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
23. Number of areas not in compliance with government ambient air standards and therefore unable to accommodate additional municipal and industrial development	5	7	4	0	0	0

Timber	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
24. Percentage of public and private forest land in Oregon available for timber harvest	84 %	79 %	70 %	65 %	65 %	65 %
25. Amount of timber harvested per year in Oregon (five-year rolling average; billions of board feet)	9.1	7.8	8.4			

Streamlined Permitting	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
26. Percentage of permits issued within the target time period or less:						
a. Air contaminant discharge			66 %	100 %	100 %	100 %
b. Wastewater discharge			50 %	100 %	100 %	100 %
c. Building						

Accessibility of Markets and Information

Air Transportation	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
27. Number of U.S., Canadian, and Mexican metropolitan areas of over 1 million population served by non-stop flights to and from any Oregon commercial airport			18	20	23	26
28. Number of international cities of over 1 million population (outside Canada and Mexico) served by direct and non-stop air service to and from any Oregon commercial airport		1	4	7	9	12

Ground Transportation	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
29. Backlog of city, county, and state roads and bridges in need of repair and preservation			20%	15%	10%	5%

Marine Transportation	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
30. Percentage of the 50 largest ports outside the United States served with direct service from the Port of Portland			54%	60%	70%	80%

Telecommunications	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
31. Percentage of Oregon households with single-party, touchtone-capable telephone service		65%	85%	98%	99%	99%
32. Percentage of Oregon telephone lines that reliably can transmit data at medium speed		80%	97%	100%	100%	100%

Research and Technology	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
33. Oregon's national ranking in federal research and development funding per capita			32nd	25th	20th	15th
34. Oregon's national ranking in private research and development funding per capita			32nd	25th	20th	15th
35. Oregon's national ranking in patents issued per capita			9th	8th	7th	6th

Public Finance

Taxes	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
36. Oregon property tax rates as percentage of U.S. average			140%	< 100	< 100	< 100
37. Total taxes per capita as percentage of U.S. average			90%	90%-100%	90%-100%	90%-100%
38. Oregon ranking: per capita state and local tax burden			20th	20th	20th	20th

Public Infrastructure Investment	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
39. Real per capita capital outlays for facilities (constant dollars)	\$328	\$404	\$254	\$459	\$501	\$583

Appendix

Endnotes: Benchmarks for Exceptional People

1. Pregnancy rate per 1,000 females ages 10-17

Explanation: In supporting a measure of pregnancy among children, benchmark reviewers and the Progress Board felt the measure should be limited to females under 18. National teen pregnancy statistics are generally reported for females 15-17. Very young mothers, ages 10-14, were included in response to public comment and an interest in understanding the full range of this problem among young females. *Source and availability of data:* *Vital Statistics*, published annually by the Health Division. *Discussion:* In order to emphasize the value of pregnancy prevention, the Progress Board added this benchmark to the following benchmark which measures the teen birth rate. Both the pregnancy and birth rate benchmarks were narrowed to exclude 18- and 19-year-old mothers. An argument can be made that they are young adults rather than children. Pregnancies among teens through 17 years result in poor outcomes for both mother and baby much more often than do pregnancies generally. Consequences may include prenatal and birth complications, difficulty with neonatal care, and infant mortality. These represent huge preventable personal and social costs.

2. Birth rate per 1,000 females ages 10-17

Source and availability of data: *Vital Statistics*, published annually by the Health Division. *Discussion:* This is related to the previous benchmark. In addition to the risks listed above, mothers who are children face risks of dropping out of school, becoming welfare dependent, and limiting their life options. Their children face a greater risk of impaired development and a poor start in life.

3. Percentage of children 0-17 living above the federal poverty level

Source and availability of data: Children's Defense Fund, gathered from census and Current Population Survey data. This information might also be gathered through a state population survey like that conducted in 1990. *Discussion:* This is a general indicator which subsumes other measures of family well being. The definition of the poverty level is a current national policy question. Many benchmark reviewers commented that 100% of the federal poverty level is an inadequate standard of living, and suggested 150% of federal poverty level as a truer standard of adequate income. Another suggested alternative is 70% of the Lower Living Standard Income Level (LLSIL), which is used to determine family eligibility for several federal assistance programs. For families of two or more, 70% of LLSIL is 5% to 20% above the poverty level, depending on family size. The benchmark is currently set to 100% of the federal poverty level, due to availability of data. Future reports should use a more realistic measure of poverty.

4. Number of children abused or neglected per 1,000 children under 18

Source and availability of data: Currently reported by the Children's Services Division. *Discussion:* Child abuse and neglect is linked to immediate stresses on families, including single parent families, unemployment, and drug and alcohol abuse. It is linked to many social problems in later life, including teen pregnancy, crime, and drug and alcohol abuse. While child abuse and neglect are correlated with spousal abuse, this measure is reported separately because the data are in different form.

5. Spousal abuse: domestic violence calls per 1,000 households

Source and availability of data: This is based on calls to domestic violence program shelters statewide, and census data on household size. The calls are not unduplicated: Some calls are from women who have called previously. The Oregon Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence has suggested measuring this indicator through the total number of domestic violence calls received annually per 100,000 households. *Discussion:* This is a strong measure of family dysfunction, and is strongly correlated with child abuse. Just as abused children often grow up to become child abusers, children who witness abusive spousal relationships frequently adopt such behavior in their adult relationships.

6. Percentage of children who are homeless

Explanation: Homeless children face greater risks in virtually every aspect of their lives, ranging from family stress and instability to lack of access to health resources. *Source and availability of data:* This data was gathered for the first time in the 1990 Census. It should be reported by 1993. Oregon currently has no plans or methodology to gather intercensal estimates of homeless populations. If Oregon gathers intercensal estimates on homelessness, the Children's Services Division should be responsible for developing and reporting the data. *Discussion:* This benchmark was added in response to the suggestion of many reviewers. It is an important addition to measures of child welfare and family health in Oregon.

7. Percentage of babies whose mothers received adequate prenatal care

Explanation: Adequate care is that which begins before the third trimester of pregnancy or includes at least five visits. *Source and availability of data:* *Vital Statistics*, published annually by the Health Division. *Discussion:* Inadequate prenatal care is associated with increased incidence of low birthweight and infant mortality. The Institute of Medicine and the American Academy of Pediatrics both estimate that each dollar spent on prenatal care prevents the need to spend \$2 to \$10 on high technology care for low birthweight babies.

8. Percentage of healthy birthweight babies

Explanation: This is the converse of low birthweight babies, those full-term babies which weigh less than 2,500 grams. *Source and availability of data:* *Vital Statistics*, published annually by the Health Division. *Discussion:* Low birthweight is the most important determinant of infant mortality. In addition, low birthweight babies who survive bear an increased risk of birth defects, mental retardation, many other physical ailments, and child abuse and neglect. Oregon ranks among the ten best states in low incidence of low birthweight babies, both overall and for white, African-American, and non-white subgroups. However, the overall rate of low birthweight babies in Oregon is projected to increase to 5.6% by 2000 absent new concerted initiatives. Benchmarks proposed here would require such initiatives.

9. Percentage of babies born to mothers who did not use:

a. illicit drugs during pregnancy

Source and availability of data: An estimate supplied by the Health Division, based on studies at hospitals in Oregon and nationwide. Estimated cost of gathering this data twice statewide through a census of births is \$200,000. This measure is complicated by mothers' resistance to reporting drug use, and the task of tracing drug use *throughout* a pregnancy. *Discussion:* Drug exposure puts babies at greater risk of complications during pregnancy and correlates with low birthweights and exposure to AIDS and sexually transmitted diseases. Babies in drug abusing families face greater risks of health, inadequate nutrition, and abuse and neglect.

b. alcohol during pregnancy

Explanation: In the extreme, significant use of alcohol is associated with fetal alcohol syndrome, which includes a wide variety of abnormalities. As little as two drinks per day during early pregnancy may be associated with recognizable, though milder, abnormalities in a significant share of exposed infants. There is no known safe lower threshold of alcohol use during pregnancy. *Discussion:* Oregon Health Division notes a reported prevalence rate of almost 9% through reports accompanying birth certificates. National figures suggest alcohol use during pregnancy may be several times higher, between 25% and 33%. In addition, it seems likely that Oregon mothers who drink during pregnancy, underreport the degree of such drinking.

c. tobacco during pregnancy

Explanation: Tobacco use is associated with low birthweight infants and the complications arising from low birthweight. As with alcohol, there is no known lower threshold of safe tobacco use during pregnancy. *Discussion:* Twenty-four percent of pregnant women use tobacco according to reports accompanying birth certificates. Oregon Health Division analysis suggests tobacco use may also be underreported. It is notable that over 55% of smoking mothers report using less than 1/2 pack of cigarettes per day.

10. Infant mortality rate per 1,000

Source and availability of data: *Vital Statistics*, published annually by the Health Division. *Discussion:* This is a fundamental health statistic which all states and most countries keep. Oregon's infant mortality rate is lower than the U.S. average but significantly higher than Japan's rate of 5 per 1,000, which has been used to set Oregon's benchmark for 2010. Oregon's overall infant mortality rate is significantly affected by its Sudden Infant Death Syndrome rate (1.4 per 1,000), which is among the highest in the nation.

11. Percentage of two year olds who are adequately immunized

Source and availability of data: The Oregon Department of Education will gather this data for all children beginning at kindergarten. *Discussion:* Immunization is an effective way to reduce health risks among young children. It is also an indicator of the care and attention parents pay their children.

12. Percentage of babies and toddlers receiving basic health care

Source and availability of data: This data is not currently available. The Health Services Commission is in the process of defining basic health care for all Oregonians. Gathering this statistic will require developing an estimate of the population receiving the defined level of service.

13. Percentage of children entering kindergarten meeting specific developmental standards for their age

Explanation: This is a measure of whether Oregon five year olds are thriving. *Source and availability of data:* This data is not currently gathered statewide. Several school districts offer voluntary preschool screenings which assess children's health and their physical, mental, and social development. The State Department of Education and Community

Children and Youth Services Commission should be responsible for gathering this data. A rough estimate of the survey cost is \$200,000. *Discussion:* Reviewers felt that this benchmark is both important and difficult to measure. The measure is fundamentally different in purpose and use from case-by-case preschool screening. It will be based on an anonymous survey of 1,000 to 1,500 Oregon school children and will measure how well Oregon youngsters are doing as a whole. It will not be used to make judgments or decisions about specific children.

14. Basic Student Skills: Percentage of Students Who Achieve Basic Established Skill Levels

- a. Third grade
- b. Fifth grade
- c. Eighth grade
- d. Eleventh grade
- e. Baccalaureate degree

Explanation: This benchmark measures the skills of Oregon students in a variety of subjects as they proceed through school. *Source and availability of data:* The assessment system for this benchmark in the K-12 grade range was authorized by the 1989 Legislature and is currently being developed by the Department of Education. On a rotating basis all students in grades 3, 5, 8, and 11 will be tested each spring in language arts (1991), mathematics and health (1992), science and physical education (1993), and social studies, art, and music (1994). *Discussion:* A number of reviewers proposed changes in school operations, or measures that focus on how education is provided (e.g., student/teacher ratios, teacher salaries, PTA involvement). However, the Progress Board believes that the most important measures are the results of the education process: the knowledge and capabilities of students themselves at different grade levels. This is consistent with the fundamental purpose of these benchmarks, which is to set levels of attainment for Oregonians, independent of the means to achieve those ends.

