

REGIONAL POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT

**WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 1992
METRO COUNCIL CHAMBERS
5:00 PM - 6:30 PM**

AGENDA:

- I. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR
MEETING OF MAY 13, 1992**
- II. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**
- III. PLANNING PROJECTS REPORT (MATERIALS
ENCLOSED)**
- IV. METROPOLITAN GREENSPACES MASTERPLAN
BRIEFING (MATERIALS ENCLOSED)**
- V. LCDC URBAN GROWTH MANAGEMENT
PROJECT (MATERIALS AVAILABLE AT THE
MEETING)**

**PLEASE LET US KNOW IF YOU CANNOT MAKE IT
(220-1537). ALL PARKING SPACES ARE AVAILABLE
TO THE PUBLIC AT 5:00 PM.**

THANKS!!!!

Regional Policy Advisory Committee

Minutes of Meeting of May 13, 1992

Members and Alternates in Attendance:

Susan McLain, Chris Utterback, Gussie McRobert, Gretchen Kafoury, Jim Gardner, Jerry Arnold, Dick Benner, Pauline Anderson, Jim Zehren, Richard Kidd, Darlene Hooley, Bob Liddell, Roy Rogers, Earl Blumenauer, Fred Neal, Peggy Lynch, Ed Marcotte, Chris Foster

Others Present:

Ethan Seltzer, Andy Cotugno, Mark Turpel, Terry Moore, Gail Ryder, Robin McArthur-Phillips, Rob Kappa

The meeting was called to order at 5:15 pm.

I. Jerry Arnold moved and Gretchen Kafoury seconded that the minutes of the previous meeting be approved. The minutes were unanimously approved as submitted. Jim Gardner asked if there were any citizens in the audience wishing to speak. No one came forward.

II. Ethan Seltzer provided an update on the Regional Growth Conference and Region 2040 Study projects, including the telephone survey, stakeholder interviews, local jurisdiction "kits", and public workshops. Jerry Arnold asked whether the Conference was worth the effort. Ethan Seltzer replied that it was the only event of its kind that brought together the regional growth management "stakeholders". Jim Gardner noted that next year the conference would occur at the time that the Region 2040 alternatives would be entering the Phase II analysis, providing good material for the workshops.

III. Ethan Seltzer then introduced Terry Moore, leader for the consultant team working on the Region 2040 Study. Terry described the kit being used with local governments, and the ways in which the results would be used later on. He then showed the Region 2040 slide show, following which he asked RPAC members to review the material on growth themes handed out at the meeting. Terry then asked RPAC to discuss which themes should be given the highest priority, or most attention, and why (what follows is a compilation of comments made during the discussion):

--economic development and diversification of the economy is key. Commercial development and industrial parks must be located near transportation and labor.

--Theme 5 makes sense. We should use the primary corridors and make the most of the huge public investment in LRT.

--Theme 14 should get some attention because the balance of jobs and housing is important.

--I don't like themes 1, 2, 5, and 7. 1 is too narrow. 2 needs to be balanced. Emphasizing high density corridors (5) isn't popular. 7 raises the question of which cities and where. Theme 8 looks pretty good.

--Themes 12, 13, and 14 are related and should be looked at as a package.

--Theme 5 shouldn't mean only high density corridors. There needs to be balance, with high density corridors part of an overall package. There should be balanced growth but better regional function, and linkages to themes 12, 13, and 14.

--I like theme 10 since it implies a walkable, bikeable place.

--If you don't have theme 11, it won't work. Also, there needs to be a theme 15 that deals explicitly with sense of place or community as the basis for future urban form. Everyone needs a place to fit in.

--With theme 11 should come consideration of air quality and the affect of Washington on Oregon. Also 9 crosses the river.

--Theme 1 is important. We need to see more than 3% in Portland. 1 and 5 are related. I don't like 5 because it's wasteful of land, energy, and air quality.

--How can we do this using the existing UGB? Clackamas County faces a future as a bedroom community if the UGB stays the same and no land for jobs is added.

Terry Moore remarked that it's hard to get 600,000 inside the UGB, and all too easy for most people to put the density "somewhere else". He stated that he heard a need to do all of themes 9 through 14, that themes 1 and 5 work for some, what about theme 6?

--Many techniques will need to be used. The UGB won't last for 50 years. If we don't want to be LA then we must expect satellite cities to be part of the mix.

--I don't like 1, 2, and 3. Also 4 is a problem. Theme 5 should be looked at for the activity center concept, and for looking at activity centers as cities in some cases. Theme 7 should be incorporated in the mix. Themes 12, 13, and 14 need to work together. Theme 11 must always be considered. 9 and 10 are opposites. There needs to be a mix.

