A G E N D A

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736
TEL 503 797 1700 | FAX 503 797 1797

Ken Gervais

METRO

Meeting: **FUTURE VISION COMMISSION**

Date: December 19, 1994

Day: Monday

Time: 4:00 p.m. - 6:30 p.m.

Place: Metro, Room 370

	Approximate Time
1. CALL TO ORDER	5 minutes
2. ROLL CALL	
3. PUBLIC COMMENT and OTHER BUSINESS	10 minutes
4. MINUTES • Approval of November 7, 14 and 21 minutes	
5. DISCUSSION OF IMPLEMENTATION SECTION FOR THE FV DRAFT • Benchmarks and Leading Indicators	125 Minutes

Upcoming Meetings:
Jan 9

Enclosures:
December 5th Future Vision Draft
Memo from Ethan Seltzer

Questions? Call 797-1562.

Portland State University

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

December 13, 1994

To: Members of the Future Vision Commission

From: Ethan Seltzer

Re: Meeting Agenda for December 19

At our next meeting, the last before January 9, 1995, we will discuss the following:

- Councilor visits

- Benchmarks and rest of Implementation Section - We are seeking a list of leading indicators/benchmarks that can be used to guide the annual state of the region report and discussion. Our challenge is to come up with one or two leading indicators for each vision statement that can serve to draw attention to the topic addressed by the vision statement. Please note that this is **not** intended to be an exhaustive list, with every conceivable benchmark listed to cover all facets of the vision statement. Like the "Sustainable Seattle" effort circulated to you in the past, we hope to have a relatively short list of 20 to 40 benchmarks that provide a quick check on our progress. Give us your best!

- Letter from Sustainable Oregon - We need to review the letter as we did for the one from Bill Bulick.

We also received comments from Mike Houck and Robert Liberty. Mike and Robert, please review your comments and so that we can discuss them as we address the issues noted in this memo.

Also attached to this memo is a form that you can use to help identify icons for the maps. At your last meeting you decided to go with two maps: a map of the nine counties and a map of the three counties. We need your suggestions for photographs to serve as icons. David and Glen will use your suggestions and other materials on hand to assemble drafts for your review.

Thanks for your help! Please feel free to call should you have any comments or questions.

Attachments: December 5 draft
Letter from Sustainable Oregon
Photo Selection Chart

School of Urban and Public Affairs Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies
503/725-5170 FAX 725-5199

PHOTOS FOR ICONS...SUGGESTED EXAMPLES BY _____

VISION STATEMENT	PHOTO ICON SUGGESTION
I-1 CHILDREN	
I-2 EDUCATION	
I-3 PARTICIPATION	
S-1 SAFETY	
S-2 ECONOMY	
S-3 DIVERSITY	
S-4 CIVIC LIFE	
S-5 CAPABLE COMMUNITIES	
S-6 ROOTS	
P-1 RURAL LAND	
P-2 CHOICE	
P-3 A LIFE IN NATURE	
P-4 WALKING	
P-5 LINKAGES	
P-6 DOWNTOWNS	
P-7 EQUITY	
P-8 GROWTH MANAGEMENT	
Other?	

PLEASE RETURN TO DAVID, GLEN, OR KEN AT METRO AS SOON AS POSSIBLE, FAX 797-1794. THANKS!

12/20/94

To: Ethan Seltzer & Ken Gervais
From: Mike Houck
RE: Future Vision Commission Benchmarks

Last night I was asked by the FVC to consolidate and give you benchmarks for P3, Life In Nature. Here's my cut:

Water Quality: 95% of all streams (and **all** rivers) in the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan region meet instream flow needs throughout the summer months and have winter flows which do not negatively impact the physical and biological integrity of these waterbodies. All streams and rivers meet federal, state and local in-stream water quality standards.

Restoration: All streams within the region which were identified in 1994 as being in a degraded condition have active restoration programs to replace riparian habitat and wetlands for their multiple values. There is an active Metropolitan Conservation Corps which provides labor for restoration projects and provides meaningful, skill-oriented jobs for at-risk and underemployed youth and adults. There has been no net loss of wetlands inventoried in 1994 and there has been a net gain of 800 acres of wetlands which are distributed throughout the region, 50% of which serve natural functions and 50% of which serve primarily water quality functions.

Biodiversity: The number of species of plants and animals and their distribution is the same in 2040 as surveyed in 1994 and no additional plants or animals are experiencing localized extinction. The following indicator species have increased in population by the year 2040: osprey; great blue heron; native cutthroat trout; fall Chinook salmon; pileated woodpeckers; yellow warbler; willow flycatcher; red-legged frog; western pond turtle; river otter; beaver; muskrat.

Greenspaces & Parks: No one lives more than walking distance (1/4 mile) from **both** a neighborhood park and Greenspaces. A minimum of 12% of Greenspaces are publicly owned and are distributed equitably throughout the region.