Explanation of item e., baccalaureate degree: This benchmark is the counterpart to those measuring the skills of younger students. *Source and availability of data:* This data is not gathered currently. Several states and test providers have developed the means to assess skills at this level. Examples include "rising junior" assessments of basic competency.

15. Percentage of high school graduates proficient in at least one language other than English

Source and availability of data: Oregon Department of Education survey *Foreign Languages in Oregon Schools* (1987). This data will be updated in early 1991. *Discussion:* Increasing international trade and growing diversity within Oregon require better understanding of different peoples and cultures. Language proficiency is regarded as an indicator of these attributes. However, data for non-English language proficiency is not directly available. The only available measure of second language attainment among Oregon high school students is the percentage of students enrolled in second-year language classes, which is currently 8%. Standards of language proficiency and corresponding measures may need to be developed, but they will involve considerable cost.

16. Ranking on national assessments

- a. Fourth grade
- b. Eighth grade
- c. Twelfth grade

Explanation: The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is collecting comparative assessment data for a variety of subjects over time, beginning in 1991 with a national mathematics assessment. *Source and availability of data:* National data will be available through NAEP. Both national and international comparisons can be made by using test items from international assessments in Oregon's instruments. *Discussion:* These benchmarks are preferable to Oregon's Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) rank, which is limited to a self-selected group of college-bound students, and was roundly criticized as a proposed benchmark.

17. Ranking on international reading, math, and science assessments

See Note 16.

18. Percentage of students free of involvement with alcohol in the previous month

- a. Eighth grade
- b. Eleventh grade

Source and availability of data: This information is collected in the *Oregon Public School Drug Use Survey*, conducted in even numbered years for the Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs. Alcohol figures for 1990 are taken from the 1990 interim report. Drug and tobacco figures are taken from the 1988 final report. The final 1990 report will be released in January of 1991. *Discussion:* Use of alcohol, illicit drugs, and tobacco are linked with many poor outcomes, including increased incidence of drug dependence, increased property crime, and a variety of health risks.

19. Percentage of students free of involvement with illicit drugs in the previous month

- a. Eighth grade
 - b. Eleventh grade
- See Note 18.

20. Percentage of eleventh grade students free of involvement with tobacco in the previous month
See Note 18.

21. Sexually transmitted disease rate per 10,000 Oregonians ages 10-19

Explanation: This benchmark includes early syphilis, gonorrhea, and chlamydia, and is reported as rate per 10,000. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Health Division. *Discussion:* This information is important both in its own right and as an indicator of risk for the spread of HIV/AIDS into this population.

22. Percentage of K-12 children who meet national physical fitness standards

Explanation: This benchmark will be based on norms established by the National Children and Youth Fitness Studies I and II by the U.S Public Health Service. *Source and availability of data:* This data is not gathered currently. It was proposed in *Health Objectives for the Year 2000*, and will probably be gathered by the Department of Education. The Department will assess health in 1992 and physical education in 1993. *Discussion:* Risk of cardiovascular disease depends significantly on exercise, together with diet and tobacco use. Health related fitness depends significantly upon aerobic exercise.

23-28. Current Transitions from Secondary Education

Explanation: This group of six benchmarks measures the attainment of students presently going through secondary and post-secondary systems. For the three post-secondary measures, it is difficult to establish which age group of Oregonians should serve as the base to calculate a rate of attainment. It is also generally difficult to establish measures of post-secondary attainment and achievement. Nevertheless, these measures are important because the skill attainment of these students, and especially that of non-college-bound youth, is critical to our future.

23. Percentage of high school students enrolled in vocational and technical education programs

Source and availability of data: Vocational Education Division, Department of Education. These two enrollment benchmarks (23 and 24) are taken from *Lessons from the Old School: European Workforce Development Strategies for Oregon*, by Tami Miller, Joint Legislative Committee on Trade and Economic Development, and Bob Baugh, Oregon Economic Development Department. *Discussion:* Students who do not go on to baccalaureate programs face the greatest change in Oregon's economic transition, yet historically and comparatively (see *Lessons*) we have done little to prepare them for life beyond high school. These benchmarks measure the success of Oregon's non-college bound youth in connecting with meaningful, realistic opportunities, and in becoming more self-sufficient.

24. High school student enrollment in structured work experience programs
See Note 23.

25. High school graduation rate

Source and availability of data: Department of Education. *Discussion:* Opportunities are especially bleak for young Oregonians who drop out of high school. A national study shows that among the change in real earnings of males 20 to 24 years old between 1973 and 1986, the wages of high school dropouts plunged 42%. This benchmark includes only those high school graduates counted by the Department of Education. Those who achieve high school equivalency certification in other ways are documented in the benchmark, below, which measures the completion rate in the population of all Oregonians at least 25 years old.

26. Percentage of 25 year-olds with certificates granted in non-baccalaureate education and training programs

Source and availability of data: Office of Educational Policy and Planning, reporting IPEDS data gathered annually. Also, see Note 28. *Discussion:* This benchmark complements benchmarks 23 and 24 by charting Oregonians' success in gaining significant, certified occupational skills.

27. Percentage of 25 year-olds with baccalaureate degrees
See Note 28.

28. Percentage of 30 year-olds with post-baccalaureate degrees

Source and availability of data: Office of Educational Policy and Planning, reporting HEGIS and IPEDS data gathered annually. Benchmarks 26 through 28 either will require additional work to establish appropriate base populations from which to compute rates, or will require significant effort and expenditure to survey a sample of 25 and 30 year olds regarding their educational attainment. *Discussion:* These two benchmarks measure the flow of students

through Oregon's higher education system. The number of jobs which will require at least some post-secondary training is projected to increase significantly in coming years. As skill requirements for jobs of all kinds rise, the share of Oregonians who complete higher education must also increase.

29-33. Adult Formal Education Attainment

Explanation: All benchmarks are measured for the population of Oregonians at least 25 years old. The first four measures are nested; each is a prerequisite for the next level of education. *Source and availability of data:* The first three measures are gathered in the decennial census. The first four measures were reported in the Oregon State Demographic Task Force, "1990 Oregon Population Survey for the State of Oregon." The final benchmark, apprenticeship completion, can also be gathered through survey. *Discussion:* Well over 75% of Oregon's work force in the year 2000 is currently at work. Not only will new jobs require higher average skill levels, skill levels in current jobs will also rise.

34. Percentage of work force that has received at least 20 hours of education related to work skills and knowledge within the past 12 months

Source and availability of data: This data is not currently available, but can probably be gathered by survey. *Discussion:* This is a measure of the continuing training of Oregon workers in response to changing technologies, mix of industries, and production methods. It replaces, in part, a proposed benchmark of work force quality which defied precise definition and measurement.

35. Percentage of employer payroll dedicated to training and education

Explanation: U.S. employers spend an amount equal to approximately 1.5% of payroll on upgrading the skills of their current workers. By contrast, employers in northern European countries spend approximately 3%. *Source and availability of data:* This data is not gathered currently. With moderate additional effort and expense, this data should be obtainable. One possible means: a survey of Oregon employers by the Employment Division. *Discussion:* Continued employer investment in worker development bolsters competitiveness and productivity. As a consequence, it will also help prevent or reduce worker displacement.

36. Percentage of displaced workers reemployed within 24 months and earning at least 90% of previous income

Explanation: This is a critical measure of how well Oregon responds to the needs of Oregonians most immediately affected by economic change. *Source and availability of data:* Currently unavailable and unknown. This information may be available through identification-blind tracking of displaced workers' unemployment insurance records kept by the Employment Division.

37-39. Literacy Skills (prose, document, quantitative skills)

Explanation: These benchmarks are indicators of the functional literacy skills of adult Oregonians, ages 16-65. They measure adult ability to answer questions of various degrees of difficulty regarding information in text (newspaper articles, warranties) and other documents (advertisements, graphs, pay slips, bus schedules, menus, unit pricing information.) *Source and availability of data:* This information was collected in 1990 in a statewide survey authorized by the Oregon Legislature. The survey instrument was developed by the Educational Testing Service and the U.S. Department of Labor for a concurrent nationwide functional literacy study. Similar studies of the literacy of America's adults will be conducted approximately every four years. *Discussion:* Benchmark reviewers noted the importance of measuring adult work force skills. Many noted that workers need a broad variety of attributes that contribute to work success (for example, positive attitude toward work, ability to learn, listening skills, ability to work with others.) Instruments to assess these skills statewide and allow comparison with other populations are not currently available.

40-43. Multilingual Skills

Explanation: These benchmarks document Oregonians' self-reported proficiencies in second languages other than English. They are surrogates for broader cultural awareness and understanding. *Source and availability of data:* This information was self-reported in the Oregon State Demographic Task Force report 1990 *Population Survey for the State of Oregon*. Language proficiency identified in benchmarks 40 through 42 was available in the survey. Proficiency for benchmark 43 can be determined but would require additional survey data analysis. *Discussion:* The survey question asked only about proficiency in a language other than English, not about proficiency in English as a second language. Multilingual skill is inferred from the fact the survey was conducted in English.

44. Scores of Oregonians on an assessment of basic geography knowledge

Explanation: This is an indicator of Oregonians' awareness and understanding of a broader world. *Source and availability of data:* Data for this benchmark is not currently available, and would likely require significant effort and expense to gather. *Discussion:* As with student foreign language proficiency, reviewers suggested broader measures of cultural understanding.

45. People participating in cultural exchanges

Explanation: This is a measure of actual contact with people from other cultures. *Source and availability of data:* Further research is required. This information is not currently gathered, but should not require significant effort or expense to obtain. It may be available through a survey. Another alternative is to identify Oregonians participating in specific exchange programs. This may be prohibitive, however, given the variety and diffusion of these programs. *Discussion:* This benchmark was suggested as a more meaningful measure than passports issued annually per 1,000 population.

46-51. Health Practices (percentages of adults who practice a list of certain behaviors related to health)

Explanation: This is not a measure of health per se, but rather a measure of practices which contribute to good health. (For example, cigarette smoking is the leading preventable cause of death in Oregon.) *Source and availability of data:* The Health Division gathers this data annually as part of the national Behavioral Risk Factor Survey (BRFS) program coordinated by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC). The 1990 benchmark figures are taken from the 1989 survey. Comparison with other states is possible.

46. Percentage of adults who use vehicle safety restraints consistently

Explanation: This is the percentage of adults who say they always use seat belts. Comparative national studies show that self-reported use of restraints exceeds observed use of restraints by about 8%. Oregon's recent passage of a ballot measure requiring use of vehicle safety restraints is expected to greatly increase their use.

47. Percentage of adults who have normal blood pressure

Explanation: This is the inverse of the number of hypertensives. The CDC defines hypertensives as those who report having been told more than once that their blood pressure is high, who are on medication, or who still have high blood pressure.

48. Percentage of adults who maintain a recommended weight-to-height ratio

Explanation: The CDC publishes this data using a body mass index (BMI). The BMI is a ratio of weight in kilograms divided by height in meters squared. The ratio for overweight females is 27.3 or greater, and for males 27.8 or greater.