--All themes can't be emphasized or 2040 won't work. Emphasize 1 and 5. If Portland fails, then the region fails. Investment in LRT demands focusing development in corridors. Theme 9 means that the air quality will be too poor to support industrial growth.

Terry Moore mentioned that as he begins to prepare for the development of alternatives, he sees aspects of themes 9 through 14 emerging as evaluative criteria. Jim Zehren noted that

he should also look at the benchmarks.

Terry then asked RPAC to discuss the characteristics of the region that are most important to quality of life.

--The distinct character of areas, communities, and districts which leads to sense of place.

--We can't expand the UGB to Salem. We should avoid becoming a western version of megalopolis. We will not accomplish much if we don't stick to our guns regarding density. Design is key.

--Nature gives us the pattern within which our cities should be built. Parks and schools need better coordination with the planning program, and all elements of what makes a center need to be considered together.

--View corridors are critical.

--Low heights of buildings. I don't like tall buildings. We must have open space, diversity in housing types, and setbacks from amenities.

--We must have open space. As density increases and plans near build-out, there must be psychic relief.

--Pedestrian friendly. Neighborhoods and districts need to be places you can really walk.

--People need to know they have real choices. Human scale means that people don't get lost. We must keep that scale everywhere because it adds to sense of place.

--Sense of community. But benchmarks for this are hard to find. Access to stores, gathering places, and transit by foot can serve as indicators for community.

--Access to parks.

--Neotraditional neighborhoods are important because people are afraid of being swallowed up.

--I am pleased to hear shared values for community, but no one seems to like theme number 6. How can it be fixed?

--Only focusing inside the UGB is too limiting.

--Excise the term "new towns".

Terry then asked if each person could let him know in 1 minute the 1 thing they want him to hear before we get into the development of alternatives.

--Communities need to understand the need for balance and priorities in a world of limited resources.

--Change will happen and things will be different.

--There is a tremendous shared sense of values, values are converging and we need to capture these views. The terminology "sucks". "Density", "neotraditional", etc. are all bad. We need win-win terms based on shared values.

--Pictures are needed to get past words. We need real examples to show how it can happen, because we need to change local plans.

--Cultural differences and styles mean that we must avoid cookie-cutter solutions and application of the themes to the region. We need to mesh differences and support multiple lifestyles. We can't leave folks out.

--There are different values and standards, and they must be defined at the start. Playing the growth game at the conference was useful because it was enlightening to see just how tough the task really is.

--I wince when I hear "up to 500,000". It might be more or less, so our planning must consider ranges. We need to communicate an accurate sense of the trade-offs. We need to use pictures to do this, and if the trade-off is not apparent locally, then the macro-level appreciation of the trade-off will be tough to communicate. We must communicate the implications of choosing the status quo.

Terry Moore then distributed the surveys to the RPAC members and asked that they return them as soon as possible.

Peggy Lynch mentioned that it will be necessary to figure out how to do a 20 minute presentation for citizens.

IV. Ethan Seltzer reported on the LCDC Urban Growth Management Project and noted that RPAC needs to look at the recommendations at its next meeting.

V. Chris Utterback asked if RPAC would look at the charter. Jim Gardner replied that it wasn't really an RPAC issue. Susan McLain mentioned that there would be public meetings on the charter later on.

Fred Neal asked if there could be a State Agency Council report to RPAC. Dick Benner replied that we could set it up anytime.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:52 pm.

JUNE PLANNING PROJECTS REPORT

1) Region 2040

- Telephone Survey report done (enclosed)
- Stakeholder interviews almost done
- Local government "kits" 90% complete
- Conference proceedings to printer by end of June
- Public workshops June 13, 16, 17, 18 (flyer enclosed)
- Scope of work for alternatives development complete
- Technical memo on Mixed Use Urban Centers nearing completion (may be available at meeting)
- Search for additional resources to enhance the project continues...

2) Urban Reserves

- First cut at "sifting" data complete
- 14-month timeline for designation of urban reserves underway (enclosed)
- Need to begin discussion with counties regarding development of management agreements

3) Urban Infill and Redevelopment

- Methodology developed
- Literature search underway
- Initial RLIS work targeted for late June/early July

4) UGB Maintenance

- Forest Park UGB land trade still pending
- PCC Rock Creek amendment to Council in late June
- UGB periodic review to Council in July
- Discussions with Forest Grove regarding industrial land supply
- Monitoring proposed North Plains UGB amendment (outside of Metro's jurisdiction)

TELEPHONE SURVEY FOR THE REGION 2040 PROJECT

A QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH REPORT

APRIL, 1992

PREPARED FOR

METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

DSI

Decision Sciences, Inc.

