

**METRO**

SHERRIE BLACKLEDGE
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
METRO
FULL PACKET

DATE: September 30, 1993
TO: Members of the Future Vision Commission
FROM: Ken Gervais *KG*
RE: Agenda packet

Enclosed in this packet are:

- * Memo from Ethan Seltzer re: next meeting
- * Memo from Len Freiser on Drafting Sub-Committees
- * "Notes from Icons Discussion" taken at the September 27th meeting
- * Draft Workplan (9/27/93) provided by Ethan Seltzer
- * Speech "Planning and Dreams: The 2005 Project" by Bruce Taylor Hamilton with the Oregon Historical Society
- * Article "Portland Garners High Marks..." provided by Wayne Lei

An agenda for the October 11th meeting, the minutes from the September 27th meeting and the publication Ten Essentials to a Quality Regional Landscape will be sent to you shortly under separate cover.

Portland State University

P.O. Box 751, Portland, OR 97207-0751

MEMORANDUM

September 29, 1993

To: Members of the Future Vision Commission
From: Ethan Seltzer
Re: Next Meeting

Thank you for your patience with the development of the workplan for the Commission. In preparation for the next meeting, please come prepared to discuss the following items:

- 1) Tour - please check your calendar for a Saturday when we could charter a bus and tour the territory.
- 2) Sense of Place, Icons, Photos, and You - if at all possible, please get out your camera and shoot some slides of scenes, sights, buildings, and other patterns that shape your sense of place. Bring 3 to 5 of the most important with you and we'll show them as part of the discussion at the next meeting. Again, the focus for the discussion will be sense of place, and the topics included in that discussion include greenspace, landscape, historic structures, settlement patterns, cultural resources, community values and aspirations, transportation, urban form, urban design, rural form, and housing density and affordability.

Another way to approach this is to keep a log between now and the next meeting in which you simply record the specific sense of place features or relationships that you personally encounter in your daily travels. What, specifically, constitutes sense of place for you? By topic? Why? Taking some time to develop your thoughts will make our discussion next time that much more valuable. As Peggy Lynch noted at the last meeting, we are seeking those observations about the metropolitan area that feel so right, so much so that the term "intuitively obvious" is given new meaning!

- 3) Commenters - please start listing potential commenters that you believe will have a stake in the observations made by the Commission. We will want to begin contacting and scheduling them soon.

- 4) After the Next Meeting Get-Together - Please let Ken or Karen at Metro know before the next meeting if you are interested in meeting informally/socially with your fellow Commissioners after the meeting on October 11.

- 5) Background Information - Based on the "Commissioner Comfort Level" survey developed by Wayne Lei, it appears that there are no topics where everyone feels either very knowledgeable or ignorant. The Commissioners that responded feel most confident regarding their knowledge of community values and aspirations. Areas where knowledge seems to be generally thin are rural form, water, telecommunications, air, cultural resources, benchmarks/performance standards, and energy.

We will attempt to bring more information to the Commission on air, water, and energy through the development of the study area atlas project. Rural form will be addressed somewhat through the settlement patterns background work, though this topic and that of cultural resources will benefit from the upcoming sense of place discussion. The

Members of the Future Vision Commission/Next Meeting
September 29, 1993
Page 2

benchmarks topic will be addressed through the implementation paper and more thoroughly discussed in the second phase of the Commission's work. Finally, we will continue to investigate the telecommunications topic and bring materials to you as we find them.

At the next meeting, lets discuss the results of the survey, the proposed list of background papers attached to the workplan schedule, and ways to better meet the information needs of the Commission and individual Commissioners.

Thanks, again, for your time and effort. Please feel free to contact Ken, Karen, or myself should you have any comments, requests, or questions. If at all possible, please make time to visit the "library" at Metro to see what is available on the shelves.

ES:ac

DATE: September 28, 1993
TO: Members of the Future Vision Commission
FROM: Len Freiser
RE: Formation of Vision Element Drafting Subcommittees

We met, as directed by the Commission, to discuss approaches to involving Commission members in all vision drafting activities. Based on that discussion, and on previous discussions of the full Commission, we are convinced that the drafting of our vision statement must be an activity carried out by Commission members. Though we look forward to staff support for typing, research, and other activities, we believe that Commission members themselves must be the ones to actually draft the results of our discussions.

We propose that four subcommittees be formed, one for each of the following vision elements: Natural environment, sense of place, economic vitality, and community and social well-being. Descriptions of each of these are included in the workplan schedule distributed at the meeting. Collectively, these four areas address the 16 topic areas that we identified in our table of contents.