50. Percentage of adults who drink alcohol only in moderation

Explanation: 30 or fewer drinks per month, and no more than five on any occasion

51. Percentage of adults who do not currently smoke tobacco

Discussion: Reviewers suggested including smokeless tobacco use in a measure of total tobacco use. In 1989, the CDC dropped a smokeless tobacco use question from its survey of risk factors. In 1988, the abstinence rate for smokeless tobacco was 95.5%. This percentage cannot be combined with the figure for abstinence from smoking, however, due to possible duplication.

52. Total deaths annually attributable to AIDS

Source and availability of data: The Health Division reports this information annually in *Vital Statistics*. The figure reported is for 1990, and represents a 53% increase over 1989. *Discussion:* Many reviewers suggested adding a benchmark which measures the incidence and spread of AIDS in Oregon. This measure was chosen as a well documented indicator. Proposed alternatives (such as the incidence of HIV) were rejected as being impossible or extremely difficult to determine. Program response to meet the proposed goals includes, as the primary prevention measure, stopping the spread of HIV.

53. Percentage of adults who abuse drugs

Source and availability of data: An objective, population-wide measure of drug abuse is not currently available. A possible surrogate measure is the arrest rate for driving under the influence of intoxicants (DUII) which is kept by the Law Enforcement Data System.

55. Drug and alcohol related death rate per 100,000 annually

Source and availability of data: This information is reported annually in *Vital Statistics* by the Health Division.

56. Unintentional injuries per 100,000 annually

Source and availability of data: The Health Division compiles information on all hospitalized injury patients with a stay of one or more days, and on all injury-related deaths, based on reports from the Oregon Injury Registry, Hospital Discharge Index, Death Certificates, and the Medical Examiner's Records. *Discussion:* This is the leading cause of death among Oregonians 1-34 years old, and the leading cause of loss of potential years of life up to age 70.

57. Suicide rate per 100,000 annually

Source and availability of data: The Health Division reports this statistic annually in *Vital Statistics*. *Discussion:* This benchmark was suggested by reviewers, with the observation that Oregon's rate is among the highest in the nation. The U.S. rate is 12.6.

58-62. Note: These benchmarks reflect the Progress Board's commitment to measure the degree to which all of Oregon's people are participating in the state's social and economic well being. In measuring benchmarks in the future, whenever possible and appropriate, the Board will attempt to assess the progress and participation of Oregon's citizens by race, gender, and disability.

58. Income per capita as a percentage of Oregon median

Source and availability of data: This data is available through decennial census reports. Gathering specific data for racial groups for 1995 or other interim years would require a moderate additional effort and expenditure. Each non-white subgroup is at most about 3% to 4% of the total population, so a statistically valid survey would require oversampling.

59. Infant mortality per 1,000 live births

Explanation: This is a fundamental measure of health. It is associated with adequacy of prenatal care, birthweight, mother's age, and mother's educational attainment. *Source and availability of data:* This data is gathered by the Health Division. The most recent report available is *Oregon Infant Deaths, 1981-1983 Birth Cohort*. Due to the small size of non-white subgroups, infant mortality rates can be reliably reported only as five-year averages.

60-62. Civic and Occupational Achievement

Explanation: These benchmarks are broad measures of the degree to which all Oregonians participate in economic and civic opportunities in Oregon. Each benchmark in this section will be reported as the ratio of subgroup share of the benchmark group to subgroup share of the Oregon adult population (for example, Hispanic percentage of Oregon elected and appointed officials to Hispanic percentage of the adult Oregon population).

60. Elected and appointed officials

Source and availability of data: These data are not currently available, and would likely require significant effort and expense to gather. A Portland City Club committee seeking similar information has conducted a survey of local governments in the Portland area.

61. Successful business ownership

Source and availability of data: This data is reported as the number of registered minority-owned businesses. It is available through the Office of Minority, Women, and Emerging Small Business, which can also provide a breakdown by ethnic group.

62. Participation in historically underrepresented occupations

Source and availability of data: Data for this benchmark are not currently gathered and would require significant effort and expense to collect. The Employment Division is the best positioned organization to acquire this information. *Discussion:* This benchmark was suggested at the Progress Board's Summit on Exceptional People. Building trades and teaching were listed at the summit as prime examples of occupations in which racial minorities have been underrepresented.

63. Percentage of schools which have culturally diverse curricula

Source and availability of data: Information is not currently collected for this benchmark and the one which follows, and its availability is uncertain. The Department of Education is in a position to collect this information through standardization visits to all public schools in Oregon now conducted on a six-year rotation.

64. Percentage of schools which have conflict resolution curricula
See Note 63.

65. Hate crimes -- crimes against people or property motivated by intolerance

Source and availability of data: The Law Enforcement Data System (LEDS) began collecting this data October 1988, and has reported statistics through June 1990 in its *Semi-Annual Report of Criminal Offenses in Oregon Motivated by Prejudice*. The 1990 figure is double the number of hate crimes which occurred during January through June 1990, converted to a rate per 100,000 population using population estimates from Portland State University. *Discussion:* One group of reviewers suggested including crimes of malice in this benchmark. LEDS does not report crimes according to whether they were motivated by malice.

66. Civil rights complaints and violations

Source and availability of data: Research to date has not revealed a clear or uniform reporting system for either this benchmark or the one which follows. One partial measure is civil rights complaints filed with the Bureau of Labor and Industries.

67. Sexual harassment complaints and violations
See Note 66.

68. Reduction in crimes which result in incarceration

Explanation: This benchmark was suggested by a working group at the Summit on Exceptional People, as a measure of social justice, and of opportunities which make crime less attractive. *Source and availability of data:* This benchmark requires further research. Data can probably be obtained through the Law Enforcement Data System or a combination of criminal justice information systems with little additional effort or expense.

- 69-71. Independence and Community Participation of Seniors

Explanation: These benchmarks frame issues significant to Oregon seniors: ability to live independently, dignity, self-determination, participation in the community, and economic well being and self-sufficiency. This population is defined as Oregonians at least 65 years old.

69. Percentage of seniors living independently or with minimal assistance

Source and availability of data: Information for this benchmark is available through the Senior and Disabled Services Division.

70. Percentage of seniors who are employed and/or who volunteer at least 15 hours per week

Explanation: This benchmark reflects the variety of seniors' choices in activity, which include various combinations of employment, volunteer work, and leisure pursuits. *Source and availability of data:* This data is not gathered currently. It can be gathered through the state population survey. (For example, in the 1990 Population Survey for the State of Oregon, 6.5% of Oregonians over 64 reported being employed at least 35 hours per week.)

71. Percentage of seniors living above the poverty level

Source and availability of data: The 1990 Population Survey for the State of Oregon.

- 72-73. Mentally Disabled Oregonians

Discussion: Benchmarks for both mentally and physically disabled Oregonians require more research and refinement. The benchmarks for the mentally disabled measure their ability to function independently, to receive treatment without being institutionalized, to achieve some degree of self-sufficiency, and to participate in their communities. *Source and availability of data:* Mental Health & Developmental Disability Services Division. Oregon's mentally disabled population is estimated from national figures. Prevalence of mental disability is relatively uniform across populations.

Physically Disabled Oregonians: It has proved difficult to develop measures of outcomes for this population. Benchmarks for Oregonians with physical disabilities may parallel those for the mentally disabled population.

72. Percentage living independently or with minimal assistance

Explanation: Many mentally disabled Oregonians can live at least partially independently, given access to adequate mental health services.

73. Percentage who are employed and/or who volunteer at least 15 hours per week

See Note 72-73.

Endnotes: Outstanding Quality of Life

1. Percentage of Oregonians living where the air meets government ambient air quality standards

Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which the air in Oregon meets government air quality standards year round. The data are based on monitoring of Oregon airsheds for carbon monoxide, ozone, fine particulates, and other pollutants. **Source and availability of data:** Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. The data are currently reported. **Discussion:** New air quality standards and monitoring data in the future will likely require adjustment of the benchmark data, both retroactively and prospectively. The dramatic improvement in air quality attainment from 30% in 1980 to 89% in 1990 was the result of efforts in the Portland and Eugene-Springfield metropolitan areas to meet air quality standards.

2. Miles of Oregon's rivers and streams not meeting government in-stream water quality standards

Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which the water in Oregon's rivers and streams fails to meet government in-stream water quality standards. The data are based on measurements and assessments of the suitability of in-stream flows for several designated beneficial uses, including fishing (considering dissolved oxygen and temperature) and swimming (considering bacteria and virus levels as well as weed growth). The data are technically valid only for 3,500 miles of in-stream flows monitored, although the miles monitored are those known to be the most impacted based on visual assessments and other information. There are approximately 112,000 miles of rivers and streams in Oregon. **Source and availability of data:** Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. The data for 3,500 miles of in-stream flows are currently reported. DEQ considers the data for 3,500 in-stream miles, out of 112,000 in-stream miles statewide, to be an inadequate basis for managing Oregon's in-stream water quality. DEQ indicates that an adequate data base would require increasing the in-stream flows monitored to 9,000 miles. DEQ estimates that this increase in stream miles monitored would cost an additional \$1 million annually. **Discussion:** New in-stream water quality standards, monitoring data, and assessment of information will probably require adjustment of the benchmark sums, both retroactively and prospectively.

3. Percentage of Oregon groundwater that is contaminated

Explanation: The purpose of this benchmark is to call attention to the need to monitor the extent to which Oregon's groundwater meets government groundwater quality standards. The precise nature of the benchmark data to be monitored is undecided. **Source and availability of data:** Oregon Department of Environmental Quality; secondarily, Oregon Department of Water Resources. Data currently are available only for approximately 20% of the state's surface area, predominately in the Hermiston and Klamath Falls areas. DEQ indicates that a statewide network of monitoring wells is necessary to adequately describe the overall quality of Oregon's groundwater. DEQ estimates that to monitor groundwater quality for 90% of the state's surface area by the year 2010 would cost \$5 million for monitoring wells and approximately \$1 million annually for data collection, lab analyses, and administration. **Discussion:** DEQ indicates that collecting data from monitored wells is preferable to collecting data from domestic wells, although use of monitoring wells is more expensive.

4. Percentage of Oregon hazardous waste sites cleaned up or being cleaned up

Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which sites on the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality's inventory of hazardous waste sites in Oregon have been cleaned up or are proceeding toward clean-up in compliance with a plan and schedule approved by DEQ. The inventory consists of those sites where releases of one or more hazardous substances has been confirmed and where clean-up is required. The inventory is currently being prepared by DEQ and will be essentially completed before 1995. New sites will probably be discovered after 1995. **Source and availability of data:** Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. DEQ has identified more than 800 sites in a data base of potential release sites. About 150 sites are being added to this data base annually. DEQ expects to have 150 sites in the inventory by the end of 1991, and further expects to complete evaluation of the sites in the data base for inclusion and ranking in the inventory by the end of 1995. Thereafter, new potential release sites are expected to be identified from time to time, evaluated, and ranked for inclusion in the inventory.

5. Pounds of Oregon municipal solid waste landfilled or incinerated per capita per year

Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which Oregon reduces municipal solid waste through recycling, product packaging requirements, or other means. **Source and availability of data:** Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. The data are currently reported.