Watershed Management: All of the region's waterbodies (streams, wetlands and rivers) are managed by local jurisdictions and regionally on a watershed basis and for their multiple values including: fish and wildlife habitat, flood reduction, water quality, open space, increased property values, recreation, education and research. 15% of land within the urban growth boundary will be in either publicly or privately owned Greenspaces.

Air Quality & Views: The region will meet all federal and state air quality standards and all of the cascade mountain peaks visible on clear days in 1994 will be visible in the year 2040.

I know I said that I'd merge these into three or four categories, but that was not possible, given the number of topics covered in P3. I tried, as much as possible, to mirror the Oregon Benchmarks and have attached the appropriate pages so you can compare them. Some of the topics (eg. restoration and watershed management do not appear in the Oregon Benchmarks).

I believe it will be necessary to convene experts in the fields of water quality, watershed management, fish and wildlife populations and management and restoration to ascertain whether these benchmarks are reasonable and attainable. I would use these as examples of benchmarks and leave it open regarding whether a technical advisory group can come up with better benchmarks.

8. Percentage of land with allowable soil loss erosion rates							
a. Cropland		54%		72%	72%	75%	80%
b. Pasture land		92%		95%	95%	95%	96%
c. Forest land		87%		90%	90%	91%	92%
9. Forest land:							
a. Percentage of Oregon forest land in 1970 still preserved for forest use	100%	97%	92%	92%	91%	91%	90%
b. Percentage of Eastern Oregon forests that are healthy (all ownerships)							
10. Percentage of Oregon wetlands in 1990 still preserved as wetlands			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
11. Percentage of identified Oregon hazardous waste sites that are cleaned up or being cleaned up			57%	62%	73%	87%	100%
12. Percentage of high-level radioactive nuclear waste cleaned up at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation				0%	0%	0%	40%
13. Pounds of Oregon municipal solid waste landfilled or incinerated per capita per year				1,826	1,800	1,400	1,050

Plants, Fish, and Wildlife	1970	1980	1990	1992	1995	2000	2010
14. Percentage of native fish and wildlife that are:							
a. Threatened, endangered, or sensitive				23%	25%	27%	28%
b. Uncertain status				66%	63%	60%	54%
c. Healthy				11%	12%	13%	18%
15. Percentage of native plant species that are:							
a. Threatened, endangered, or sensitive				10%			
b. Uncertain status				7%			
c. Healthy				83%			
16. Percentage of key sub-basins in which wild salmon and steelhead populations are increasing or at target levels	13%	13%	25%		38%	88%	100%

Outdoor Recreation	1970	1980	1990	1992	1995	2000	2010
17. Acres of primitive and wilderness public land in Oregon (millions)	15.7	16.1	17.1	17.1			
18. Acres of multi-purpose public land available for recreation in Oregon (millions)	25.8	25.4	24.4	24.4	24.8	24.8	24.8
19. Acres of Oregon parks and protected recreation land per 1,000 Oregonians			157		160	160	160

Developed Environment Which Is Convenient, Affordable, Accessible, and Environmentally Sensitive

Community Design	1970	1980	1990	1992	1995	2000	2010
20. Percentage of new developments where occupants are within ½ mile of a mix of stores and services, transit, parks, and open spaces							
21. Percentage of existing developments where occupants are within ½ mile of a mix of stores and services, transit, parks, and open spaces							
22. Percentage of development in Oregon per year occurring within urban growth boundaries				89%			
23. Residences per acre within urban growth boundaries							
24. Number of Oregonians (in thousands) with drinking water that does not meet health standards		250	160	75	45	0	0
25. Number of Oregonians (in thousands) with sewage disposal that does not meet government standards			200	143	134	67	0
26. Percentage of total land within the Portland metropolitan area which is open space				20%			
27. Percentage of total land within the Portland metropolitan area preserved as open space				3%			
28. Acres of community parks, designated recreation areas and designated open space per 1,000 Oregonians living in communities			16		18	20	20

(10%)	0	5%
20%	25%	30%

1995	2000	2010
20th-25th	20th-25th	20th-25th

1995	2000	2010
$120	$120	$120

1995	2000	2010
10.0%	9.8%	9.5%
70%	75%	80%
71%	75%	80%
120%	115%	110%
32%	30%	25%

Maintain Oregon's Capacity for Expansion and Growth

Land	1970	1980	1990	1
46. Percentage of Oregon industrial acreage identified in comprehensive plans that is actually suitable for development				
a. Portland Area				4
b. North Coast				1
c. Southwest				1
d. Willamette Valley				1
e. Central				2
f. Eastern				2

Water	1970	1980	1990	1
47. Number of river miles not in compliance with government water quality standards and therefore unable to accommodate additional development			1,100	1,

Air	1970	1980	1990	1
48. Number of areas not in compliance with government ambient air standards and therefore unable to accommodate additional municipal and industrial development	5	7	4	

Timber	1970	1980	1990	1
49. Percentage of public and private forest land in Oregon available for timber harvest	84%	79%	70%	7
50. Amount of timber harvested per year in Oregon (five year rolling average; billions of board feet)	9.1	7.8	8.4	7