MARKET, PUBLIC OPINION, AND COMMUNICATIONS RESEARCH

SUMMARY

During the week of April 6, 1992, Decision Sciences, Inc. administered a random sample telephone survey of 405 tri-county residents in order to assess values, beliefs, and opinions related to the future of the Portland metropolitan area. The questionnaire consisted of 28 questions and made extensive use of open-ended questions to provide for in-depth qualitative information. Quality control measures that were taken to assure a valid study included random digit dialing, questionnaire pretesting, callbacks, and formal content-analysis of responses to open-ended questions.

When asked what the respondent liked most about where they lived, important were convenience (mostly in terms of transportation to and from one's neighborhood), closeness to downtown, not being crowded, a small town feel, the people, quiet, good neighbors, natural beauty, and low or no crime.

When asked what they disliked about their neighborhood, traffic congestion, crime, the people, and that nothing was disliked, stand out.

Respondents were asked to identify communities or neighborhoods in which they would find appealing to live, and responses are too diverse to easily classify. However, when asked what about their choice made it appealing, mentioned most often were a country or rural feel and nice, well maintained houses and yards.

Related to appealing places in which to work, again locations are difficult to classify, but most mentioned reasons include accessibility and convenience, being close to home, and easy transportation.

Related to appealing places in which to shop, two-thirds mentioned malls or downtown locations. Reasons include having a wide selection, variety or diversity, everything compact or close by, shopping near home, and to some extent, easy transportation.

Six out of ten respondents saw the quality of life in the next 20 years in the metropolitan area as getting worse, 20% saw it as getting better, 17% saw it as staying about the same, and 3% were unsure. Reasons for a deteriorating quality of life include a perception of things growing too fast, an increase in crime and a decrease in public safety, and an increase in traffic congestion. Reasons for it getting better include an increased emphasis on and awareness related to the environment, a growing economy, and a belief that things would get better only if land use planning were used.

Respondents who live in an area changing from rural to suburban were more likely to rate their future quality of life as getting better, while rural residents were more likely to rate it as getting worse. Frequent users of mass transit were more likely to choose better, while non-users were more likely to choose worse.

A series of six questions were presented in a tradeoff format, using a 7-point rating scale where 1-3 indicated strength of favor for one tradeoff, 4 meaning both tradeoffs were equally attractive (or unattractive), and 5-7 indicating strength of favor for the other tradeoff. Following are the results for the questions that revealed clear preferences.

Respondents preferred growth in developed areas over growth in undeveloped areas.

Respondents strongly favored investment in mass transit over investment in roads for cars. For all six tradeoff questions, this one had the most pronounced results. Of all respondents,

mass transit users were more likely to choose investment in mass transit, as were females and households with no children.

For the question about trading off living and working in the same area versus living separately from work, results are not clear. But it appears that there was a tendency toward polarization, where either end of the scale (1 or 7) was chosen most. Since 2 was chosen more often than 6, there is the tendency for living and working in the same area to be slightly favored.

Another question presented the tradeoff of a public policy to encourage affordable housing through the use of smaller homes, smaller land parcels, multiple unit housing, and other cost reducing design options, versus the belief that the market will take care of itself in response to consumer demand. Results indicate some preference for a policy to encourage affordability though it was not strongly preferred.

Tradeoff questions about the physical nature of future development and mixed use (residential and commercial) do not show any clear preferences.

In sum, for the six questions, we find considerable support for growth in developed areas only, strong support for mass transit, a little support for living and working in the same areas, some support for a public policy for affordable housing, and no clear preference for either suburban-like growth versus downtown-like growth or for mixed use (residential and commercial) centers versus residential and commercial separation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction and Methodology.....	1
Values and Beliefs Related to Places to Live.....	2
Values and Beliefs Related to Places to Work.....	5
Values and Beliefs Related to Places to Shop	5
Values and Beliefs Related to Future Growth.....	5
Demographics.....	11
Tables	13
Appendices	42

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

1	Likes About Neighborhood.....	14
2	Like Most About Neighborhood	16
3	Dislikes About Neighborhood.....	18
4	Dislike Most About Neighborhood	20
5	Appeal as Places to Live	22
6	Appeal as Places to Work.....	23
7	Appeal as Places to Shop	24
8	Future: Better, Same, or Worse	25
9	Quality of Life Getting Better	26
10	Quality of Life Getting Worse	27
11	Growth in Developed Areas vs. Undeveloped Areas.....	28
12	Investment in Roads vs. Investment in Mass Transit.....	29
13	Suburban-Like Growth vs. Downtown-Like Growth	30
14	Live and Work: Same Area vs. Separation	31
15	Residential and Commercial Areas: Mixed or Separation	32
16	Public Policy for Housing Affordability: Yes or No.....	33
17	Length of Residence.....	34
18	County of Residence	35
19	Residential Setting.....	36
20	Major Activity	37
21	Mass Transit Usage	38
22	Children in Household	39
23	Age	40
24	Gender	41