We discussed the fact that the 16 topics could be sorted effectively a number of ways. However, we believe that the distribution of topics proposed in the workplan schedule is as good as any, and believe that we should proceed with them barring any major objections from Commission members. Please let us know as soon as possible, preferably before the next meeting, if you have any problems with the distribution and what you'd like to propose in its place.

Each drafting subcommittee would consist of the Chair, Len Freiser, plus 2 to 3 additional Commission members. Each drafting subcommittee would be responsible for discussing the results of the Commission discussion on their topic area, and then drafting the discussion into a statement of what should be kept, added, or changed. Drafting subcommittees should also frame information needs for future Commission discussions and vision drafts, and bring them back to the full Commission for delegation to staff.

Please note that the subcommittees will carry primary responsibility for drafting. We believe that the result will be a true citizen-driven product, supported by staff in a manner that keeps the discussion and decision-making in front of the Commission at all times. We envision the subcommittees to serve the Commission, with all final editing and decisions to be the result of full Commission discussion.

For this to work, Commission members must be willing to contribute to the work of the subcommittees. There are currently 18 members and alternates. With four subcommittees of no more than four members each, not counting the Chair, means that we will need at least 8 and as many as 12 committee volunteers willing to follow through with this task over the next ten months.

In preparation for the next meeting, please identify your first and second choices for subcommittee assignment. Final assignment will be made by the Chair, and if too few volunteer for this task, the Chair will assign members to contribute to this process. To assist you we've enclosed copies of our table to contents, and of the workplan schedule memo distributed at the last meetings.

We believe that what we propose here is consistent with the spirit of the Commission and our discussions to-date. We are also tremendously excited at the prospect of producing this document in an innovative way, simultaneously engaging Commission members fully in our task and involving them directly, hands-on, in the production of our product.

Please feel free to contact us should you have any questions or comments about this proposal.

Thanks!

LF

Future Vision Commission
Notes from Icons Discussion
September 27, 1993

ICONS

Cosmic Zoom - from the broad region to the neighborhood

Nothing is sacred or permanent, ordinances can change with the next election

Save: green along the Tualatin Mountains (West Hills and Forest Park)

Greenways along transportation routes such as Ainsworth and 72nd Avenue parkways in Northeast

Don't deforest hill slopes

Trees with limbs, ordinances must be specific

Views of Mts. Hood, St. Helens, Adams and Jefferson everyday without smog from Powell Butte and Council Crest

"Greenbelts" along transportation corridors throughout study area

River Greenways (Klott Willamette Corridor Study)

Implement Goal 15

Unrealistic: save everything we have now? Enhance what we have now?

Design with Nature: development with and around the landscape to protect as much of what's left as possible

Preserve buttes, Parrott, Bull and Chehalem mountains

Retain working landscape

50 years from now landscapes will look different than they do today

Greenway as functional piece of working landscape and no public access necessarily implied

Evergreen forest in each community, deciduous street trees do not make an urban forest

Distinctive Willamette valley agricultural landscape

Economics of agriculture: a land form and a land use

Farms coterminus with city

Agriculture should be encouraged for economic purposes, natural landscape, rural form

Preservation of agricultural lands in same terms as preservation of industrial land

Oak savannah, Ponderosa pine landscape - how much is left?

Orchards (can use California orchards of 30, 40 years ago, now subdivisions, as example)

Oak forest as way to distinguish Willamette Valley

Native vegetation: identify
promote
require?

Green per capita requirement?

East hills, Clackamas hills, will grow to those boundaries, decide to preserve soon

Sense of enclosure in Portland with surrounding hills....the forest beyond present in our thinking

Built and natural never separated

Rebuild forests in right of ways, along highways

Large mammals in the city (Get Oregonian and Oregon Historical Society photos, one of man in suit downtown with huge salmon)

Beaver in our creeks

Neighborhood parks, nature nearby, open green for urban form and local culture

Horserings in the curbs

Maintain integrity of hilltops

Dark space at Sauvie Island where the lights stop when you fly over at night (light pollution)

Cattails, frogs, birds

Sauvie Island as regional icon

Area is known for environmental quality and activism

Cleaner water than national standard may be possible due to land and climate

Goal of swimable rivers!

Surface water management via runoff control and urban design

Maintain great drinking water that needs little treatment

Diversity of urban and suburban forms around the region

Are our choices among what to ruin?

Ross Island

Heron, crawfish, red tailed hawks

National forests and corridors leading to them (rivers)

The forested fringe and the river corridors leading to it

The Gorge!

The Sandy River!