Clean Beautiful Natural Environment

Air	1970	1980	1990	1992	1995	2000	2010
1. Percentage of Oregonians living where the air meets government ambient air quality standards	33%	30%	89%	50%	100%	100%	100%
2. Carbon dioxide emissions (million metric tons) as a percentage of 1990 emissions			100%	102%	100%	100%	100%

Water	1970	1980	1990	1992	1995	2000	2010
3. Miles of assessed Oregon rivers and streams not meeting government state and federal in-stream water quality standards			1,100	1,100	723	75	0
4. Groundwater:							
a. Total amount							
b. Percentage that is contaminated							
5. Percentage of key rivers and rivers with in-stream water rights meeting in-stream flow needs							
a. Less than 9 months out of the year				35%	30%	26%	21%
b. 9 to 11 months out of the year				25%	28%	33%	36%
c. 12 months out of the year				35%	35%	35%	36%

Land	1970	1980	1990	1992	1995	2000	2010
6. Percentage of Oregon agricultural land in 1970 still preserved for agricultural use	100%	100%	96%	95%	95%	94%	94%
7. Percentage of rangelands which are in good or excellent condition				22%	23%	27%	35%

Clean natural environment. Nothing so threatens the natural environment in Oregon as the state's growing water problem. The drought in 1992 heightened awareness of the state's vulnerability to water shortages from low precipitation. However, in too many cases, stream flows are being depleted by irrigation; and stream habitat and water quality are being degraded by livestock grazing, logging, mining, and other activities. Already, more than 30 stocks of fish are classified as sensitive, threatened, or endangered, and it is very possible that further listings of salmon stocks will occur.

	1970	1980	1990	1992	1995	2000	2010
Stream Flow Percentage of key rivers and streams with in-stream water rights meeting in-stream flow needs 9 or more months out of the year				65%	70%	74%	79%
Stream Quality Miles of assessed Oregon rivers and streams not meeting state and federal government in-stream water quality standards			1,100	1,100	723	75	0
Salmon Percentage of key sub-basins in which wild salmon and steelhead populations are increasing or at target levels	13%	13%	25%		38%	88%	100%

Government efficiency; revenue reform. This is critically important. Oregon's governments must renew the public sector by focusing all agencies on performance outcomes and by streamlining operations. At the same time governments need to raise taxes to levels sufficient to achieve both urgent benchmarks and other goals. Under Measure 5, dollars available for public services are shrinking dramatically. The benchmarks cannot be achieved unless the tax system is reformed in a way that is fair and that provides enough money to pay for vital public services.

	1970	1980	1990	1992	1995	2000	2010
Taxes. Oregon ranking in state and local taxes per capita		15th	19th		20-25th	20-25th	20-25th
Public Infrastructure Investment Real per capita capital outlays for facilities (1990 constant dollars)	$426	$525	$330	$432	$597	$651	$758
Public Agency Performance.							
a. Percent of agencies that employ results oriented performance measures							
1. State government				25%	100%	100%	100%
2. Schools							

Endnotes: 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 federal air quality standards year round. The data are based on monitoring of Oregon airsheds for carbon monoxide, ozone, fine particulates, and other pollutants. New air quality standards and monitoring data in the future will likely require adjustment of the benchmark data. *Rationale*: Good air quality is fundamental to the health of Oregonians. *Data source*: Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Air Quality Division.

2. Carbon dioxide emissions (million metric tons) as a percent of 1990 emissions
Explanation: This benchmark measures carbon dioxide (CO_2) emissions in the state relative to 1990 emissions. The goal is to stabilize emissions at the 1990 level of 35.5 million metric tons. *Rationale*: Most leading atmospheric scientists predict that increasing emissions of greenhouse gases will raise the earth's average temperature by 2°F to 5°F before the end of the next century. There is uncertainty about the rate of change and the consequence of such change. Nevertheless, prudent policy supports the need to buy insurance against the potentially large costs of global warming. Many of the actions that will have to be taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions are the responsibility of individuals, businesses, local governments, and states. Most of the reductions to meet the target can be achieved by cost-effective energy efficiency measures. *Data source*: Oregon Department of Energy.

3. Miles of assessed Oregon rivers and streams not meeting state and federal 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 reflect the miles of streams which have total maximum daily loads established. These include the Grande Ronde, Umatilla, Pudding, Klamath, Coast Fork Willamette, South Umpqua, Tualatin, and Yamhill rivers, and Columbia Slough. There are about 112,000 total miles of rivers and streams in Oregon. Today, about 3,500 miles of in-stream flows are monitored. New in-stream water quality standards, monitoring data, and assessment of information will probably require adjustment of the benchmark sums, both retroactively and prospectively. *Rationale*: Clean rivers and lakes are essential to providing water that is safe for drinking, recreation, and fish and wildlife. *Data source*: Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Water Quality Control Division.