6. Percentage of development in Oregon per year occurring within urban growth boundaries

Explanation: This benchmark will measure the extent to which new residential, commercial, and industrial construction each year in Oregon is occurring within urban growth boundaries throughout the state. The units of measure will be numbers of building permits issued or, preferably, the dollar value of building permits issued. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, with the assistance of the U.S. Census Bureau, Oregon Housing Agency, Oregon Building Codes Agency, and Oregon counties. The data are not currently collected. There may be some data collection costs.

7. Percentage of Oregon agricultural land in 1970 still preserved for agricultural use

Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which public and private Oregon land used for agriculture in 1970 is still used for agriculture. For purposes of this benchmark, "agricultural land" means acres of crop land, pasture land, and range land regardless of whether such land is being actively used for such purposes, is fallow, or is enrolled in a government set-aside program. The benchmark sum for 1990 is extrapolated from reported data for 1982 and 1987, assuming an annual decrease from 1987 to 1990 that corresponds to the average annual decrease that occurred from 1982 to 1987. The estimated actual amounts of agricultural land in Oregon, in millions of acres, are as follows: 1970, 15.8; 1980, 15.8; 1990, 15.2; 1995, 15.0; 2000, 14.8; 2010, 14.8. *Source and Availability of Data:* U.S. Department of Agriculture. USDA publishes this data every five years. The next publication of such data will occur in 1992.

8. Percentage of Oregon forest land in 1970 still preserved for forest use

Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which public and private Oregon land in forest use in 1970 is still in forest use. For purposes of this benchmark, "forest land" means acres of forested land where the dominant uses are for timber, watershed, wildlife, or recreation. (The extent to which Oregon forest land is available for timber harvest is measured by benchmark 24 of the section Diverse, Robust Economy.) The estimated actual amounts of forest land in Oregon, in millions of acres, are as follows: 1970, 25.3; 1980, 23.3; 1990, 19.4; 1995, 17.9; 2000, 17.9; 2010, 17.9. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Forestry. The data are currently reported. Benchmark estimates are extrapolated from reported data.

9. Percentage of Oregon wetlands in 1990 still preserved as wetlands

Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which Oregon's wetlands in 1990 are still wetlands. The unit of measure is acres of wetlands identified as such by the Oregon Division of State Lands. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Division of State Lands. DSL is identifying Oregon wetlands based on aerial photographs and other information, and expects to complete this process in 1991. The division estimates that its process will identify approximately 80% of Oregon's acreage that technically would qualify as wetlands under applicable criteria. DSL indicates that identifying 100% of Oregon acreage qualifying as wetlands would cost several million dollars.

10. Percentage of Oregon rivers and streams meeting in-stream flow needs

Explanation: This benchmark will measure the extent to which in-stream flows in Oregon's rivers and streams meet in-stream flow needs. In-stream flow needs will consist of public and private water rights. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Water Resources. DWR is establishing a data base and model for estimating the stream flow for each Oregon river basin, based on stream flow gauge data at a limited number of water rights locations. DWR believes that by the end of 1991 it will be able to calculate the benchmark sum for 1990. *Discussion:* There currently are in-stream water rights for approximately 450 stream flow locations in Oregon. These water rights were set between 1959 and 1990. In recent years, the State's departments of Environmental Quality, Fish and Wildlife, and Parks and Recreation were given authority to request greater in-stream flows. The Department of Fish and Wildlife has informed the Water Resources Commission of ODFW's intent to apply for greater flows at most of the 450 stream flow locations. The commission expects to receive other applications for in-stream water rights at 500 to 1,500 new locations by 1996. In analyses performed in August 1990, 50% of the streams in the John Day River Basin normally met the in-stream water rights, and 34% of the streams in the Rogue River Basin normally met the in-stream water rights. The benchmark sums projected for 1995, 2000, and 2010 are based on a policy of stream flow restoration endorsed by the Water Resources Commission, the Legislative Emergency Board, and Governor Goldschmidt.

11. Oregon groundwater quantity.

Explanation: The purpose of this benchmark is to call attention to the need to monitor the extent to which Oregon's groundwater is being depleted. The precise nature of the benchmark data to be monitored is undecided. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Water Resources. Detailed data currently are available for only about 4% of the state's surface area. DWR estimates that a detailed analysis of groundwater quantity for the state as a whole would cost approximately \$93 million. DPW indicates that a more general assessment of groundwater quantity statewide could be operational in two years at a cost of \$500,000. The more general assessment would be based on DPW data from construction records for wells, a statewide pump test program required by 1987 state legislation, and an observation network of about 400 wells statewide. *Discussion:* The Oregon Department of Water Resources began detailed analyses

of individual aquifers approximately four years ago. Three aquifers covering a total of about 150 square miles have been analyzed to date. Four additional aquifers, covering a total of about 350 square miles, are currently being analyzed. DWR also performs detailed analysis of "critical areas" where significant groundwater problems have developed. DWR has established five critical areas covering a total of about 550 square miles, and currently is investigating another potential critical area covering about 250 square miles. Given the current rate of analysis and Oregon's surface area (approximately 96,000 square miles), detailed analyses of all of Oregon's aquifers will require decades to complete.

12. Number of native wildlife species listed as threatened, endangered, or extinct in Oregon

Explanation: This benchmark addresses the extent to which natural habitat sufficient for sustaining native mammal, bird, reptile, amphibian, and fish species is maintained in Oregon. This benchmark does not address the extent to which habitat is maintained for other species such as insects and plants. The benchmark sum for a given year will be a composite number of (a) those species on the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife's threatened and endangered species lists for that year plus (b) those species which became extinct in Oregon since Oregon became a state (in 1859) and remain extinct. **Source and availability of data:** Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. The data are currently reported. **Discussion:** The benchmark data will be adjusted, both retroactively and prospectively, as new information is learned about the threatened, endangered, or extinct status of particular species.

13. Acres of primitive and wilderness public land in Oregon (millions)

Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which primitive and wilderness land is maintained in Oregon. This resource consists of public land without roads which has no recreational facilities (except trails), is open to limited recreational uses, and is protected from development, timber cutting, and other resource extraction. **Source and availability of data:** Oregon Department of Parks and Recreation. The data are currently reported. **Discussion:** The projected addition of one million acres between 1990 and 1995 reflects new wilderness acreage expected to be designated on federal land in Oregon.

14. Acres of multi-purpose public land available for recreation in Oregon (millions)

Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which multi-purpose public land available for recreation is maintained in Oregon. This resource consists of public land with roads which has no recreational facilities (except trails), is open to broad recreational uses, and is not protected from development, timber cutting, or other resource extraction. **Source and availability of data:** Oregon Department of Parks and Recreation. The data are currently reported.

15. Acres of Oregon parks and protected recreation land per 1,000 Oregonians

Explanation: This benchmark measures the amount of parks and other protected recreation land in Oregon compared to Oregon's population. This resource consists of public land with roads which has recreational facilities, is designated for recreational uses, and is protected from development, timber cutting, and other resource extraction. This resource includes local, state, and national parks, designated camping and picnic areas, monuments, and similar designated recreation land. **Source and availability of data:** Oregon Department of Parks and Recreation. The data are currently reported. **Discussion:** The increase in the per capita data from 1990 to 1995 anticipates additions to Oregon's state parks land base, one or more new additional national parks in Oregon, and general increases in park and recreation land in response to expected increases in demand from Oregonians and tourists.

16. Investment in non-urban recreational facilities (campsites, picnic tables, boat ramps, etc.) in Oregon compared to Oregon's population

Explanation: This benchmark will address the extent of public investment in recreational facilities on Oregon outdoor recreational lands outside of cities, as compared to Oregon's total population. For purposes of this benchmark, "recreational facilities" means human-made facilities requiring initial construction and subsequent maintenance, such as campsites, picnic tables, boat ramps, shelters, parking lots, and trails. The precise nature of the benchmark data to be monitored is undecided. Possible units of measure include (a) dollars of facility construction and maintenance spending per capita per year and (b) PAOT ("persons-at-one-time") measures of the capacity of facilities. **Source and availability of data:** Oregon Department of Parks and Recreation. The data are not currently reported. The department indicates that it previously collected facility spending data statewide but ceased to do so because local government spending data was inconsistent and unreliable and because it had concerns about the usefulness of aggregating spending data for various types of facilities. The department also indicates that it previously collected PAOT data statewide but ceased to do so because it had concerns about the usefulness of aggregating PAOT data for various types of facilities. The department was also concerned that both the spending and the PAOT units of measure fail to address the differing disparities between facilities and facility demands in the various geographic areas of the state.

17. Percentage of miles of major rural highway corridors in Oregon rated visually attractive

Explanation: This benchmark will address the extent to which major Oregon highway corridors outside of urban growth boundaries are visually attractive. In the rating system envisioned a group of representative citizens would initially evaluate control segments of highways in order to establish an index of scenic qualities and a list of visual detractors. Thereafter, technicians would rate designated highway corridors based on the index and the detractors previously established. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Transportation. ODOT indicates that it can establish this rating process within its existing budget. *Discussion:* ODOT indicates that a great deal of work is being done nationally on visual corridor rating processes. The department is confident that a rating process can be developed for Oregon that will be both objective and reliable in its application. ODOT's confidence in this regard is based on its knowledge of the programs in other states as well as on its own experience with a visual rating process for evaluating the physical condition of Oregon's highways. Visual corridor detractors anticipated include litter, billboards, junkyards, timber clearcuts, and gravel pits.

18. Percentage of Oregonians who commute (one-way) within 30 minutes between where they live and where they work

Explanation: For purposes of this benchmark, "commute" means traveling to and from work by single-occupancy automobile, carpool, transit, taxi, bicycle, foot, or other means, as well as working in one's home. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Transportation. The data are currently reported.

19. Percentage of Oregonians who commute to and from work during peak hours by means other than a single occupancy vehicle

Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which Oregonians get to work during peak hours by means other than driving alone. For purposes of this benchmark, "traveling to and from work" means commuting by carpool, transit, taxi, bicycle, foot, or other means, as well as working in one's home. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Transportation. The data are currently reported.

20. Percentage of miles of limited access highways in Oregon's urban areas that are not heavily congested during peak hours

Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which the interstate highways and freeways in Oregon's urban areas are not heavily congested during rush hours. The benchmark sum for 1980 reflects data reported for 1983. The benchmark sum for 1990 is extrapolated from the reported data for 1983 and 1988, assuming an annual decrease from 1988 to 1990 that corresponds to the average annual decrease from 1983 to 1988. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Transportation. The data are currently reported.

21. Transit hours per capita per year in Oregon metropolitan areas

Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which transit service is offered in Oregon's metropolitan areas -- Portland, Salem, Eugene-Springfield, and Medford. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Transportation. The data are currently reported. *Discussion:* This benchmark is a standard measure of transit effort which is used nationally. It can be viewed as a measure of the extent to which transportation services are provided to transit-dependent populations, including the elderly and the poor.

22. Percentage of Access Oregon Highways built to handle traffic at a steady 55 mile-per-hour rate

Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which the Access Oregon Highway system has been completed in accordance with the target design and operational standards for that system. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Transportation. The data are currently reported. *Discussion:* Approximately 92% of Oregon's population lives within 10 miles of Access Oregon Highways.