LIST OF APPENDIXES

APPENDIX

A	Verbatim Comments: Likes About Neighborhood	43
B	Verbatim Comments: Like Most About Neighborhood.....	47
C	Verbatim Comments: Dislikes About Neighborhood	50
D	Verbatim Comments: Dislike Most About Neighborhood	54
E	Verbatim Comments: Appeal as Places to Live.....	57
F	Verbatim Comments: Appeal as Places to Work	61
G	Verbatim Comments: Appeal as Places to Shop	65
H	Verbatim Comments: Quality of Life Getting Better.....	70
I	Verbatim Comments: Quality of Life Getting Worse.....	71
J	Metro 2040 Survey.....	74

INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

During the week of April 6, 1992, Decision Sciences, Inc. (DSI) administered a public opinion survey to 405 residents in the tri-county area to assess values, beliefs, and opinions related to the future of the Portland metropolitan area. The sample for the study was provided to DSI by Survey Sampling, Inc. and consisted of randomly selected, listed and unlisted telephone numbers. The number of respondents surveyed in each county is proportional to the population distribution according to 1991 county population figures provided by Portland State University, Center for Population Research and Census. The survey instrument, developed in conjunction with METRO, consisted of 28 questions and 58 variables. See Appendix J.

Statement of Limitations. Any sampling of attitudes is subject to a margin-of-error, which represents the difference between a sample of a population and the total population. For a sample size of 405, if the respondents answered a particular question in the proportion of 90% one way and 10% the other way, the margin of error would be $\pm 2.92\%$. If they answered 50% each way, the error margin would be $\pm 4.87\%$ (the worst case plus or minus figure). These plus-minus figures represent the differences between the sample and the total population at the 95% confidence interval.

DSI employed quality control measures in the implementation of the study including questionnaire pretesting, callbacks, and verification. Statistics were computed using SPSSPC+.

Quantitative results were analyzed by general frequencies. Beyond general frequencies, only those interactions which were statistically significant and relevant for planning and policy-making purposes are discussed. When these interactions were not statistically and practically significant, analysis remains at the general frequencies level.

Note on Coding of Open Ended Responses. Many open-ended questions were included in the survey. Responses were carefully analyzed for content and assigned response categories. This was an exhaustive effort, but the analysis revealed particularly valuable information regarding residents' values and beliefs and served to validate findings from closed-ended questions. Tables have been prepared which contain both the numbers and percents for each response category as well as numbers and percents for broader categories.

VALUES AND BELIEFS RELATED TO PLACES TO LIVE

Respondents were asked what they like most about the neighborhood or area in which they live (see Appendix A for a listing of verbatim responses and Table 1 for the results of the content analysis). Respondents could mention up to four likes. Percents below are percents of mentions.

- Mentioned most often were responses in the Land Use category (19.7%), in particular having everything convenient, accessible, or being near downtown (11.6%).
- Second most mentioned was the Demographics category (15.3%), with not too crowded/not too big (4.3%), the people (2.8%), and small town feel (2.2%) being mentioned the most.
- Environmental Quality (12.8%) ranked third, with the standout in this category being quiet (10.5%).
- A Sense of Community/Quality of Life ranked fourth (11.5%), with neighborliness/friendly town (5.8%) and good neighbors (3.2%) standing out.
- Natural Beauty (8.0%) came in next, accentuated by 4.3% of comments mentioning scenic beauty/the greenery/pretty town.
- Finally, Public Safety recorded 6.2% of mentions, with no or low crime (3.8%) being mentioned the most in that category.

Considering these results together, residents like a neighborhood one can travel to and from with relative ease, has a small town not crowded feel, is quiet, has friendly neighbors, is green and natural looking, and has no crime or a low level of crime.

Respondents were asked which one thing they like most about their neighborhood (see Appendix B for a listing of verbatim responses and Table 2 for the results of the content analysis). Everything being convenient, accessible, being near downtown increased to 14.6%. Quiet increased to 13.9% and neighborliness, friendly town increased to 7.2% of mentions.

Respondents were asked what they disliked about living in their part of the metropolitan area (see Appendix C for a listing of verbatim responses and Table 3 for the results of the content analysis).

- Mentioned considerably more often than other factors were Transportation issues (22.6%), in particular, too much traffic/congestion, or lack of parking (17.6%).
- Public Safety (12.0%) ranked second, with mentions of crime (5.1%) predominating.
- Third was a specific mention of Nothing being disliked (9.9%), with Demography coming in next (8.1% mentions), including 6.5% mentioning too many people.
- Land Use also ranked fourth, tied with Demography, but two items (urban sprawl at 3.1% and poor planning at 2.7%) scored more mentions than did most other individual response categories.