4a. 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. Groundwater is a major source of water for drinking, crop irrigation, and industrial uses. Currently, detailed data are available for only about 4% of the state's surface area. Further research and investigation must be done in order to collect data for this benchmark.

4b. Percentage of Oregon groundwater that is contaminated
Explanation: DEQ indicates that a statewide network of monitoring wells is necessary to adequately describe the overall quality of Oregon's groundwater. This is not a factor for a large percentage of the population, but it is crucial for a number of communities that use wells. Only about 2 percent have adequate management plans to protect wellheads.

5. Percentage of Oregon key rivers and rivers with in-stream water rights meeting in-stream flow needs: (a) < 9 months a year, (b) 9 to 11 months per year, (c) 12 months a year
Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which in-stream flows in Oregon's rivers and streams meet in-stream flow needs. It is based on a sample of 450 sites. *Rationale*: In 1987, the Oregon Legislature created in-stream water rights to support benefits derived from public uses in streams and lakes. These benefits include recreation, maintenance and enhancement of aquatic and wildlife habitat, pollution abatement, and navigation. *Data source*: Oregon Department of Water Resources, Resource Management Division.

6. 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 agricultural uses. 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 1992 is extrapolated from reported data for 1982 and 1987, assuming an annual decrease from 1987 to 1992 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; 1992, 15.0 1995, 15.0; 2000, 14.8; 2010, 14.8. *Rationale*: State policy is to preserve productive agricultural lands. Much of the decrease agricultural land is due to urbanization. *Data source*: U.S. Department of Agriculture. A new census of agricultural land is anticipated.

7. Percentage of rangelands which are in good or excellent condition
Explanation: This measures the percentage of rangelands which meet Soil Conservation Service's condition categories of "good" and "excellent." These ratings are based on, among other criteria, plant diversity and soil condition. *Rationale*: Rangeland quality is critical to watershed protection and a sustainable ranching industry. Even though the overall condition of Oregon's rangeland is better than it has been in the past century, we should still try to increase the productivity of those lands that can feasibly be improved. *Data source*: Oregon

Department of Agriculture, based on Soil Conservation Service data.

8. Percentage of land with allowable soil loss erosion rates
Explanation: This measures the amount of lands which are eroding at a rate that normal or healthy soils should. *Rationale*: Controlling soil erosion is key to maintaining land productivity. Nearly half of all cropland was eroding at an accelerated rate in 1982. Because of the implementation of the 1985 Food Security Act (FSA), the percent croplands with unacceptable erosion is now 28%. *Data source*: Oregon Department of Agriculture, based on Soil Conservation Service data.

9a. 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 estimated actual amounts of forest land in Oregon, in millions of acres, are as follows: 1970, 25.3; 1980, 23.3; 1990, 19.4; 1992, 19.4; 1995, 17.9; 2000, 17.9; 2010, 17.9. *Rationale*: State policy is to conserve productive forest lands. *Data source*: Oregon Department of Forestry.

9b. Percentage of Eastern Oregon forests that are healthy (all ownerships)
Explanation: Currently the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is setting up sample test plots in Eastern Oregon forests, where forest health is a very serious problem. Within the next few years, we should have reliable data to measure this benchmark.

10. 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. Between 1990 and 1992, there was a net gain of 65 acres of wetland area. *Rationale*: Wetlands provide important habitat for plants, animals and insects. Wetlands also promote recharge of groundwater, dissipate floodwaters, and stabilize streambanks. Wetlands improve water quality by filtering sediments and pollutants. *Data source*: Oregon Division of State Lands, Environmental Planning and Permits Section.

11. Percentage of identified 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. New sites will probably be discovered, and we will modify our benchmark both prospectively and retrospectively. *Rationale*: If not controlled, hazardous wastes can contaminate groundwater and surface waters, harming fish and wildlife and threatening human health. *Data source*: Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Hazardous and Solid Waste Division.

12. Percentage of high-level radioactive nuclear waste clean-up at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation
Explanation: This benchmark measures the progress on cleaning up high-level nuclear waste from weapons production at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation. *Rationale*: Hanford has the nation's largest accumulation of nuclear weapon's waste. The Columbia River, which borders the site and is linked to Hanford by aquifers, is at risk from both radioactive and hazardous chemical contamination. The U.S. Department of Energy and Washington State, with participation by Oregon, have signed a detailed agreement setting forth both actions and timelines to clean up Hanford over the next 30 years. *Data source*: Oregon Department of Energy.

13. 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. *Rationale*: Recycling and reuse saves resources, landfill space, and reduces air and water pollution. *Data source*: Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Hazardous and Solid Waste Division.

14. Percentage of native wildlife species that are threatened, endangered, sensitive, or have uncertain status, or are healthy in Oregon
Explanation: There are 560 wildlife and 80 fish species in Oregon. The threatened, endangered, and sensitive species are those classified as such under Federal and state listings. "Uncertain status" is when the majority of the populations have unknown (or uncertain) status and are not listed as sensitive. Currently, the only data available for healthy status is for game wildlife and fish. In future years non-game species will be added to this category. *Rationale*: This benchmark addresses the extent to which natural habitat is sufficient for sustaining native mammal, bird, reptile, amphibian, and fish species. *Data source*: Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife.