23. Percentage of Oregonians living in communities with daily scheduled inter-city passenger bus, van, or rail service

Explanation: This benchmark will measure the extent to which inter-city public transportation services are provided to Oregonians. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Transportation. The data are not currently reported but will be in early 1991. Current levels of inter-city bus service are indefinite due to the effects of the Greyhound Bus Lines labor dispute.

24. Percentage of Oregonians living within 50 miles of an airport with daily scheduled air passenger service

Explanation: Daily scheduled air passenger service currently is available at the following Oregon airports: Portland International, Bend/Redmond, Pendleton, Salem, Eugene, Coos Bay/North Bend, Medford/Jackson County, and Klamath Falls. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Transportation. The data are currently reported.

25. Ratio of the price of a home that a median income Oregon household can afford over the median price of

Oregon homes for sale

Explanation: This benchmark will compare the prices of Oregon homes with the home purchasing power of Oregonians. This ratio is a measure of housing affordability that is commonly used nationally. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Housing Agency. The data are not currently collected. Relevant information is available from various sources, such as the U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and multiple listing services throughout Oregon.

26. Percentage of Oregon households below median income spending less than 30% of their household income on housing (including utilities)

Explanation: The 30% mark is a standard housing affordability figure used nationally. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Housing Agency. The 1990 benchmark will be available from 1990 U.S. Census Bureau reports. Data for non-census years will need to be collected.

27. Number of Oregonians who are homeless

Explanation: This benchmark measures the number of Oregonians who are without fixed nightly shelter at some time during a year. The 1990 benchmark is based on one-night survey counts of individuals in Oregon homeless shelters. That figure does not include homeless migrants in Oregon. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Shelter Network. Additional data for 1990 will soon be available from the U.S. Census Bureau.

28. Number of Oregonians (in thousands) with drinking water that does not meet government standards

Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which Oregonians' drinking water does not meet government drinking water standards. The benchmark for 1990 is the number of Oregonians who are served by community water systems which (a) currently are under orders from the Oregon Health Division to improve their water quality or (b) will be required to filter their water in 1991. For purposes of this benchmark, "community water systems" means drinking water systems serving 25 or more people. There are about 980 community water systems in Oregon serving approximately 2.3 million people. This benchmark does not measure the quality of drinking water supplied by water systems serving fewer than 25 persons, primarily small wells and other supplies serving one or a small number of households. There are 100,000 to 150,000 such smaller drinking water systems in Oregon, serving approximately 500,000 people. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Health Division. Data for community water systems are currently reported. Data for smaller water systems (serving fewer than 25 persons) are not currently reported. *Discussion:* There currently are quality standards for some 30 drinking water contaminants. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is planning to increase the number of contaminants for which there are quality standards to 83 in 1993 and to increase the number of such contaminants by 25 every three years for several years thereafter. The costs of complying with these new EPA-mandated standards in Oregon would probably be several hundred million dollars. Because of the magnitude of these costs, both in Oregon and in other states, there is some uncertainty as to the future imposition of the EPA mandates. To the extent new standards are put in place and new water quality data are collected, the benchmark data will be adjusted both retroactively and prospectively.

29. Number of Oregonians (in thousands) with sewage disposal that does not meet government standards

Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which Oregonians' means of sewage disposal do not meet government standards. The benchmark for 1990 is the number of Oregonians whose means of sewage disposal currently are under orders or other requirements of the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality to install sanitary sewers to abate groundwater pollution or correct health hazards. The 1990 benchmark does not include Oregonians served by sewer systems in which a compliance schedule for improvements has been established by permit or order and the local jurisdiction is proceeding in accordance with the permit or order. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. The data are currently reported.

30. Overall crimes per 1,000 Oregonians per year

Explanation: This benchmark measures the overall crime rate in Oregon as reported by Oregon law enforcement agencies. The overall crime rate measures the incidence of violent crimes against persons (see Note 31 below), property crimes (see Note 32 below), and behavioral crimes (violations of laws concerning weapons, prostitution, drugs, gambling, family offenses, DUII, liquor, disorderly conduct, juvenile curfews, juvenile runaways, and other offenses relating to personal conduct, responsibility, and public order). The 1980 benchmark is derived from data for 1981. The 1990 benchmark is derived from data for 1989. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Criminal Justice Services Division (Law Enforcement Data System). The data are currently reported. *Discussion:* The data for this benchmark do not take into account differences between reported crime rates and actual crime rates.

31. Violent crimes per 1,000 Oregonians per year

Explanation: This benchmark measures the rate of violent crimes against persons in Oregon as reported by Oregon law enforcement agencies. For purposes of this benchmark, "violent crimes against persons" include murder, negligent homicide, forcible rape, other sex crimes, kidnapping, extortion, robbery, purse-snatching, aggravated assault, and simple assault. The 1980 benchmark is derived from data for 1981. The 1990 benchmark is derived from data for 1989. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Criminal Justice Services Division (Law Enforcement Data System). The data are currently reported. *Discussion:* The data for this benchmark do not take into account differences between reported crime rates and actual crime rates.

32. Property crimes per 1,000 Oregonians per year

Explanation: This benchmark measures the rate of property crimes in Oregon as reported by Oregon law enforcement agencies. For purposes of this benchmark, "property crimes" include burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft, arson, forgery/counterfeiting, fraud, embezzlement, stolen property, and vandalism. The 1980 benchmark is derived from data for 1981. The 1990 benchmark is derived from data for 1989. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Criminal Justice Services Division (Law Enforcement Data System). The data are currently reported. *Discussion:* The data for this benchmark do not take into account differences between reported crime rates and actual crime rates.

33. Juvenile crimes per 1,000 juvenile Oregonians per year

Explanation: This benchmark measures the rate of crimes of all types committed in Oregon by juveniles as reported by Oregon law enforcement agencies. For purposes of this benchmark, "juvenile crimes" means those crimes which are cleared by the arrest of persons 17 and under. This benchmark does not measure juvenile arrests which do not result in clearances of crimes. Nor does this benchmark measure crimes which in fact are committed by juveniles but for which there are no juvenile arrests resulting in clearances of those crimes. The 1980 benchmark is derived from data for 1981. The 1990 benchmark is derived from data for 1989. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Criminal Justice Services Division (Law Enforcement Data System). The data are currently reported. *Discussion:* The data for this benchmark do not take into account differences between reported crime rates and actual crime rates. This benchmark differs from the other crime rate benchmarks in that it focuses on the nature of the criminal rather than on the nature of the crime.

34. Percentage of Oregon felons returning to prison within three years after release

Explanation: This benchmark measures the recidivism rate of felons within three years after release from Oregon prisons, whether they are returned due to parole violations or new offenses. This benchmark does not include felons returned to prison within three years after their outright release (not to parole), but the number of prisoners so released is negligible. The benchmark for 1980 is derived from data for 1983. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Corrections. The data are currently reported. *Discussion:* Oregon Department of Corrections has considered collecting this data for five years after release, rather than only three years after release. The Department has not disaggregated the number of felons who are returned to prison due to parole violations from the number of felons who are returned to prison due to new offenses. Some additional costs would be incurred to make these changes in data collection.

35. Property damage per year in Oregon due to wildfires (millions of 1989 dollars; five-year rolling average)

Explanation: This benchmark measures annual property damage caused by wildfires (forest and range fires) on public and private land in Oregon protected by the State of Oregon, in 1989 dollars. This benchmark does not measure property damage caused by wildfires on U.S. Forest Service lands and Indian forest lands managed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Oregon. For purposes of this benchmark, "property damage" means damage to real and personal property including timber and other natural resources. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Forestry. The data are currently reported. There may be analytical reasons for aggregating wildfire damage on land protected by the State with wildfire damage on land protected by the U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Indian Affairs in Oregon. There also may be analytical reasons for disaggregating wildfire damage caused to real and personal property (structures and their contents) from wildfire damage caused to timber and other natural resources. *Discussion:* An Oregon Department of Forestry study indicates that more than 187,000 homes in Oregon, worth a combined total of approximately \$4.6 billion, currently are in locations with a high potential for wildfires. The Department of Forestry, along with the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development and local planning, building code, and fire prevention agencies are developing various approaches to preventing wildfire damage in high-risk forest interface zones. These approaches include new land use regulations and other planning requirements, new building codes regulating use of flammable building materials, and public education regarding prevention measures.

36. Acres of community parks, designated recreation areas, and designated open space per 1,000 Oregonians living in communities

Explanation: This benchmark measures the amount of parks and designated recreation and open space land in Oregon cities and local park and recreation districts, compared to the number of Oregonians living in cities. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Parks and Recreation. The data currently are reported. *Discussion:* The projected increases in the per capita data from 1990 to 1995 and from 1995 to 2000 anticipate the need to increase urban park, recreation, and open space land in Oregon cities as additional land within cities is developed, annexations occur, redevelopment increases densities, and public demand for green space grows. Providing adequate park, recreation, and open space land in Oregon's communities will help quell the growth in demand for non-urban parks and recreation land and the transportation system improvements necessary to provide access to non-urban park and recreation locales.

37. Investment in community recreation facilities (playgrounds and equipment, tennis courts, swimming pools, etc.) relative to the number of Oregonians living in communities

Explanation: This benchmark will address the extent of public investment in recreational facilities on outdoor recreation land in Oregon cities and local park and recreation districts, as compared to the number of Oregonians living in cities. For purposes of this benchmark, "recreational facilities" means human-made facilities requiring initial construction and subsequent maintenance, such as playgrounds and playground equipment, tennis courts, swimming pools, activity centers, parking lots, and nature trails. The precise nature of the benchmark data to be monitored is undecided. (See Note 16.) *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Parks and Recreation District. The data are not currently reported. (See Note 16.)

38. Number of arts events attended per capita in Oregon per year

Explanation: This benchmark measures attendance at arts events in Oregon as compared to Oregon's population. For purposes of this benchmark, "arts events" means public events of the following art forms: theater, music, visual arts, dance, opera, literary arts, media arts, photography, crafts, folk arts, interdisciplinary arts, and multi-disciplinary arts. This benchmark does not measure attendance at commercial movie theaters or at small private art galleries. Nor does it distinguish between attendance by Oregonians and non-Oregonians. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Arts Commission. *Discussion:* In 1990, 36 Oregon communities held annual arts or cultural festivals. Also in 1990, Oregon ranked 31st among the 50 U.S. states in annual per capita state spending on the arts (including "percent for arts" construction spending).

39. Percentage of Oregonians served by a public library which meets minimum service criteria

Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which Oregonians are served by public libraries which meet minimum service criteria established by the Oregon State Librarian. For purposes of this benchmark, "served by" means residing in the service area of a public library; "minimum service criteria" means minimum criteria for hours, staff, collections, physical facilities, budget, and services. In 1990, approximately 7% of Oregon's population lived in areas of the state with no public library service at all. In 1990, therefore, 7% of Oregonians had no public library service at all, 27% of Oregonians were served by public libraries that did not meet the State Librarian's minimum service criteria, and 66% of Oregonians were served by public libraries that did meet the State Librarian's criteria. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon State Librarian. The data are currently reported. *Discussion:* In 1990, 38% of Oregonians used a public library on a regular basis. In this context, "regular basis" as determined by the Oregon State Librarian means 24 library transactions per year (a single transaction might be checking out a book, requesting a periodical, or posing a question to library staff).