The Multnomah Channel

North and South Park Blocks

Ability to walk to nature

The falls in Oregon City

-Look at Future Focus document

h:\fvc\927notes

**Future Vision Commission
Draft Workplan
September 27, 1993**

What follows is a proposed schedule for Commission activity, meeting by meeting, through next July. Please note that the schedule is predicated on preparing the Commission to comment uniquely from its vantage point on the Region 2040 urban form alternatives next summer. The Region 2040 process gives the Commission the opportunity to both provide a unique perspective to the Metro Council and to test the utility of the vision statement prepared by that date.

The underlying premise in this workplan is that the Commission will first develop a vision, then verify it, revise it, and test it again. In this process, the Commission may want to develop subcommittees to explore specific topics as needed to fully investigate the implications of both the present trends for the metropolitan area and the Commission's own thinking about the path that we ought to be on.

The Commission will begin with a discussion of what ought to be kept, changed, and added for each of four topic categories. The topic categories have been identified using the notes from previous Commission meetings and are proposed to be:

- 1) The Natural Environment - topics to include air, water, wildlife habitat, native vegetation, energy, land
- 2) Sense of Place and the defining Icons for our Communities (built environment and cultural landscape) - topics to include greenspace, landscape, historic structures, settlement patterns, cultural resources, community values and aspirations, transportation, urban form, urban design, rural form, housing density and affordability
- 3) Economic Vitality (access and opportunity for both employers and employees) - topics to include economy, telecommunications, education
- 4) Community and Social Well-being (our social contract with each other) - topics to include education, safety, social delinquency and crime, community values and aspirations

This list can be revised and rearranged. After the fifth meeting, the Commission will have a draft "vision" statement that can be used as the basis for discussions with invited commenters. Further review and revision of the vision statement will take place following incorporation of comments, other public contact, and background studies.

The Commission may want to move the schedule back somewhat in order to ask for and receive information needed by commission members to enable them to participate fully in the discussion. This would also have the advantage of providing a logical time for a tour. Note that the photo project would be targeted to coincide with the Commission's discussion of Sense of Place and defining Icons.

Please note that this schedule only goes through the first ten months. Keep in mind that a second phase of Commission activity, concerning implementation and preparing for a substantive linkage between the Future Vision and the Regional Framework Plan, will be developed in the months ahead.

Begin Step 1:

1) Commission Discussion I - The Commission will begin by discussing:

-- boundaries for the work of the Commission; and

-- what, within those boundaries, ought to be kept, added, or changed in the metropolitan region. Commission members would be asked to organize their thoughts according to specific categories, including landscape, natural resources, communities, economy, education, culture, families, and linkages. Complete by end of October.

- | | | | |
|--------|---|---|---------------------|
| (Sept) | 1 | Environment | Calendar |
| | | Product: discussion of what should be kept, changed, added plus specific information needed by the Commission to understand current trends and options. Appoint drafting subcommittee. Begin identification of commenters. Review background studies list. | |
| (Oct) | 2 | Sense of Place/Icons | Contact Plan/Slides |
| | | Product: discussion of what should be kept, changed, added plus specific information needed by the Commission to understand current trends and options. | |
| | 3 | Economic Vitality | Summary/follow-up |
| | | Product: discussion of what should be kept, changed, added plus specific information needed by the Commission to understand current trends and options. | |
| (Nov) | 4 | Community/Social | Summary/follow-up |
| | | Product: discussion of what should be kept, changed, added plus specific information needed by the Commission to understand current trends and options. | |
| | 5 | Review Draft | Assist Drafters |
| | | Product: revise draft produced by drafting subcommittee for distribution to invited commenters and for use in public workshops and events associated with Region 2040. Develop list of specific questions for commenters to assist with first round of testing. | |

Begin Step 2:

2) Invited Commenters - The Commission has indicated a desire to invite community leaders into the process at an early date. To make the most of their time, and to focus their comments on the task before the Commission, the results of the Commission's discussion will be written up and provided in advance to invited commenters. Invitees will be asked to consider the same set of questions as the Commission -- what should be kept, added, and changed -- and to comment on the results of the Commission's discussions to date. Ongoing through April.

<u>Meeting</u>	<u>Commission Discussion</u>	<u>Staff Work</u>
(Dec) 6	Commenters	Finish Scheduling Commenters
	Product: Response to draft vision and to questions posed by the Commission to be used in revising the draft or identifying issues needing discussion and resolution by the Commission in subsequent steps.	
7	Commenters	Summarize
	Product: Response to draft vision and to questions posed by the Commission to be used in revising the draft or identifying issues needing discussion and resolution by the Commission in subsequent steps.	
(Jan) 8	Commenters	Summarize
	Product: Response to draft vision and to questions posed by the Commission to be used in revising the draft or identifying issues needing discussion and resolution by the Commission in subsequent steps.	
9	Commenters	Summarize
	Product: Response to draft vision and to questions posed by the Commission to be used in revising the draft or identifying issues needing discussion and resolution by the Commission in subsequent steps.	
(Feb) 10	Commenters	Summarize
	Product: Response to draft vision and to questions posed by the Commission to be used in revising the draft or identifying issues needing discussion and resolution by the Commission in subsequent steps.	