15. Percentage of native plant species that are threatened, endangered, or sensitive, or have uncertain status, or are healthy
Explanation: This benchmark is based on a report, *Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Plants and Animals of Oregon*, a document prepared by Oregon Natural Heritage Program, Oregon Department of Agriculture, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Division of State Lands, and Oregon Natural Heritage Advisory Council. There are approximately 3,370 flora species in Oregon. *Rationale*: This benchmark addresses the extent to which natural habitat is sufficient for sustaining native plant species. *Data source*: Oregon Department of Agriculture.

16. Percentage of key sub-basins in which wild salmon and steelhead populations are increasing or at target levels
Explanation: This measures the change in stock in populations of wild salmon and steelhead. The key subbasins are the Willamette (including the McKenzie), Clackamas, Deschutes, John Day, Grande Ronde, Salmon, North Oregon Coast, and the South Oregon Coast. *Rationale*: Increasing the stock of wild salmon and

steelhead helps assure healthy and diverse fish populations. *Data source*: Northwest Electric Power and Conservation Planning Council.

17. 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 that has no recreational facilities (except trails), is open to limited recreational uses, and is protected from development, timber cutting, and other resource extraction. The projected addition of one million acres between 1990 and 1995 reflects new wilderness acreage expected to be designated on federal land in Oregon. *Rationale*: Primitive and wilderness lands offer unique recreational opportunities and are part of our cultural heritage. *Data source*: Oregon Department of Parks and Recreation.

18. Acres of multi-purpose public land available for recreation in Oregon (in 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. *Rationale*: Access to a variety of outdoor recreational opportunities is important to Oregonians and to visitors to the state. *Data source*: Oregon Department of Parks and Recreation.

19. 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. *Rationale*: The demand for recreational opportunities is growing rapidly. For example, in 1988-1989, the tally of state park visits was nearly 40 million, double the number two decades earlier. *Data source*: Oregon Department of Parks and Recreation.

20. Percentage of new developments where occupants are within 1/2 mile of a mix of stores and services, transit, parks, and open spaces.
Explanation: This measures the ability of people to meet many of their needs for shopping, services, and mobility without having to rely on their automobiles. This benchmark applies to new development. The one-half mile distance refers to access by walking or by bicycle. *Rationale*: This pattern of development provides places for people to live that are inviting, reduce the need for driving, and preserve open spaces. *Data source*: Data are not available, since this will apply to development after 1992.

21: Percentage of existing developments where occupants are within 1/2 mile of a mix of stores and services, transit, parks and open spaces.
Explanation: This benchmark is for existing development. *Data source*: Census, land use, and transit district data will be analyzed using a geographic information system. Data are available, but have not previously been analyzed.

22. Percentage of development in Oregon per year occurring within urban growth boundaries
Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which new residential, commercial, and industrial construction each year in Oregon is occurring within urban growth boundaries throughout the state. The benchmark is a composite of the number of residential units built within urban growth boundaries in four communities: Bend (43%), Brookings (63%), Medford (76%), and Portland (95%). *Rationale*: Under Oregon's land use laws, all urban areas have designated a boundary to define where growth and development should occur. The aim is to fend off sprawl and preserve and protect farm and forest lands. *Data source*: *Growth Management Case Studies*, Oregon Department of Land Conservation

23. Residences per acre within urban growth boundaries.
Explanation: Reasonable densities for homes and multi-family dwellings suggest that land within urban growth boundaries is being fully utilized, protecting other lands for other uses. *Data source*: Not currently gathered. This will be investigated for the next edition.

24. Number of Oregonians (in thousands) with drinking water that does not meet health standards
Explanation: This benchmark measures the extent to which Oregonians' drinking water does not meet government drinking water standards. For purposes of this benchmark, we measure drinking water systems serving 25 or more people. There are about 1,000 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. 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. *Rationale*: Healthy drinking water is crucial to the well being of the citizens of a community. *Data source*: Oregon Health Division, Drinking Water Section. Data for community water systems are currently reported. Data for smaller water systems (serving fewer than 25 persons) are not currently reported.

25. 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. *Rationale*: Inability to provide proper sewage disposal results in a threat to the health of those affected and a barrier to further development in the area. *Data source*: Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, *Sewage Need Survey*.

26. Percent of total land within the Portland metropolitan area that is preserved as natural areas and open spaces

Explanation: This measures areas within urban growth boundaries that are preserved as either natural areas or open spaces. This measure is only for the Portland metropolitan area (not including Vancouver). The boundary used is the Metro Service District Boundary. Not all undeveloped land is included, only those areas which have the potential to protect habitat. A redevelopment area, where buildings have been cleared (no trees or habitat), would not be included. As further inventories are done in other metropolitan areas, they will be added to this benchmark. *Rationale*: Residents of urban areas have a variety of recreation needs, from viewing natural areas to using intensively developed parks with game fields and recreation equipment. Urban areas also contain natural areas that provide critical habitat for a variety of plants and animals. *Data source*: Portland Greenspace Inventory, METRO.