40. Ratio of the demand for nonparental child care to the supply of nonparental child care in Oregon

Explanation: This benchmark compares (a) the number of Oregon children under age 15 whose parents are seeking child care for those children from unrelated individual or institutional child care providers to (b) the number of children under age 15 which unrelated individual and institutional child care providers in Oregon have the capacity to serve. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Commission on Child Care. The benchmark data were calculated using a child care demand and supply model developed by the Commission and the Oregon Child Care Resource and Referral Network. The model uses population estimates of the Portland State University Center for Population Research and Census, labor force participation estimates from a 1990 survey conducted by Bardsley and Neidhart, Inc. for the Oregon Office of Economic Analysis, employer surveys conducted by Arthur Emlen and Associates and the Regional Research Institute for Human Services at Portland State University, child care referral and provider records collected by local child care resource and referral agencies, and a variety of national and regional research studies on child care.

41. Percentage of Oregon's nonparental child care capacity whose providers are licensed or registered in Oregon, listed with an Oregon resource and referral agency, or nationally accredited

Explanation: This benchmark is aimed at measuring the quality of care provided by Oregon's child care providers. For purposes of this benchmark, "child care capacity" means the number of children under age 15 which unrelated individual and institutional child care providers in Oregon have the capacity to serve. (See Note 40 above.) For purposes

of this benchmark, "licensed or registered" means licensed or registered as a child care provider by the Oregon Children Services Division. Currently, Oregon child care providers providing care to more than six children (not including children of the providers) must be licensed with CSD. Oregon child care providers not required to be licensed may elect to register with CSD. Licensed providers are required to maintain standards regarding child-to-provider ratios, group size, and facilities and programs. Registered providers are required to participate in training, and have access to continuing training resources and programs. For purposes of this benchmark, "Oregon resource and referral agency" means a local child care resource and referral agency established in one of 16 service delivery areas across the state established by the Oregon Commission on Child Care pursuant to 1989 state legislation. Resource and referral agencies currently are operational in nine service areas. Child care providers may elect to be listed with their local resource and referral agencies, in which event the providers have access to continuing training and technical assistance and participate in on-going local child care policy and planning activities. For purposes of this benchmark, "nationally accredited" means formally accredited or certified to provide child care by one of the following three national child care organizations: National Association for the Education of Young Children, National Association of Family Day Care, and Council for Early Childhood National Recognition. To be nationally accredited, providers are required to participate in training and must maintain standards for facilities and programs. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Commission on Child Care. The data are currently reported.

42. Average percentage of household income spent on child care per year by Oregon households below median income

Explanation: This benchmark will compare (a) the amounts spent on child care each year by Oregon households below median income to (b) the household incomes of Oregon households below median income. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Commission on Child Care. The data are not currently reported. The Commission indicates that by the end of 1991 it will have in place a process to collect, evaluate, and report the data necessary for this benchmark.

Discussion: There currently is not a particular percentage of household income spent on child care which is recognized as a standard, as there is, for example, for affordable housing.

43. **Percentage of Oregonians with economic access to basic health care** *Explanation:* The purpose of this benchmark is to measure the extent to which Oregonians have access to basic health care services and facilities irrespective of their ability to pay for such services themselves. The term "basic health care" has yet to be defined; this is a complex, major public policy decision currently under review by the Oregon Health Care Services Commission. The benchmark for 1990 is an estimate of the percentage of Oregonians who had health insurance to provide payment for health care services and facilities in that year. This benchmark is only an estimate, however, and does not reflect varying amounts and types of insurance coverage. The insurance-related benchmark for 1990 is used only as a surrogate indicator of the extent of Oregonians' economic access to health care for that year. The projected benchmark data for 1995, 2000, and 2010 should be viewed in relation to the 1990 mark. Use of the insurance-related benchmark for 1990 should not be interpreted to mean that the insurance model is presumed to be the best way to increase the number of Oregonians with economic access to health care. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Health Division. The data are not currently reported (see explanation above). A new data base will need to be created once the definition of "basic health care" is determined.

44. Percentage of Oregonians with geographic access to basic health care

Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which Oregonians have geographic access to basic health care services. The benchmark data are based on federal criteria for geographic access to doctors and other medical professionals in federally-designated Health Manpower Shortage Areas (HMSAs) within Oregon. Approximately 170,000 Oregonians, living in HMSAs covering approximately half of the state, had inadequate geographic access to basic health care in 1989. This information for 1989 was used to calculate the benchmark for 1990. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Health Division. The data are currently reported. *Discussion:* There are unresolved questions about the definition of "basic health care" in this benchmark and in benchmark 43. (See Note 43 above.) Although the Oregon Health Division does not have data for this benchmark for 1970 or 1980, it does have information that 125,000 Oregonians in 1987 did not have adequate geographic access to basic health care. This figure, combined with the figure for 1989, indicates that the number of Oregonians without geographic access to basic health care increased by 45,000, or 36%, in two years. The Oregon Health Division also indicates that the following additional populations of Oregonians were underserved in 1989 under federal criteria: migrants and seasonal farm workers, 136,690; homeless and poor, 4,147.

45. Percentage of adult Oregonians who vote

Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which Oregonians who are legally entitled to vote do so. The benchmark data for 1970, 1980, and 1990 were calculated based on the average number of Oregonians voting in the gubernatorial elections occurring during, just prior to, and just after the particular year. For 1970, this was the average for the 1966, 1970, and 1974 elections. For 1980, this was the average for the 1978 and 1982 elections. For 1990, this was the average for the 1986 and 1990 elections. In determining the number of Oregonians legally entitled to vote, the voting age population (age 18 and older) for the particular year was reduced by the estimated number of Oregonians who

were ineligible to vote due to their status as aliens (non-citizens), institutionalized persons (legally incompetent), imprisoned felons, or mobiles (insufficient time of residency). The benchmark data were not adjusted in any way to account for the number of Oregonians who were registered to vote in a given year; both the number of Oregonians legally entitled to vote and the number of Oregonians who voted in a given year were calculated irrespective of the number of Oregonians who were registered in that year. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Elections Division. (The population figure used to calculate the benchmark for 1990 was obtained from the Portland State University Center for Population Research and Census.) The data are currently reported.

46. Oregon's ranking among states in percentage of adults who vote

Explanation: This benchmark measures voter turnout in Oregon compared to voter turnout in other states. The benchmarks for 1980 and 1990 were calculated based on the average percentage of voter turnout in the presidential elections occurring during or nearest in time to that year. For 1980, this was the 1980 election. For 1990, this was the 1988 election. Reported data prior to 1980 were unavailable. Recalculation of the benchmark data based on multi-year averaging may be desirable once reported data for additional presidential elections become available. *Source and availability of data:* U.S. Census Bureau. The data currently are reported.

47. Percentage of Oregonians who volunteer at least 50 hours of their time per year to civic, community, or nonprofit activities

Explanation: This benchmark is intended to measure the extent to which Oregonians seek to improve the quality of life in their communities by actively participating in civic, community, and nonprofit activities. *Source and availability of data:* The data are not currently collected, but can be gathered by survey. The cost of collection is expected to be nominal.

Endnotes: Benchmarks for a Diverse, Robust Economy

1. Oregon manufacturing employment as a percentage of average national employment in manufacturing

Explanation: This measure is a location quotient. It divides Oregon's percentage of employment in manufacturing by the comparable national figure. The resulting quotient indicates the extent to which Oregon's employment in manufacturing is greater or smaller than the national average. **Source and availability of data:** The Oregon Employment Division total non-agricultural wage and salary employment and manufacturing employment for Oregon. The U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis publishes comparable national data in its monthly *Survey of Current Business*. **Discussion:** Manufacturing has traditionally been a source of high-wage jobs and income producing exports. Oregon wants to maintain its high-wage manufacturing base and expand its exports. Thus, maintaining the state's manufacturing sector at a level comparable to the national level is a conservative goal.

2. Percentage of manufacturing employees outside the state's largest manufacturing industry

Explanation: The state's largest manufacturing industry is currently lumber and wood products. This benchmark uses, as a definition of "industry," the two-digit Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code groupings. **Source and availability of data:** Employment data are estimated annually by the Oregon Employment Division. **Discussion:** Oregon's economy has relied heavily on just a few major industries, especially lumber and wood products, which has been able to depress the entire state economy during an industry downturn. Such downturns may be caused by events such as cycles in the national economy, natural disasters, or changes in the competitive position of the industry. Oregon needs a more diversified economy, relying less on any one basic industry. This benchmark is not intended to reduce employment in Oregon's largest manufacturing industry but rather to build up other manufacturing industries so Oregon will have a more balanced, less vulnerable economy.

3. Percentage of lumber and wood products manufacturing employees in "value-added" manufacturing

Explanation: "Value-added" includes all lumber and wood products manufacturing (SIC 24) except logging, dimensional lumber, and veneer and plywood (SICs 2411, 2421, 2435, and 2436.) It also includes the wood furniture and fixtures manufacturing industries (SICs 2511, 2512, 2517, 2521, and 2541 -- all based on the 1987 revision of SIC codes.) **Source and availability of data:** *Oregon Covered Employment and Payrolls*, available annually from the Oregon Employment Division. **Discussion:** With the current and anticipated declines in the primary forest products sector in Oregon, expansion of Oregon's secondary wood products industries is a high priority. This effort will at least partially replace jobs and income lost from the declining primary wood products sector.

4. Percentage of agricultural gross state product in food processing

Explanation: The agricultural industry includes food and kindred products, agricultural services, farming, and fisheries. Gross state product is a measure of the gross market value of goods and services produced by an industry. **Source and availability of data:** Oregon's Gross State Product by industry data is available annually from the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis in its *Survey of Current Business*. **Discussion:** Agriculture is Oregon's second largest basic industry, but the state does not take full advantage of the opportunity to add value to agriculture products. Many commodities are shipped in bulk to processors elsewhere. This benchmark is intended to increase in-state processing of agricultural products.

5. Small business startups per 1,000 population

Explanation: Small businesses are those that appear as new accounts on State Unemployment Insurance files because they employ at least one employee who is covered by unemployment insurance. Such data do not include self-employed individuals. **Source and availability of data:** Oregon Employment Division covered employment data for 1981 through 1986 were analyzed by the Oregon Economic Development Department with funding from a U.S. Economic Development Agency grant. Updating these data would require additional commitment of funds. **Discussion:** Small business has been characterized as the base of a healthy economy, and Oregon is recognized as a small business state. Despite our preponderance of small businesses, we can improve Oregon's ability to encourage new business startups and expansions to take advantage of new markets and technologies. This measure captures ease of entry into the marketplace, business vitality, optimism, entrepreneurial activity, and innovation. Raising this benchmark will enhance the vitality of Oregon's economy.

6. Supply of in-state producer services relative to industry demand

Explanation: Producer services include finance, insurance, business services, engineering and management services, and legal services. This group traditionally provides services to the business community. The benchmark is a location quotient. It identifies Oregon's proportion of non-agricultural wage and salary employment in producer services relative to the national proportion. A quotient of 1.0 indicates that Oregon has the same proportion of employment in producer services as the nation. **Source and availability of data:** Data are published employment estimates from the Oregon

Employment Division and the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Discussion:* Oregon has a low percentage of its employment in producer services when compared to the national average. This implies that, on average, we "import" these services from elsewhere. A lack of sufficient services in the state may also inhibit business formation or it may increase business costs. The benchmark seeks to raise Oregon's relative level of employment in producer services and to keep the state within a reasonable range of the national average.