Begin Steps 3 and 4:

3) Commission Discussion II - Based on what it hears, the Commission will revise the results of its first discussion and define background studies needed to provide a reality check on the product of the its discussions to date. Complete by December.

4) Testing and Revision - The background studies will be used by the Commission to test the ideas in its discussion to that point, and to help establish the relationship between and relative priority of the elements to be kept, added, and changed. Complete by May.

11	Review Background Docs. Link to doc.
	Product: Review of background reports and presentation of additional information needed to test the vision against present trends and options, charter mandates, and other issues brought to the table by Commission members, commenters, and the public.
(Mar) 12	Review Background Docs. Link to doc./summarize
	Product: Review of background reports and presentation of additional information needed to test the vision against present trends and options, charter mandates, and other issues brought to the table by Commission members, commenters, and the public.

- | | | |
|----------------|---|---------------------------|
| <u>Meeting</u> | <u>Commission Discussion</u> | <u>Staff Work</u> |
| 13 | Discuss and Revise | Discussion Q's. |
| | Product: Review of background reports and presentation of additional information needed to test the vision against present trends and options, charter mandates, and other issues brought to the table by Commission members, commenters, and the public. Develop instructions for drafting subcommittee as it prepares revision. | |
| (Apr) 14 | Discuss and Revise | Summarize/Assist Drafters |
| | Product: Review of background reports and presentation of additional information needed to test the vision against present trends and options, charter mandates, and other issues brought to the table by Commission members, commenters, and the public. Develop instructions for drafting subcommittee as it prepares revision. | |
| 15 | Review Draft | Assist Drafters |
| | Product: Revised draft vision. Region 2040 briefings. | |

Begin Step 5:

5) Document Editing and Public Review - Discussion with the public and decisionmakers to focus and refine the vision statement. Complete by September.

- | | | |
|----------|--|------------------|
| (May) 16 | Commenters | Devel. Disc. Q's |
| | Product: Review revised draft with commenters with particular emphasis on the utility of the draft for informing land use and growth management decisions locally and regionally. Region 2040 briefings. | |
| 17 | Commenters | Summarize |
| | Product: Review revised draft with commenters with particular emphasis on the utility of the draft for informing land use and growth management decisions locally and regionally. Region 2040 briefings. | |
| (Jun) 18 | Discuss and Revise | Write Disc. Q's |
| | Product: Produce revised draft. Region 2040 briefings. | |
| 19 | Test against 2040 | Assist Drafters |
| | Product: Commission's view of the alternatives based on the vision. | |
| (Jul) 20 | Draft 2040 Comments | Write Disc. Q's |
| | Product: Comments for Metro Council. | |
| 21 | Implementation | Draft Comments |
| | Product: Begin development of implementing chapters. | |

Discussion Papers
Initial List
September 27 1993

- 1) Study Area Atlas - an atlas for the study area that shows boundaries and other features associated with charter mandated topics and the 8 to 16 areas of interest identified by the Commission at its August 3rd retreat. Particular attention will be paid to showing, wherever feasible, linkages beyond the study area.
- 2) Carrying Capacity - the Charter asks the Commission to consider carrying capacity issues associated with the land, air, and water resources of the region. There are several important issues to be dealt with here, not the least of which is that carrying capacity, applied to metropolitan urban development, can be a relative concept. First, what is the experience with applying the carrying capacity concept to a metropolitan region? Has there been any effort to look at issues like education and economy in addition to more natural resource-based concerns associated with air, land, and water? Second, what are the issues that should be considered for each category--land, air, water--including such issues as density, safety, community identity, and others? Third, what kind of criteria could the Commission use to incorporate carrying capacity into its formulation of the Future Vision. The product of this investigation will be a research paper culminating in recommendations for the use of the carrying capacity concept in the deliberations of the Commission.
- 3) Settlement Patterns - the Charter makes specific reference to both present and future settlement patterns as a context for the work of the Commission. A background report will be developed that looks at the evolution of settlement patterns in the region, the forces that generated them, an appraisal of the operation of those forces today, and the likely generators for existing and new settlement patterns in the future. The report should review the options for creating "new communities" or for channeling growth to outlying communities. This report may include additional work on telecommuting, and will coordinate with ongoing efforts at the Oregon Department of Energy to investigate the use of telecommuting for energy conservation in the state.
- 4) Values and Visions - there have been a number of "value" studies in the metropolitan area and the state in recent years, and a growing list of locally produced visions for area communities. This background report will assemble as much of this information as possible, summarize it, and identify common or unique themes.
- 5) Implementation - the relationship between the Future Vision, Region 2040 Plan, and the Regional Framework Plan need to be spelled out, with particular attention to options for implementing the Future Vision through the other plans over time. Also to be included is a review of non-regulatory and non-statutory options available for consideration by the Commission. Approaches to implementation need to consider Charter mandates for consideration of carrying capacity, including attention to the economic and education resources of the metropolitan area and the potential for creating "new communities".