27. Percent of land within the Portland metropolitan area that is preserved as open space
Explanation: This measures the undeveloped land within urban growth boundaries. It includes protected and unprotected natural areas and open space. This measure is for the Portland metropolitan area only. *Rationale*: See #26, above. *Data source*: Portland Greenspace Inventory, METRO.

28. 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. *Rationale*: Adequate park, recreation, and open space land in Oregon's communities is needed to meet the burgeoning demand for nearby outdoor recreation. *Data source*: Oregon Department of Parks and Recreation

29. 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. *Rationale*: Thirty minutes is an almost universal average for commutes. A longer commute suggests more vehicles on the highway for a longer time, which will affect congestion and air quality. The average commute in Oregon in 1990 was 20 minutes. The goal is to maintain that average commute. *Data source*: *Oregon Population Survey*, a random survey of 3,200 Oregon households, and the decennial Census of Population and Housing.

30. Percentage of miles of limited-access highways in Oregon metropolitan 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. *Rationale*: Congestion exacts a toll in terms of driver frustration, lost work time, more air pollution, more gasoline use, and higher cost of goods and services. *Data source*: Oregon Department of Transportation.

31a. 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. *Rationale:* This benchmark is a standard measure of access to transit. *Data source*: Oregon Department of Transportation.

31b. Percentage of streets in urban areas that have adequate pedestrian and bicycle facilities
Explanation: This will measure the percentage of non-residential streets in urban areas that have adequate bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Appropriate facilities will vary, but they include marked bike lanes, direct routes, sufficient width for safe travel in traffic, sidewalks, and paths, and safe street crossings. The focus of this benchmark is streets to work and shopping destinations. Citizens are more likely to use bicycles or walk as alternatives to using a vehicle if the streets to their destinations are safe for walking or bicycling. This data will be collected for all metropolitan areas in the next biennium.

32. 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. *Rationale*: A major source of congestion and air pollution is people who drive alone to work. *Data source*: *Oregon Population Survey*, a random survey of 3,200 Oregon households.

33. Vehicle miles travelled per capita in Oregon metropolitan areas (per year)
Explanation: This benchmark measures the per capita vehicle miles travelled annually in Clackamas, Multnomah, Washington, Marion, Polk, Lane,and Jackson Counties. *Rationale*: The State Transportation Planning Rule requires metropolitan areas – Portland, Salem, Eugene, and Medford – to adopt plans to reduce vehicle miles travelled over the next thirty years. Benchmark goals reflect implementation of the rule. These goals will be achieved through increased carpooling, increased use of mass transit, and pedestrian friendly urban design. *Data source*: Oregon Department of Transportation.

34. Percentage of Oregon households that can afford the median-priced Oregon home for sale
Explanation: This compares the prices of Oregon homes with the home purchasing power of Oregonians. *Rationale*: Housing affordability is a linchpin of Oregonians' stability and self-sufficiency. Among low income Oregonians, housing costs are often the single largest budget item, and finding and keeping housing is a continuing challenge. *Data source*: Oregon Housing and Community Services Department, based on 1990 Census of Population and Housing. Data for non-Census years may be collected through the *Oregon Population Survey*, a random survey of 3,200 Oregon households.

Portland State University

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

December 27, 1994

To: Ken Gervais, Glen Bolen VIA FAX 797-1794

From: Ethan Seltzer

Re: Indicators/Benchmarks

What follows are a list of benchmarks for which we need to establish the following:

- Does anyone collect it now? If not, is there something similar that is being used?
- What was the value in 1990 or at its most recent point of collection?
- What would it take for Metro to get access to the data?
- Is there a better indicator than the one we're seeking?

Do your best! Obviously we won't get all of what we want, but give it a shot. Call if you have questions.

I-1 Readiness to learn/school readiness for kindergarten or first graders (call Children First)
I-2 Adult literacy; student skill achievement; time to rehire and/or to attainment of previous income
I-3 Voter turnout in local and metro races; number of candidates in local and metro races
S-1 Crime rates by crime; perception of crime surveys; % of schools with no reported crimes
S-2 Household income; Percapita income; business formation; business failures; business license activity by economic sector
S-3 Bias crime rate; standardized segregation index (census)
S-4 Number of active neighborhood associations, CPO's, etc.; number and types of voluntary associations by community
S-5 Number of newspapers, radio stations, cable access studios, etc. by community; number of self-nominations for recognition of neighborhood "breakthroughs" (check benchmarks)
S-6 Number of designated structures saved/demolished; number of annual celebrations of place and history by community
P-1 Number of acres in farms with gross sales of at least $40,000.00 outside UGB's; number of lots less than or equal to five acres in size outside of UGB's
P-2 number of dwelling units within a quartermile of parks, shopping, transit, and public buildings; percentage of households able to afford the median sale price for housing
P-3 ...use Houck's memo...
P-4 PEF by community/jurisdiction; number of miles of bike lanes by community; mode split for walking by community
P-5 ...check flow study for ideas; intermodal shipping activity at Port
P-6 vacancy rates in downtowns by type of use and by downtown; percentage of business licenses in downtowns, by downtown
P-7 children in poverty; percentage of households paying no more than 30% of their monthly gross for housing; new jobs by jurisdiction
P-8 population density; percentage of urbanized area

Section 5. Regional Planning Functions.