7. Percentage of manufactured goods sold outside the United States

Explanation: Manufactured goods include durable and non-durable products. They do not include commodities such as grain or services such as banking or insurance. *Source and availability of data:* Export values of manufactured goods are available annually from the Portland State University International Trade Institute. The value of all manufactured goods in Oregon is estimated by the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis in its Gross State Product series. The series is updated infrequently as funding allows. Fortunately, gross state product estimates at this level of detail can be readily developed from other published state and national sources. *Discussion:* The reduction of international trade barriers has resulted in a growing importance of international trade to the United States, and especially to a Pacific Rim state such as Oregon. To survive in this more global marketplace, Oregon and the nation will need to take advantage of opportunities in newly opened international markets, thus increasing exports of manufactured goods. This benchmark sets aggressive targets for increasing Oregon's exports.

8. Total visitor industry expenditures by non-Oregonians (in billions of 1987 dollars)

Explanation: This measure includes expenditures by non-resident visitors in Oregon for accommodations, food, recreation, fuel, and other expenses. *Source and availability of data:* Non-resident visitor expenditures are estimated annually through surveys commissioned by the Oregon Economic Development Department's Tourism Division. The figures used are derived from estimates of "non-resident visitor direct economic impact." *Discussion:* Oregon's visitor industry has grown substantially over the past decade. The *Oregon Shines* vision of the visitor industry projects rapid growth during the 1990s as well. The visitor industry is assisting many rural communities in the transition from sole dependence on natural resources extraction and processing. It is a valuable part of a diversified economy. Oregon has substantial room for growth in this industry. The 1995 benchmark comes directly from *Oregon Shines*. The benchmarks sets less demanding goals for growth in the industry during the 1995 to 2010 period.

9. Percentage of Oregonians employed outside the Portland metro area

Explanation: The Portland area is one of six regions in Oregon used in these benchmarks. The definition of the regions, by county, is as follows: *Portland:* Clackamas, Multnomah, Washington, and Yamhill; *Northwest:* Benton, Clatsop, Columbia, Lane, Lincoln, Linn, Marion, Polk, and Tillamook; *Southwest:* Coos, Curry, Douglas, Jackson, Josephine, Klamath, and Lake; *Columbia:* Gilliam, Hood River, Morrow, Sherman, Umatilla, and Wasco; *Central:* Crook, Deschutes, and Jefferson; *Eastern:* Baker, Grant, Harney, Malheur, Union, Wallowa, and Wheeler. *Source and availability of data:* Total employment estimates by county or metropolitan area are published annually by the Oregon Employment Division. *Discussion:* Oregon's population and employment during the 1980s shifted from rural areas of the state toward urban areas. Although the percentage of Oregon's population represented by the Portland area is relatively lower than the share of urban populations in most western states, Oregon needs to forestall continued rural decline and growth-related urban problems. This benchmark underscores the importance of maintaining the geographic diversity of the state's economy and employment.

10. Percentage of Oregonians not economically disadvantaged

Explanation: "Economically disadvantaged" is a classification of poverty that is roughly comparable to the group of people who have income less than 125 % of the official national poverty income level (adjusted by family size). *Source and availability of data:* The Oregon Employment Division makes an annual estimate, for the Job Training Partnership Act Administration, of the number of economically disadvantaged individuals age 14 and older in Oregon. *Discussion:* Oregon has tried for many years to find ways to help people rise above poverty. This benchmark acknowledges that effort and addresses the need to raise a larger share of Oregon's population above the level of poverty. Inclusion of this benchmark in this section implies that the state will find ways to increase the skills and employability of those in poverty and to add them to the work force in jobs that provide sufficient income.

11. Percentage of Oregonians in the middle income range

Explanation: The middle income range is defined as the range of adjusted gross income (AGI) from 50% of average AGI to 150% of average AGI. The percentage of Oregonians in this range is roughly estimated by the number of state personal income tax returns in this range. *Source and availability of data:* Adjusted gross income data are published annually by the Oregon Department of Revenue. The data represent the AGI of those filing full-year personal income tax returns. *Discussion:* Oregon's distribution of income is thought to be similar to that of the nation. However, the nation's glaring disparities of wealth and poverty contribute to crime, social unrest, shortages of skilled labor, and undeveloped and unused talent. Increasing the percentage of Oregonians in the middle income range will tend to reduce

extremes of wealth and poverty, which are often accompanied by social inequity and conflict.

12. Per capita personal income as a percentage of the U.S.

Explanation: Per capita personal income is the total personal income divided by the total population for the United States, Oregon, and regions within the state. *Source and availability of data:* Per capita personal income data are published annually by the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis in its *Survey of Current Business* publication. *Discussion:* As Oregon makes progress toward a variety of its economic goals, the earnings of Oregonians should improve dramatically. Data are presented for both the Portland area and other regions of the state as an indicator that this improvement in earnings should occur throughout Oregon. Strategies that address many of the benchmarks in this document are intended to raise income levels outside as well as within the Portland area.

13. Total Employment

Explanation: Total employment is an estimate of all the residents of a county or state who hold jobs. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Employment Division estimates of annual average total employment by county. *Discussion:* Oregon has recently experienced a period in which native Oregonians had to leave the state to find adequate employment. Rural Oregonians must often seek employment in metropolitan areas. And graduating high school and college students often find more lucrative jobs outside the state. This benchmark sets goals to provide employment opportunities in Oregon that will encourage our children to remain in Oregon when they are ready to enter the labor force. These benchmarks for total employment represent the number of jobs that need to be added for children currently residing in Oregon as they reach working age, taking into account job vacancies left by those retiring from the work force.

14. Oregon's ranking among states in workers' compensation costs

Explanation: This benchmark measures Oregon's workers' compensation premium competitiveness on a national level by comparing Oregon's premiums with those of the other 49 states. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Insurance and Finance. Data reported. *Discussion:* Oregon's high costs in this area are consistently cited by businesses inside and outside Oregon as a strong disadvantage to doing business or locating here. This benchmark also has international implications, given relatively high and rapidly growing U.S. medical costs. The benchmark targets a ranking of 20th-25th. If Oregon's ranking were too low, benefits to worker's may be less than desired. If state ranking were too high, as it is today, the costs of the system would be higher than desired.

15. Oregon's ranking among states in health care costs

Explanation: There is strong support for this benchmark and so it is included here. As of yet, however, no suitable benchmark or data is available. The Oregon Progress Board will continue to work on this benchmark.

16. Energy productivity: amount of money spent on energy to generate \$1 of personal income in Oregon as a percentage of the comparable average U.S. expenditure

Explanation: This benchmark compares how efficiently and productively Oregon is using energy to the rest of the nation as a whole. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Energy. Data is available. *Discussion:* The Oregon Department of Energy proposed this benchmark in response to comments during the public review process regarding the need for a measure of energy efficiency or productivity. The advantage of this indicator is three-fold: 1) it measures both how efficiently we use energy and how fast we shift to a least-cost mix of energy sources in response to price changes, 2) it largely filters out changes caused by the business cycle, weather, and industry-mix shifts, and 3) it sets a state goal of improving our overall energy efficiency relative to the U.S.. The ratio is not calculated on a per capita basis because weather effects and a change in industry mix can mask the real change in energy productivity. Note: Oregon fell to a 90% productivity level in 1980 due to a rapid increase in oil prices. Oregon uses less oil in its energy mix than does the nation as a whole. Therefore, Oregon's energy productivity ratio, as defined here, dropped relative to the U.S. ratio.

17. Energy Rates and Services: Oregon average electricity rates as a percentage of the national average

Source and availability of data: Oregon Department of Energy. Data available. *Discussion:* The draft benchmarks included a measure of Oregon's industrial electricity rates. Since such a benchmark would measure only costs to industry, the Oregon Department of Energy recommended this addition. ODOE stated that the industrial rate benchmark reflected Public Utility Commission decisions on rate spread between customer classes as well as the overall cost of Oregon's electricity system. By developing a general electricity system cost benchmark, it is possible to filter out the effects of PUC rate spread decisions. A measure of electricity reliability is possible, but ODOE felt that it could not set a meaningful target. In an extreme, Oregon could have a high-cost system but meet the benchmark by keeping industrial rates low. Additionally, given the on-going emphasis on system reliability, ODOE did not feel there was a need for a reliability measure.

18. Oregon average industrial electric rates as a percentage of the national average

Source and availability of data: Oregon Department of Energy. Data available. *Discussion:* While OPUC rate spread decisions influence this benchmark, it is still useful as a measure of the cost of doing business in Oregon.

19. Oregon natural gas rates as a percentage of the national average

Source and availability of data: Oregon Department of Energy. Data available. *Discussion:* The Oregon Department of Energy submitted this benchmark as a replacement for a similar one which focused solely on industrial rates. This particular benchmark was the only one ODOE investigated which passed the test of being a) measurable and b) one that Oregon can attempt to influence. One reason is that a measure of Oregon spot rates to national spot rates is not something Oregon can influence. Another is the relative markups of local distribution companies. While Oregon can influence this, it cannot adequately measure it nor develop a meaningful target. First, different businesses buy different LDC services and some are likely to bypass them altogether. Second, a good national measure of LDC markups does not exist and the market continues to change rapidly. Finally, the LDC markup is a small part of the industrial customers' natural gas bill.

20. Acreage of industrial sites identified in comprehensive plans that are actually suitable for development

Explanation: The focus of this benchmark is to determine how many acres of industrially zoned land in Oregon are developable. In order to be developable, the land in question must not have any development restrictions placed upon it such as a wetland designation. The site must be utility-served or able to be quickly connected to the local utilities. Quick and easy access to the local transportation system is also necessary. The land itself should be prepared for immediate development; improvements to the land to make it developable should be made in advance. Local urban facilities such as roadways and water and sewerage systems need to have sufficient capacity to accommodate the site's development. These are but a few of a site's attributes which determine its ability to be developed. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Economic Development Department. Available with some expenditure and significant effort. Data collection will occur through a random sample survey. The OEDD will develop a list of criteria to judge the selected sites. Using this criteria, OEDD staff or someone on contract with the Department will go out in the field to obtain the necessary data. *Discussion:* Available, developable land is in short supply in Oregon and is one of the biggest issues in economic development. Through the comprehensive planning process, many of Oregon's cities and counties have designated land for industrial development which is not suitable for development, for one reason or another. Sites declared as wetlands and sites which have no access to transportation and utility facilities are not likely to attract developers or industry. The importance of this benchmark is to ensure that Oregon's inventory of industrial land, as designated by local comprehensive land use plans, is able to meet the needs of industry.

21. Ratio of Oregon's undeveloped, industrially zoned acreage to acreage under annual industrial development

Explanation: This development absorption measure indicates how rapidly we, as a state, are using up this scarce resource. The calculation would be a five-year rolling average. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Economic Development Department. Available with some expenditure and significant effort. *Discussion:* Again, available, developable industrial land is in short supply in Oregon and is one of the biggest issues in economic development. An absorption measure indicates how much excess capacity Oregon has for economic growth and expansion. The closer to 1 the ratio is, the less room Oregon has for expansion.