Speech

Oregon Chapter / American Planning Association

Ashland / 5 March 1993

PLANNING AND DREAMS

THE 2005 PROJECT

Good morning. I am Bruce Taylor Hamilton, Director of Publications and Special Projects at your Oregon Historical Society. I am here through the good offices of several of your colleagues; I wish to give special acknowledgment to your President, David Siegel who along with John Anderson (Chair of the Oregon Visions Project), encouraged me to come before you this morning. I also wish to note the cooperation and encouragement I have received from Bill Molnar, Susan Yates and John McLaughlin. And to all of you who crawled out of bed this morning, I hope that my words will make that crawl worthwhile.

I want to start by asking you to carry a thought with you during my remarks, a thought that I hope will be a germ of long association among us all; among the Oregon Chapter of the American Planners Association and the Oregon Historical Society and its offshoot the 2005 Project.

We are interested in your working with us--we know it to be vital. And I want you to think about aiding us by using your professional training and experience in ways that you have always wanted to use them. I want you to dream along with us.

In November 1805, after eighteen months on the trail, the members of the Lewis & Clark Expedition--the Corps of Discovery--reached the Pacific, the western edge of the Oregon Country. These cold and weary persons (men, a woman and a child) huddled through the worst winter of each of their lives at the mouth of the great River of the West--the Columbia--and in so doing helped create one more reason for the region eventually to become part of the United States.

The expedition of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, and their cohorts who ventured overland into what was unknown to the Euro-American mind, was the physical and mental extension and manifestation of one man's mind, that of Thomas Jefferson. The Expedition's members' collective savvy, intelligence, their sinews and courage, their tact and diplomacy, their scientific interest and neutrality of intellectual pursuits, in composite represented that most American of minds among the founders of our republic, Jefferson's.

In April of last year, in the midst of what Herman Melville would call "consternations and affrights" produced by the perceived effects of Proposition Five, when timidity would have been understandable, Chet Orloff, then in only his sixth month of leadership of the Oregon Historical Society, proved a bold visionary. He stood before the most remarkable group of persons to ever attend a single event at the OHS. Before this powerful group of several hundred business, arts, education, political, scientific, ecological, and, yes, planning leaders, Orloff spoke of Portland and Oregon hosting an international gathering in 2005, the bicentennial of the Lewis and Clark Expedition arriving here in Oregon.

I have thought of my conversation this morning as "Planning and Dreams: The 2005 Project." However, something that was written for the NY Times editorial page recently (in a piece called, "The Roots of Bosnia's Anguish"), a sentence by the author, Karl Meyers, strikes me as a motto for our endeavors:

Magnanimity turns adversaries into friends;

Intolerance turns neighbors into permanent enemies.

The concept, of course, was and is beyond just that of honoring the Expedition. It is to honor the Jeffersonian traditions underlying the Expedition--the idea of the informed citizen as the bedrock foundation for democracy.

Orloff's suggestion was not without precedent--in fact, it had a telling and logical one--for less than a century earlier, stemming from the same parent organization (the Oregon Historical Society) it was suggested and agreed upon that Portland would host in 1905 the Lewis and Clark International Exposition and Oriental Fair. That event took place with great success, bringing attention to the city and the region, and adding incentive for a growth of population as new arrivals came in unprecedented numbers in the decade following the Fair.

The Lewis and Clark Exposition was a traditional world's fair, with all the attributes of that nineteenth-century invention. There was boosterism and a barely controlled jingoism. The buildings were both ornate and temporary. The fair boasted the latest in technologies, and exoticas from around the world--both displayed as art and crafts from cultures other than our own, but also displaying actual people from those regions. The Fair was the product of an expansive time, a time when we saw nothing but a limitless future. But times have changed.