As with likes, respondents were asked to choose their single most disliked thing about their neighborhood (see Appendix D for a listing of verbatim

responses and Table 4 for the results of the content analysis). The same five broad categories from the above question were ranked in the same order for this question. However, Transportation issues increased to 24.4% (with too much traffic increasing to 19.3%), Public Safety decreased to 9.9%, and most of the other categories decreased a few tenths of a percent.

Considering these two questions together, it appears that congestion and crime were key dislikes. Beyond concern over transportation and public safety issues, respondents did not appear to have any strong dislikes. On the whole, respondents had more likes than dislikes (903 mentions of likes to 520 mentions of dislikes). This finding is supported by the high percent of respondents who specifically stated they disliked nothing about the area in which they lived.

Environmental and natural beauty issues were mostly raised on the like side of the question. And, except for noise, this may indicate that area residents do not see pollution in their neighborhoods as a serious problem. The concern over noise pollution supports the high rating of quiet identified under likes.

Respondents were asked to name communities or neighborhoods in the metropolitan area they would find appealing as places to live and then to tell what about their choice(s) made them appealing (see Appendix E). Table 5 summarizes the qualities people considered appealing about their choice(s) of places to live. Four categories stood above the others. Mentioned most often was a country or rural feeling (11.3% of mentions), followed by large lots, room between houses, not crowded (9.8%), nice or well maintained houses or yards (9.0%), and friendly people and neighbors (7.7%).

Emphasis on country feeling, nice and maintained houses and yards, and the people are consistent with reasons noted above for liking one's neighborhood: quiet, greenery, and the people.

VALUES AND BELIEFS RELATED TO PLACES TO WORK

As with places in which to live, respondents were asked to identify places they would find appealing as places to work and to tell what makes them appealing (see Appendix F). Mentioned most often was accessibility and convenience (12.6%), followed by being close to home (10.4%), and a general mention of easy transportation and parking (8.1%). See Table 6

VALUES AND BELIEFS RELATED TO PLACES TO SHOP

Respondents were asked to identify communities and neighborhoods which they would find appealing as places to shop. As with living and working, respondents were asked what about these areas made them appealing places to shop (see Appendix G). Table 7 shows the results of the content analysis. Mentioned most often was location provided for a wide selection, variety, and diversity (23.6%), followed by shopping opportunities being compact or close by (16.8%), shopping being close to home (11.6%), and availability of goods (7.3%).

Three categories pertained specifically to transportation issues (easy transportation at 6.2%, no traffic or parking problems at 4.9%, and easy mass transit at 1.5%). Collectively then, 12.6% of the responses fell into transportation categories, making this point a factor in choosing places to shop. In fact, the second most mentioned category, everything being closeby, can be considered a transportation-related category, as can near home, and near work, which would inflate the transportation percent mentioned to 42.4%. The real message may be the importance to people of convenience in terms of time savings.

VALUES AND BELIEFS RELATED TO FUTURE GROWTH

All respondents were asked if in the next 20 years they saw the quality of life in the metropolitan area as getting better, staying about the same, or getting worse (see Table 8). About 6 out of 10 respondents (59.5%) chose worse, 20.0% chose better, 16.5% chose the same, 3.5% were unsure, and .5% refused to

respond. Clearly, residents see a deterioration in the quality of life over the next 20 years.

This question raised some significant demographic differences. Respondents were asked about the setting in which they lived and were given the options of rural, rural changing to suburban, suburban, or urban. Seven out of 10 rural respondents (70%) said the quality of life would get worse, compared to 56% to 59% for the other residential settings. Also, there were 26% of rural to suburban respondents who chose better, compared to 19% to 20% for the other residential settings.

Quality of life ratings were also related to mass transit use, where respondents were asked how many Tri-Met or MAX trips they had made in the last month. Choices were frequent user (13 trips or more), infrequent user (2-12 trips), and non-user. One third of frequent users thought the quality of life would get better, compared to 10% to 18% for the other use options. There were 64% of non-users who chose worse, compared to 56% of infrequent users and 40% of frequent users. The more often respondents use mass transit, the less likely they are to not rate their future quality of life as getting worse.

The 81 respondents choosing "better" to the question about future quality of life were asked why (see Appendix H for a listing of verbatim responses and Table 9 for the results of the content analysis). Mentioned most often was that the people will be getting better, more aware, and will put more effort into the environment (24.1%), followed by equal mentions of expectations of a growing economy and that the future will be better only if land use planning is used (both 15.5%).