22. Number of river miles not in compliance with government water quality standards and therefore unable to accommodate additional development

Explanation: If rivers and streams fail to meet water quality standards for certain pollutants, it is impossible for industry to obtain waste water discharge permits for those pollutants. Without these permits, industrial activity cannot occur, and economic expansion is stymied. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. Data available. *Discussion:* This benchmark measures the extent to which the water in Oregon's rivers and streams meets applicable government in-stream water quality standards. The data are based on measurements and assessments of the suitability of in-stream flows for several designated beneficial uses including fishing (considering dissolved oxygen and temperature) and swimming (considering bacteria and virus levels and weed growth). The data for this benchmark are valid only for current standards and the current assessment of water quality in 3,500 miles of streams. The miles being assessed are those known to be the most impacted. New assessments and new standards will result in additional miles designated as being out of compliance. Periodic revision of the benchmark targets will be necessary when standards are modified or when new assessments are completed. Note: during the public comment period, respondents submitted a number of comments suggesting the benchmark wording be more positive. However, the DEQ feels it more appropriate at this time to use the original wording due to data availability and the basic regulatory approach of restricting development by designating an area in non-attainment.

23. Number of areas not in compliance with government ambient air standards and therefore unable to accommodate additional municipal and industrial development

Explanation: If airsheds fail to meet water quality standards for certain pollutants, it is impossible for industry to

obtain air contaminant discharge permits for those pollutants. Without these permits, industrial activity cannot occur, and economic expansion is stymied. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. Data available. *Discussion:* This benchmark reflects Oregon's desire to assure that air quality is not a limiting factor for development. The data assumes that legislation is enacted to establish enforceable mechanisms for mandatory curtailment of the use of woodstoves. During the benchmarks review period, respondents submitted a number of comments suggesting the benchmark wording be more positive. However, the DEQ feels it more appropriate at this time to use the original wording due to data availability and the basic regulatory approach of restricting development by designating an area in non-attainment.

24. Percentage of public and private forest land in Oregon available for timber harvest

Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which public and private forest land in Oregon can legally be used for timber harvest. (The extent to which public and private forest land in Oregon is being preserved, regardless of whether that forest land can legally be used for timber harvest, is measured by benchmark 8 in the section, Exceptional Quality of Life). The decrease in the benchmark from 70 percent in 1990 to 65 percent in 1995 is based on estimated withdrawals of forest land available for timber harvest due to spotted owl set-asides. The estimated actual amounts of Oregon forest land available for timber harvest, in millions of acres, is as follows: 1970, 25.3; 1980, 23.3; 1990, 19.4; 1995, 17.9; 2000, 17.9; 2010, 17.9. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Forestry. The data are currently reported. Estimates used to calculate the benchmark data are based on numerous assumptions regarding, and extrapolations from, reported data.

25. Board feet of timber harvested per year (billions of board feet; five-year rolling average)

Explanation: This benchmark measures the amount of timber harvested annually from public and private forest land in Oregon. The unit of measure is billions of board feet. A board foot is a unit of volume measuring 1" x 12" x 12". The benchmark data are calculated based on the average amount of timber harvested per year in the five years preceding the particular benchmark year. No benchmark data projections are made as of this writing for the years 1995, 2000, and 2010. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Forestry. The data are currently reported.

26. Percentage of permits issued within the target time period or less

Explanation: This benchmark is aimed at providing the quickest possible processing of permit applications. Current rules establish target time periods for completing this process. The three components of this benchmark are air contaminant and waste water discharge, and building permits. Building permit data will be collected via survey. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Department of Environmental Quality and Oregon Economic Development Department. DEQ data available; OEDD data availability is as of yet unknown. *Discussion:* New industrial sitings or expansions are often planned on a quick time frame. Anything that might slow the process down may add extra expense, force alterations of plans, or table a project. In order to accommodate companies as they wish to locate or expand, Oregon needs to ensure that the application review process involves enough time for adequate consideration and public input, but yet is also quick enough to facilitate fast-track development as required by individual companies.

27. Number of U.S., Canadian, and Mexican metropolitan areas of over 1 million population served by non-stop flights to and from any Oregon commercial airport

Source and availability of data: Port of Portland. Data available. *Discussion:* The focus of this benchmark is on quick and convenient access from Oregon to North America's major centers of commerce. In addition to measuring passenger access to interstate air transportation, this also serves to indicate, though to a lesser extent, access of Oregon business to air cargo services. A separate air cargo benchmark does not exist, for several reasons. Published rates are not very reliable; the determining factor of shipment cost is the deal businesses can negotiate with the cargo carriers. Further, not only can the State not measure this activity, it cannot impact the cost. Once cargo enters the system at Portland International Airport, its access to domestic and international markets is virtually unlimited.

28. Number of international cities of over 1 million population (outside of Canada and Mexico) served by direct and non-stop air service to and from any Oregon commercial airport

Explanation: The difference between direct and non-stop flights is that direct flights include stops. Otherwise, it is same plane service. Connecting service involves a change of plane. *Source and availability of data:* Port of Portland. Data available. *Discussion:* Unlike the previous benchmark, direct air service is included in this measure due to the importance of direct service to international destinations. International air service is of great importance as the state builds an image of an international location. In addition to measuring passenger access to interstate air transportation, this also serves to indicate, though to a lesser extent, access of Oregon business to air cargo services. A separate air cargo benchmark does not exist, for several reasons. Published rates are not very reliable; the determining factor of shipment cost is the deal businesses can negotiate with the cargo carriers. Further, not only can the State not measure this activity, it cannot impact the cost. Once cargo enters the system at Portland International Airport, its access to domestic and international markets is virtually unlimited.

29. Backlog of city, county, and state roads and bridges in need of repair and preservation

Source and availability of data: Oregon Department of Transportation. Data available. *Discussion:* The State of Oregon needs to see that the transportation system has the capacity and quality necessary to provide Oregon businesses access to various points within Oregon and access to markets both within and beyond Oregon's borders. This benchmark focuses on the state's network of roads and bridges which are vital to the distribution system in Oregon.

30. Percentage of the 50 largest ports outside the United States served with direct service from the Port of Portland

Explanation: The world's 50 largest ports defined in *Containerisation International Yearbook* do not include any U.S. or Canadian ports. Direct service means that a vessel actually calls on a Portland facility. Transshipment, for example, a container that is imported to Portland from Bangkok, but is transhipped over Kobe, is included in the count.

Source and availability of data: Port of Portland. Data available. *Discussion:* Shipping Oregon products to overseas markets is an important part of the state's economy. This measure indicates the level of access Oregon exporters have to major ports around the world.

31. Percentage of Oregon households with single-party touchtone-capable telephone service

Explanation: This benchmark measures the capability of Oregon households to use advanced, interactive telecommunications services and 911 emergency services (from which operators can directly identify the household calling in an emergency). *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Public Utility Commission. The data are currently reported.

Discussion: Several public and institutional reviewers of the draft benchmarks, as well as attendees at a 1990 conference of telecommunications providers and consumers held at Marylhurst College, expressed interest in a benchmark of this type.

32. Percentage of Oregon telephone lines that reliably can transmit data at medium speed

Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which Oregon's public telecommunications switched network is able to reliably transmit medium-speed (1200 baud) data. Currently, standards required by Oregon Public Utility Commission tariffs require nearly all telephone lines in the state's network to transmit medium-speed data, but the network does not always meet the standards. *Source and availability of data:* Oregon Public Utility Commission. The data are currently reported. *Discussion:* The telecommunications infrastructure in Oregon is critical to economic growth and expansion. Facsimiles and data are now transmitted over telephone lines; telecommunication lines are no longer solely used for voice-to-voice communication.

33. Oregon's national ranking in federal research and development funding per capita

Source and availability of data: Oregon Economic Development Department. Data available. *Discussion:* This measure indicates Oregon's success relative to other states in attracting federal R&D funding as well as the amount of such activity occurring in the state. It is likewise a measure of Oregon's capacity for R&D. Encouraging more R&D activity in Oregon, will help to expand the state's base of high technology manufacturing. This benchmark will be increasingly important as the world moves to an information- and knowledge-based economy.

34. Oregon's national ranking in private research and development funding per capita

Source and availability of data: Oregon Economic Development Department. Data available. *Discussion:* This benchmark measures how much privately funded R&D is occurring in Oregon relative to the other states. This is an additional measure of R&D capacity in Oregon.

35. Oregon's national ranking in patents issued per capita

Source and availability of data: Oregon Economic Development Department. Data available. *Discussion:* While the two previous benchmarks measure levels of R&D funding, and to some extent, R&D activity, this benchmark is an indicator of R&D success in Oregon.

36. Oregon property tax rates as a percentage of the U.S. average

Source and availability of data: Oregon Economic Development Department. Data available. *Discussion:* Public comment on the draft benchmarks indicated that a series of tax-related benchmarks are needed. In light of the passage of Measure 5, this benchmark focuses not on change, but on holding the line on property taxes. Oregon's tax system is heavily dependent on the property tax. Given Measure 5, this benchmark anticipates a shift away from dependence on the property tax.

37. Total taxes per capita as percentage of U.S. average

Source and availability of data: Oregon Economic Development Department. Data available. *Discussion:* The purpose of this benchmark is to ensure that the state strikes a balance between property tax relief and adequate revenues for services and programs. Public comment on the draft benchmarks gave impetus to including this benchmark.

38. Oregon ranking: per capita state and local tax burden

Source and availability of data: Oregon Economic Development Department. Data available. *Discussion:* As with the previous benchmark, this measure seeks to balance Oregon's tax structure. The state should neither climb nor fall too far. Oregon should have neither an underfunded public sector nor an overburdening tax structure. By remaining near the median, Oregon can achieve this.

39. Real per capita capital outlay for public facilities

Source and availability of data: Data available. *Discussion:* Oregon must maintain its overall investment in public facilities and services. The benchmark focuses attention on the level of investment in public infrastructure in Oregon.

Acknowledgements

The Progress Board would like to acknowledge the people throughout Oregon who participated in reviewing and shaping the benchmarks contained in this report. Their insights and suggestions were invaluable.

The Board also wishes to thank the staff members and consultants who researched the voluminous data which underpin this report. This research, which required hundreds of hours, was ably assisted by many State of Oregon and local government officials.

The following individuals had a key role in assembling this report:

Duncan Wyse
Executive Director
Oregon Progress Board

Tim Houchen
Senior Policy Analyst
Oregon Progress Board

Jim Zehren
Attorney
Stoel, Rives, Boley, Jones & Grey

Art Ayre
Economist
Oregon Economic Development Department

Scott Drumm
Economist
Oregon Economic Development Department

John Svicarovich
Consulting Writer and Editor

Zoë Johnson
Administrative Assistant
Oregon Progress Board

Kathleen Dotten of Dotten & Associates organized public review of the initial draft of *Oregon Benchmarks*, a process which included outreach to a variety of Oregon institutions. She also organized the Summit on Exceptional People held in October 1990 to review the benchmarks in Section 3 of this report.

Don Barney and Peggy Bird of Barney & Worth planned and conducted 12 regional workshops that enabled citizens statewide to review the initial draft of *Oregon Benchmarks*.

Oregon. Things look different here.