That is why what we at the Oregon Historical Society have suggested nearly a century later (in a time where communication is faster but planning seems to take longer)- is an international gathering of a very different nature.

Before I give to hint at what we wish to do, I need to amplify why the old-fashioned world's fair model does not work.

We cannot think in terms of having a cornucopia of the latest technologies, for that function is so well served by the annual conventions and gatherings of specific industries--automobile and farm implement shows, the extravaganzas of electronic wonders and toys. Every industry has these conventions. So it makes no sense to even think in those terms.

Also, gone--and justifiably so--are the callous parading before a hosting nation the peoples of indigenous cultures from around the world. We have had to become aware of and more accepting of diversity. All cultures have value, all cultures get to chose their own path. We want a varied world to meet and discuss in Portland in 2005.

We live in a plugged-in world (what will it be like in 2005?). We are in almost instantaneous contact with all corners of the globe. We know better the look of the streets of Mogadishu and Beirut, the bowels of the World Trade Center, better than we know the interiors of homes a block away from our very own. Sealed in our cars, at the end of our cul de sacs, our radios and televisions give us

the latest oddiment on Oprah, and yet we know nothing about the person we pass every morning at the first intersection.

All of us as enlightened and thinking persons see what tribalism and division is doing to this world of ours. One has only look to Somalia, India, Ethiopia, South Africa, the cities of this country, parts of Idaho, Bosnia and Serbia, the former states of the Soviet Union, Israel and the Middle East as a whole, strong separatist movements in Spain, Great Britain, and Italy (even, one might argue, into our own minds and souls), that Oregon is the last place that we need to foster jingoism and unbridled regionalism.

We have talked with persons who have been deeply involved with the formation of world's fairs. We have met with persons involved with the world's fair for LA (never consummated, but much of its planning went into the groundwork for and the success of the second LA Olympics). I have met with a representative of the Bechtel Corporation who has worked on both Class A and Class B world gatherings in, among other cities, Budapest, Seattle, Vancouver, Spokane, New Orleans, and Montreal. I have listened to them about the hoops one has to negotiate with the International Expositions Association.

In a state known for its emphasis on planning and on the balanced use of its land and landscape, in a place where beaches have public access, and most bottles and cans know their place, in a state where many rivers have been protected and in some cases revitalized, in a city that has an international reputation for its good planning, in a state where we know--really know--what we have done and how much needs yet to be accomplished, in this place it would be (in my estimation) contrary to have a fair that spends millions on irresponsible structures and temporary buildings.

What ever we do, we feel strongly that it must reflect what makes Portland and Oregon unique. We think that we all have something to teach the world about planning, nurturing and patience.

The 2005 Project event will be an event that centers on the arts, the intellect, and the growing passion and need for democracy around the world. It also will be aimed at showing the world--to help inform the world--about the manner and the significance of the Portland and Oregon experiments--and the successes--in nurturing our city and region.

Orloff carefully invisioned--not the traditional pavilions and midway rides event--but an international fair of the world's great minds in Portland--minds of the humanities, sciences, and, of course, the arts. He enthused that Portland is the logical place for such a meeting and 2005 will be the prefect time for this.

Since April of 1992, numerous persons throughout the community have offered to join us, help us, re-enthusing us each day with their commitment to this project. We have moved with increasing activity into the essential early planning and clarification period--that is why I am here this morning, to gain insight from your minds.

These persons intuited what we are going to do, just as we sense that all of us together will give flesh to this intellectual skeleton.

We want you to "zone out" and to "zone in," to step away from all your rules and parameters (we will get to those soon enough) and for you to let the magic of your minds help us. Try an exercise in using your skills and techniques so arduously earned, try to use them with the creativity and looseness of a child.

Help us look to what is needed, where infill brings additional richness and usefulness to the community, to the state. Help decide with us and our citizens what it is we need.

We all recognize when something works, when something is added to the fabric of a place that makes that place special.

I've spent cold winter days, and sparkling summer evenings at Pioneer Courthouse Square in Portland listening to speeches and wonderful music, moving my gray matter and moving my feet, at what has become the center of our city. (It is with good reason that so many wayward young persons gravitate to that place in my view, for there is an umbilical quality to the real center of any community. Good planning gave us that place. In last Sunday's New York Times Book Review there is an advertisement for the latest book by Paul Kennedy--the author of The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers. His publisher, promoting the new title, Preparing for the Twenty-First Century, advertises that the book has answers for these questions:

Will the tragedy of AIDS become a form of population control in the 21st Century?

Will 45 million immigrants in the next 30 years
make the U. S. stronger or weaker?

Will it be good or bad news in the 21st century if
every Chinese household has a refrigerator?