The 241 respondents choosing worse were asked why (see Appendix I for a listing of verbatim responses and Table 10 for the results of the content analysis). Mentioned most often was that the area will grow too fast (34.5%), followed by significant expectations of an increase in crime and gangs and a corresponding decrease in public safety (18.1%), and traffic congestion and transportation problems (12.6%). A deteriorating environment or quality of life was ranked next at 8.4% mentions.

Speed of growth can be considered associated with the previous findings of liking a country or small town feel to one's neighborhood. In addition, not only were some respondents fearful of their safety today, but this issue may have been perceived as increasing in importance over the next two decades. Traffic congestion was seen as a problem today, and it too is expected to continue into the future.

A similar question was asked in a study DSI recently conducted for Envision Gresham. The question specified the Gresham area and did not offer a future time frame, but 48% chose better, 48% also chose worse, and the same was not an option. Similar to the Metro sample, among the Gresham respondents who saw a worse future, growing too fast was mentioned most often, as were traffic problems and, perhaps unique to the East county area today, too many apartments.

Trade-Off Questions. A series of scenarios in a trade-off format was presented to each respondent to rate. These questions were administered as an additional means to measure values and beliefs related to the region's future and specific land use issues. For each question, respondents were presented with two options. If they strongly favored the first option, they would choose 1 on a seven-point scale, if they felt less strongly but still favored the first option, they could choose 2 or 3 on the seven-point scale. If they favored the second option strongly,

they would choose 7 on the scale, but if they favored the second option but not as strongly, they could choose 6 or 5 on the scale. If the respondent felt both options were equal in personal preference or if the respondent did not know or was unsure, they would choose the mid-point, 4, on the scale. Results of these questions validate much of the previously discussed findings.

The first scenario was: new growth and development should occur within existing neighborhoods and business districts (1-3) versus new growth should occur on vacant land, moving out from the fringes of the existing developed area (5-7).

For this scenario, Table 11 displays the frequencies of choice for each point on the scale and also includes statistics for the mean (average), median (middle score), mode (most frequently occurring score), and standard deviation.

The mean (3.15), median (3.00), and mode (1.00) for this question fell on the growth in developed areas side. The mode (1.00) demonstrates the strong feelings of one quarter of all respondents regarding growth in developed areas only. Only 12.1% choose 6 or 7 (moderately or strongly favoring growth in undeveloped areas).

This scenario was significant by county of residence, where respondents from Washington county (2.79) felt more strongly in support of growth in developed areas than did residents of Clackamas (3.52) or Multnomah (3.19) counties.

The next scenario traded off investing in roads for cars (1-3) versus investing in mass transit (5-7) (see Table 12). This scenario accounted for the most lop-sided result, with the mean being 5.14, fully 1.14 points above the mid-point, indicating a strong preference for mass transit. In fact, over one-third (36%) chose the strongest ranking of 7, which was the mode, and only 19% fell

anywhere on the roads for cars side. This finding bolsters many previous findings of easy transportation and no traffic congestion, along with ease and convenience of access, being important to metropolitan areas residents

This scenario was significant by mass transit use. While all sub-group means fell on the invest in mass transit side, mass transit non-users (5.01) and infrequent users (5.20) felt less strongly about this issue than did frequent users (5.88).

Also, households without children (5.31) were more likely to favor investment in mass transit than were households with children (4.82).

In addition, females (5.36) were more in favor of investment in mass transit than were males (4.93).

The next scenario posed the tradeoff of future business and commercial development maintaining a moderate concentration (suburban-like growth) versus future business and commercial development being focused in new, large scale, high-rise developments in a few centers outside of downtown Portland (see Table 13). Results indicated a very even and flat distribution across all numbers on the scale. The mean was right near the mid-point (3.98), and the median was the mid-point (4.00). It appears that there was no agreement on this issue.

There was an interaction with age of respondents. The 'middle' ages (35-44 and 45-54) fell slightly on the downtown-like growth side, while ages under 35 and over 54 fell slightly on the suburban-like growth.

A scenario trading off working near where one lives versus living in an area designated only as residential, then commuting to work was presented (see Table 14). As with the previous scenario, the mean (3.85) and median (4.00) were

near or on the mid-point, but unlike the previous scenario, there were indications of some polarity on the issue. Over one-fifth of all respondents chose 1 or 7, the strongest-feeling points on the scale, and 2 (moderately live and work in same area) was chosen twice as often as was 6 (moderately live and work separately).

It can be suggested that there was some tendency towards preferring to live and work in the same area, but this may have been due partially to the wording of the question, 'to reduce commuting time, perhaps close enough to walk or ride a bicycle to work.' This wording may have been biased towards the transportation issue, rather than the issues of mixed zoning and neighborhood livability. We have found strong feelings related to ease of transportation, accessibility, and convenience, but we have also found that reasons for liking one's work location were related to work being close to home.