(1) Future Vision. *(a) Adoption*. The council shall adopt a Future Vision for the region between January 15, 1995 and July 1, 1995. The Future Vision is a conceptual statement that indicates population levels and settlement patterns that the region can accommodate within the carrying capacity of the land, water and air resources of the region, and its educational and economic resources, and that achieves a desired quality of life. The Future Vision is a long-term, visionary outlook for at least a 50-year period. As used in this section, "region" means the Metro area and adjacent areas.

(b) Matters addressed. The matters addressed by the Future Vision include but are not limited to: (1) use, restoration and preservation of regional land and natural resources for the benefit of present and future generations, (2) how and where to accommodate the population growth for the region while maintaining a desired quality of life for its residents, and (3) how to develop new communities and additions to the existing urban areas in well-planned ways.

(c) Development. The council shall appoint a commission to develop and recommend a proposed Future Vision by a date the council sets. The commission shall be broadly representative of both public and private sectors, including the academic community, in the region. At least one member must reside outside the Metro area. The commission has authority to seek any necessary information and shall consider all relevant information and public comment in developing the proposed Future Vision. The commission serves without compensation.

(d) Review and amendment. The Future Vision may be reviewed and amended as provided by ordinance. The Future Vision shall be completely reviewed and revised at least every fifteen years in the manner specified in subsection (1)(c) of this section.

(e) Effect. The Future Vision is not a regulatory document. It is the intent of this charter that the Future Vision have no effect that would allow court or agency review of it.

(2) Regional Framework Plan. *(a) Adoption*. The council shall adopt a regional framework plan by December 31, 1997 with the consultation and advice of the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) created under section 27 of this charter. The council may adopt the regional framework plan in components.

(b) Matters addressed. The regional framework plan shall address: (1) regional transportation and mass transit systems, (2) management and amendment of the urban growth boundary, (3) protection of lands outside the urban growth boundary for natural resource, future urban or other uses, (4) housing densities, (5) urban design and settlement patterns, (6) parks, open spaces and recreational facilities, (7) water sources and storage, (8) coordination, to the extent feasible, of Metro growth management and land use planning policies with those of Clark County, Washington, and (9) planning responsibilities mandated by state law. The regional framework plan shall also address other growth management and land use planning matters which the council, with the consultation and advice of the MPAC, determines are of metropolitan concern and will benefit from regional planning. To encourage regional uniformity, the regional framework plan shall also contain model terminology, standards and

procedures for local land use decision making that may be adopted by local governments. As used in this section, "local" refers only to the cities and counties within the jurisdiction of Metro.

(c) Effect. The regional framework plan shall: (1) describe its relationship to the Future Vision, (2) comply with applicable statewide planning goals, (3) be subject to compliance acknowledgement by the Land Conservation and Development Commission or its successor, and (4) be the basis for coordination of local comprehensive plans and implementing regulations.

(d) Amendment. The council may amend the regional framework plan after seeking the consultation and advice of the MPAC.

(e) Implementation. To the maximum extent allowed by law, the council shall adopt ordinances: (1) requiring local comprehensive plans and implementing regulations to comply with the regional framework plan within three years after adoption of the entire regional framework plan. If the regional framework plan is subject to compliance acknowledgement, local plans and implementing regulations shall be required to comply with the regional framework plan within two years of compliance acknowledgement; (2) requiring the council to adjudicate and determine the consistency of local comprehensive plans with the regional framework plan; (3) requiring each city and county within the jurisdiction of Metro to make local land use decisions consistent with the regional framework plan until its comprehensive plan has been determined to be consistent with the regional framework plan. The obligation to apply the regional framework plan to local land use decisions shall not begin until one year after adoption and compliance acknowledgement of the regional framework plan; and (4) allowing the council to require changes in local land use standards and procedures if the council determines changes are necessary to remedy a pattern or practice of decision making inconsistent with the regional framework plan.

(3) Priority and funding of regional planning activities. The regional planning functions under this section are the primary functions of Metro. The council shall appropriate funds sufficient to assure timely completion of those functions.

Section 6. Other Assigned Functions. Metro is also authorized to exercise the following functions: (1) Acquisition, development, maintenance and operation of: (a) a metropolitan zoo, (b) public cultural, trade, convention, exhibition, sports, entertainment, and spectator facilities, (c) facilities for the disposal of solid and liquid wastes, and (d) a system of parks, open spaces and recreational facilities of metropolitan concern; (2) Disposal of solid and liquid wastes; (3) Metropolitan aspects of natural disaster planning and response coordination; (4) Development and marketing of data; and (5) Any other function required by state law or assigned to the Metropolitan Service District or Metro by the voters.