By 2025, Africa's population will be: 50%, 150%, or
300% greater than Europe's?

Why won't robotics do for the U. S. productivity
what they've done for Japan's?

And, lastly:

What will happen to Western values when people of
the Western democracies are out-numbered ten to one?

There is, of course, some hyperbole here and a more than
slim veneer of Eurocentric paranoia associated with these
questions, but they do indicate the kinds of problems we
are increasingly going to face.

We are going to have to balance somewhere between the
strict adherence to our western values while integrating
ourselves with the empowered and overpowering world that
was once the colonies of the Euro-American empires.

Implicit in these questions are some very rude and
awakening suggestions. If there are to be forty-five
million new immigrants, we here in Oregon are facing
something more than the 500,000 newcomers from just the
adjacent forty-eight states.

I have become a strong advocate of a position that one of our main responsibilities over the next generation will be to teach the newcomers what it is we do as Oregonians to help preserve our state. I feel that we must take the position that newcomers arriving here have already left the last place they could move to, ruin, and then leave.

We are going to have to continue to educate ourselves and our new neighbors about the care and feeding that needs to be done for our place. And we are going to have to fight to maintain our sense of place. If we can do this, then we have something to teach the world. Sense of place should be a major component of our teaching.

With borders and regions breaking down, with instant electronic communications, with the trillions of dollars whipping around the world in a single day, with persons moving like bacteria in the bloodstream of the world, with leadership of industries and businesses no longer home-grown, with all the changes in this world today, and facing us, well, we have two choices.

We could try to hide---but where? Even the places of solitude and place unaffected by all that we as people have done to the earth, even the hiding places are all disappearing.

Or we can come out with our minds in gear and ready to solve problems with a strong ethical, spiritual and neighborly manner. We have no choice, unless we are interested in becoming participants in chaos.

That is what 2005 is all about. When the world agrees (just look how we all use the same calendar), when it agrees that it is about to enter a new millennium, there is something much more significant than a change of numbers. That change will have its own influence, and we here in this room, we here in this place, we all have a rare opportunity to influence the world.

We need to bring the minds of the world to join with us to make peace with each other, with the earth, and to do something about the need to consume endlessly.

In one of the few times I have agreed him, (and in one of his only short speeches), Fidel Castro, speaking at the recent Rio Conference stated that the world is being destroyed by consumerism. That too is a point that we will have to pursue. The world works not through force or will, it works through balance.

We want to have a decade of planning and events and focus and purpose and excitement and enthusiasm that will allow our city--and other towns, and counties, the state and region, to let businesses of all types and cultural institutions of any size to use the 2005 Project to focus and help aim and direct energies. We will all rendezvous in the early years of the new century, the new millennium, having taking dozens of paths in an exciting matrix moment in our region's history. And we want to leave a good and free and lasting legacy; a legacy of a place made better for its citizens, empowered and informed and excited and proud about our rightful place in the world of the 21st century.

We are calling our project the 2005 Project--the right name will emerge. (We at the Historical Society are patient about such things.) We have an advisory committee of community leaders who are helping us focus at this time. And we need constant infusions of ideas and guidance.

From last April, from today, all the way through 2005, we will associate ourselves with other projects for the mutual benefit of each. The sense of cooperation, so central to the success of Portland and Oregon, will remain for those of us at the OHS as the key criterion in all of our accelerating activities.

Our program is a long shot. Not a long shot with poor odds for we think our odds are good. This is a project that will get done.

It is a long shot because we have to aim so far, lead the target with our arrow, and understand that our collective aim will always have to be adjusted.

We have experienced international changes over the past few years; changes that would have seemed fantasy and unimaginable a decade ago. Several months back I heard the Beatles' "Back in the USSR" at a dance in Banff, Canada. Who would have guessed that the song would outlast the Soviet Union? With such dynamics continuing to face us, we ride the project at a canter with focused eyes, a steady but firm grip on the reins, and a resolve to bring admirable success to our city and state.

Because of this, we look forward to a long and fruitful association with the Oregon Chapter of the American Planners Association and all that we together will do for the 2005 Project.

I hope that we can now open the floor to conversation about all of this. Please ask any specific questions you wish. Your questions help us give focus to this project.

Portland garners high marks in survey of nation's urban areas

By GREG SMILEY

Urban experts say that because of steady growth and sound management, Portland is the unsung hero of the country.

In a survey of the 42 largest metropolitan areas in the United States, urban experts gave Portland high marks.

The Rose City ranked second to Seattle overall, and ranked first in management, second in schools, third in economy, and sixth in architecture. It was named the most underrated city in America.