There was some interaction with age, where 18-24 year olds (4.79) fell relatively strongly on the live separate from work side, while 35-44 year olds (3.14) fell somewhat on the live and work in the same area side. All other age groups were very close to the mid-point on the scale.

The next scenario asked respondents to choose between residential and commercial centers being mixed together versus residential and commercial areas being separated (see Table 15). We see again some polarization to values of 1 and 7, although less so than with the previous scenario. The mean was 3.90 (slightly on the mixed use side), but the median was 4.00. We do see some support for mixed use centers.

This scenario showed some interactions with age of respondent. Ages 25-34 and 55 and over all fell on the residential and shopping separation side, while

ages 35-44 and to a lesser extent ages 18-24 fell on the mixed use centers side. Ages 45-54 fell very near the mid-point.

The final scenario presented the tradeoff of a public policy being needed to encourage affordable housing through the use of smaller homes, smaller land parcels, multiple unit housing, and other cost reducing design options, versus the belief that the market will take care of itself under demand from consumers, and that public policy is not necessary (see Table 16). Opinion fell somewhat on the side of support for such a policy, with a mean of 3.69 and a median of 3.00. Half of all respondents fell on this side, 11% chose the mid-point, and 36% fell on the no need for policy side.

By gender, females (3.45) were more likely to favor a policy for affordable housing, while males (3.88) fell near the mid-point.

In sum, for the six scenarios, we find strong support for mass transit, considerable support for growth in developed areas only, a little support for living and working in the same areas, some support for a public policy for affordable housing, no clear preference for either mixed use (residential and commercial) centers or residential and commercial center separation, and no clear preference for suburban-like growth versus downtown growth.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Demographics for the sample can be found in Tables 17-24. To highlight, over half of the sample indicated that they had lived in the Portland metropolitan area for over 20 years, half lived in Multnomah County, 45% said they lived in a suburban setting, half indicated that they work full time, 70% said they did not use mass transit and 10% said they were frequent users, one-third said they had children living in the household, age was very evenly distributed across

categories, with perhaps a little under-representation in the 55-64 age group, and gender was evenly split.

TABLES

TABLE 1
LIKES ABOUT NEIGHBORHOOD

Q. Think about the part of the Portland metropolitan area **where you live and that you consider to be your neighborhood**. What do you like most about living there? (RECORD VERBATIM AND PROBE.)

LABEL		NUMBER	PERCENT
LAND USE			
Everything convenient/Accessible/Near downtown		106	11.6%
Shopping centers quantity and/or quality		23	2.5
Open space		18	2.0
Opportunity for quality neighborhood living		12	1.3
Suburbs convenient, not too far away		12	1.3
Good planning/Zoning		9	1.0
SUB-TOTAL		180	19.7%
DEMOGRAPHY			
Not too crowded/Not too big		39	4.3%
The people		26	2.8
"Small town"		20	2.2
Rural		15	1.6
Familiarity/Comfort level		13	1.4
Family/Friends		10	1.1
Big town with small town feeling		6	0.7
Ethnic diversity - positive		5	0.5
Right size		5	0.5
Growing population - positive		2	0.2
SUB-TOTAL		141	15.3%
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY			
Quiet		96	10.5%
Cleanliness/Clean environment/Take care of environment		10	1.1
Clean air		7	0.8
Quality of life		4	0.4
SUB-TOTAL		117	12.8%
SENSE OF COMMUNITY/QUALITY OF LIFE			
Neighborliness/Friendly town/Getting along		53	5.8%
Good neighborhoods		29	3.2
Civic pride/Pride in what they have		11	1.2
People helping people/Concern and care for others		9	1.0
Sense of responsibility		2	0.2
Community involvement in events (Rose Festival)		1	0.1
SUB-TOTAL		105	11.5%
NATURAL BEAUTY			
Scenic beauty/The greenery/Pretty town		39	4.3%
Nature		12	1.3
Views		11	1.2
Landscaping/Yard/Gardens		8	0.9
Hills (not flat)		3	0.3
SUB-TOTAL		73	8.0%
PUBLIC SAFETY			
No/Low crime		35	3.8%
Safety/Public Safety		19	2.1
Police force quantity and/or quality		3	0.3
SUB-TOTAL		57	6.2%