Portland State University

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

MEMORANDUM

December 19, 1994

To: Ken Gervais, Susan McLain

From: Ethan Seltzer

Re: Future Vision Public Review

Attached is a draft of a public review process for the Future Vision. I think it meets our objectives, brings the Council and Executive right into the middle of the loop, and can do the job in an interesting way in time for the Council to act prior to July 1, 1995. Please review this as soon as possible and let me know what you think. In particular, do you think the Council will agree to this and to the assumption that they will trust the process as described? We need to pull this together quickly so as to not squeeze the adoption process at the end. I'll be around during the holidays. Let me know what you decide after you get a chance to talk.

Thanks!

Attachment

School of Urban and Public Affairs Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies
503/725-5170 FAX 725-5199

Future Vision Public Review
Proposed Outline
December 19, 1994

Objectives:

- Public review of the report of the Future Vision Commission prior to the adoption of a Future Vision by the Council; and

- The opportunity for the Council and Executive to put their stamp on the Future Vision so that, once adopted, it articulates a set of principles that will be of service to Metro as growth management policy decisions are decided.

Overview:

The Future Vision Commission has developed a statement of values and a set of vision statements for the metropolitan region that meet the requirements of the Charter and address the broad range of concerns that citizens have regarding the growth of the region. The vision statements identify elements of our region that should be protected as well as elements that need considerable work and community attention. In light of the diverse range of views among Commission members on issues ranging from what a vision is to how it ought to be developed to what it finally contains and how it should be acted on, the final report of the Commission presents vision statements with no particular sense of priority. Consequently, since each vision statement is presented with the same weight as every other vision statement, the "story" told by the document as a whole is open to considerable interpretation.

It's not that the vision statements are too "mom and apple pie" to mean much by themselves. Quite to the contrary, the vision statements are remarkably specific, even more so when considered along with their proposed implementation actions. It is the lack of prioritization that makes it possible for many stories to be told using the same set of values and vision statements as building blocks. To make it easier for citizens and others to understand what, in total, the vision is, we need to be able to sketch more descriptively how the vision statements operate on the region and each other. Stated another way, we need to identify for the reader which statements provide the key organizing principles for what we will be known for, as a region, fifty years from now.

One way to more precisely tell the story told by the document, the story <u>intended</u> to be told, is to use the values and vision statements to describe what the region is like to live in, what we are building for in the future, and what the world expects from this region in the year 2045. In this case the values and vision statements would be used to identify the elements of the region that ought to stand out most clearly, a process that requires focus and prioritization to an extent beyond which the Commission has gone to date. However, by taking the time to tell the story of the vision in this way, we can more easily present it to a wide public audience and better describe, for them, what having these value and vision statements will mean for the region. Think of it this way: the values and vision statements are like an atlas. To make that atlas most useful to other "travellers", we need to include a travel guide. Just as all places on a map don't hold equal interest, we need to be able to describe which places in the report of the Future Vision Commission speak most clearly to our hopes for the region in the next century.

Given the timeline for adoption of a Future Vision, the fact that it is the Metro Council and Executive that will actually make direct use of it in the future, and the objectives stated above, it makes most sense for the Council and Executive to be the ones to tell the story. The Future Vision Commission could go through the process of sketching their scenario using the values and vision statements. However, the Council and Executive will still have to do it themselves if the Future Vision is truly going to be theirs. Further, sending the Future Vision Commission's story to the public for review directs the attention of the public to a story that, in the end, may or may not be embraced by actual decisionmakers. Presented below is a process that the Council, with or without the Executive could use to quickly and efficiently put their story before the people of this region, and adopt a Future Vision by the date specified in the Charter.

Proposed Process:

December 19, 1994 - January 23, 1995 Edit and produce final report of the Future Vision Commission

January 30, 1995 Future Vision Commission meets with Council and Executive to present the report with particular attention to values, vision statements, and proposed implementation steps. Council and Executive have facilitated discussion of what they've heard in order to identify priorities and central themes. Results of Council/Executive discussion are turned over to a writer who then uses the values, vision statements, and discussion results to draft a one to two-page scenario for the region in 2045.

February 13, 1995 Council and Executive receive draft scenario and have one week to return comments. Scenario and report of the Future Vision Commission are designed and readied for two publications:

- "decision kit" to be sent to about 3000

- major placement in Planning newsletter already scheduled to be sent to 50,000 in March, also announces April public meetings

Early April, 1995 Three public meetings held to receive additional testimony on the vision.

April, 1995 Final Future Vision drafted and readied for adoption.

May, 1995 Council adopts Future Vision for the region

NOTE: Not accounted for in this process is specific review with MPAC, although it could easily occur throughout March and April, parallel to the public process.