The survey of 100 urban experts was conducted by reporter Scott Thomas for Business First of Buffalo, N.Y., a sister newspaper to The Business Journal. The paper wanted to gauge the image of Buffalo, and found the city on Lake Erie ranked only 38th out of 42.

"It's intended only as an image survey," said Thomas. "There's really no right or wrong answer."

In the survey, experts voted for the best and worst metro area with regard to management, economy, public schools and architecture. They were also asked to select the most overrated and underrated metro areas.

Many of the experts had never been to Portland before, but based their opinions on what they had heard at conferences or read in journals. One planner said he was impressed by a slide show given in 1990 by then-Mayor Bud Clark.

"Planners are conference junkies," said Don McGaffin, urban planner for Santa Clara County in California and a survey respondent. "It's continually reinforced that Portland has a very pragmatic approach to planning. They actually do it."

While the study doesn't give a lot of

Portland Scores High in City Rankings

(A random sample of 100 urban experts were surveyed to determine how each area is perceived. The survey covers 42 metropolitan areas with populations of more than 1 million.)

* denotes a tie

Best Overall Score

- | | |
|-------------|----------------|
| 1. Seattle | 4. Minneapolis |
| 2. Portland | 5. Charlotte |
| 3. Atlanta | |

Best Managed

- | | |
|----------------|----------------|
| 1. Portland | 5. Atlanta |
| 2. Minneapolis | * Indianapolis |
| 3. Seattle | * San Antonio |
| 4. Phoenix | * Milwaukee |

Best Schools

- | | |
|-------------------|-------------|
| 1. Minneapolis | 4. Seattle |
| 2. Portland | 5. Columbus |
| 3. Salt Lake City | * Hartford |

Strongest Economy

- | | |
|-------------|----------------|
| 1. Atlanta | 4. Orlando |
| 2. Seattle | 5. Minneapolis |
| 3. Portland | |

Most Underrated

- | | |
|---------------|---------------|
| 1. Portland | 4. Pittsburgh |
| 2. Greensboro | 5. Milwaukee |
| 3. Charlotte | * Baltimore |

concrete data, it does show what areas are popular with city planners and planning consultants. Cities that continually rank high in "liveability" surveys are attractive

to companies looking to move or expand, McGaffin said.

Portland's success in the survey is founded on careful planning, slow but steady economic growth, firm political leadership, and the integration of diverse cultures, said planners.

"The bottom line is when you look around the city, you can see Portland has paid attention to design," said William Lamont Jr., former planning director for the city of Denver. Lamont commended the work of former Portland Mayor Neil Goldschmidt, especially ordinances that require retail development on the ground floor of buildings downtown. Portland also has a lot of civic awareness, he said.

Planners said that in their eyes, Portland is an economic success because it grew slowly, which allowed more economic diversification.

"Portland is a prisoner of the Columbia River in that it will never be a major deep-water port like Seattle, San Diego or Los Angeles," said McGaffin. "But instead of trying to emulate other West Coast cities, Portland has concentrated on what it does well, which means inland business as well as port business. It has a strong economy, but the test will be whether it can survive its success."

Jim Jacks, planning director for the city of Tualatin, said Portland has had to diversify to stay alive. Jacks was the only local planner among those surveyed. Trade, agriculture, timber, high-technology products and light and heavy metals are very different examples of what Portland offers, he said.

"We don't get as much national attention as other cities do because we don't have the population," he said. "But there

are a reasonable amount of new jobs, and Portland is a new and growing market compared to cities back East and in the Midwest."

Several planners cited the efforts of former Govs. Tom McCall and Goldschmidt as examples of the strong will necessary to control the growth of business in Portland.

But Donald Pratt, director of community development in Bremerton, Wash., said the city will have to look at restructuring its government if it grows much bigger.

"In today's market, you need a strong personality and a lot of power to get things done," he said. "Portland's form of government isn't designed to bring out leadership. It's based on a weak mayor and too many commissioners."

Daniel Lauber, president of the American Institute of Certified Planners and a resident of River Forest, Ill., said Portland doesn't face poverty and racial crises to the degree that other cities do.

"Portland's not having its resources drained by a growing underclass segment where discrimination is still rampant with regard to jobs, housing and education," he said. "Welfare costs, lost income, crime and increased police are all part of it."

Lauber said Portland's different cultures get along better than those of other cities because Portland is relatively new and fairly wealthy.

But Jacks said Portland shares one problem with everyone.

"When are we going to learn that you're never going to be able to add enough traffic lanes to get everyone to work on time?" Jacks said. "It's a great example of what doesn't work in Portland."