LABEL	NUMBER	PERCENT
TRANSPORTATION		
Mass transit/Light rail	24	2.6%
Traffic minimized/No traffic congestion	22	2.4
Roads well maintained	2	0.2
Sidewalks	1	0.1
SUB-TOTAL	49	5.3 %
PARKS AND RECREATION		
Availability/Name of specific park	20	2.2%
Location close to coast, mountains, E. Oregon	11	1.2
Recreational opportunities	5	0.5
Parks well maintained	3	0.3
The river(s): Willamette and/or Columbia	3	0.3
SUB-TOTAL	42	4.5 %
EDUCATION		
Education/Schools	32	3.5%
College education	2	0.2
SUB-TOTAL	34	3.7 %
HOUSING		
Nice homes	12	1.3%
Affordable housing/Housing cost low	11	1.2
SUB-TOTAL	23	2.5 %
ARTS AND CULTURE		
Churches	5	0.5%
Accessibility of programs	3	0.3
Frequency and availability of programs	2	0.2
Library system	1	0.1
SUB-TOTAL	11	1.1 %
HUMAN SERVICES		
Healthcare	5	0.5%
Care for elderly/Handicapped/Disabled/Disadvantaged	2	0.2
SUB-TOTAL	7	0.7 %
ECONOMY		
Jobs/Job advancement opportunities	3	0.3%
Diversified economy	1	0.1
Good business climate	1	0.1
Growing economy	1	0.1
SUB-TOTAL	6	0.6 %
GOVERNMENT		
Better taxation	2	0.2%
People have a voice/Opportunities for citizen involvement	2	0.2
SUB-TOTAL	4	0.4 %
WEATHER		
Mid/Moderate	3	0.3%
4 Seasons	1	0.1
SUB-TOTAL	4	0.4 %
DOWNTOWN	8	0.9
EVERYTHING	1	0.1
NOTHING	6	0.7
OTHER	35	3.8
NO RESPONSE	14	1.5
TOTAL	917	99.7 %

Note: Percents do not add to 100 due to rounding errors. Sub-totals are sums of numbers or percents within each category.

TABLE 2
LIKE MOST ABOUT NEIGHBORHOOD

Q. (IF MORE THAN ONE LIKE) Of all the things you like, which **one** thing do you like **the most**?

LABEL	NUMBER	PERCENT
LAND USE		
Everything convenient/Accessible/Near downtown	59	14.6%
Open space	11	2.7
Opportunity for quality neighborhood living	4	1.0
Good planning/Zoning	3	0.7
Shopping centers quantity and/or quality	3	0.7
Suburbs convenient, not too far away	3	0.7
SUB-TOTAL	83	20.4%
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY		
Quiet	56	13.9%
Clean air	4	1.0
Cleanliness/Clean environment/Take care of environment	4	1.0
Quality of life	1	0.2
SUB-TOTAL	65	16.1%
DEMOGRAPHY		
Not too crowded/Not too big	14	3.5%
"Small town"	11	2.7
Familiarity/Comfort level	7	1.7
Family/Friends	7	1.7
The people	7	1.7
Rural	6	1.5
Big town with small town feeling	5	1.2
Ethnic diversity – positive	4	1.0
Right size	1	0.2
Growing population – positive	0	0.0
SUB-TOTAL	62	15.2%
SENSE OF COMMUNITY/QUALITY OF LIFE		
Neighborliness/Friendly town/Getting along	29	7.2%
Good neighborhoods	11	2.7
Civic pride/Pride in what they have	3	0.7
People helping people/Concern and care for others	3	0.7
Sense of responsibility	0	0.0
Community involvement in events (Rose Festival)	0	0.0
SUB-TOTAL	46	11.3%
PUBLIC SAFETY		
No/Low crime	21	5.2%
Safety/Public Safety	10	2.5
Police force quantity and/or quality	0	0.0
SUB-TOTAL	31	7.7%
NATURAL BEAUTY		
Scenic beauty/The greenery/Pretty town	12	3.0
Nature	6	1.5
Views	4	1.0
Landscaping/Yard/Gardens	3	0.7
Hills (not flat)	0	0.0
SUB-TOTAL	25	6.2%

LABEL	NUMBER	PERCENT
TRANSPORTATION		
Traffic minimized/No traffic congestion	8	2.0%
Mass transit/Light rail	6	1.5
Roads well maintained	0	0.0
Sidewalks	0	0.0
SUB-TOTAL	14	3.5 %
EDUCATION		
Education/Schools	13	3.2
College education	0	0.0
SUB-TOTAL	13	3.2 %
PARKS AND RECREATION		
Availability/Name of specific park	7	1.7%
Recreational opportunities	2	0.5
Location close to coast, mountains, E. Oregon	1	0.2
Parks well maintained	0	0.0
The river(s): Willamette and/or Columbia	0	0.0
SUB-TOTAL	10	2.4 %
HOUSING		
Affordable housing/Housing cost low	5	1.2%
Nice homes	5	1.2
SUB-TOTAL	10	2.4 %
ECONOMY		
Jobs/Job advancement opportunities	4	1.0%
Good business climate	1	0.2
Growing economy	0	0.0
Diversified economy	0	0.0
SUB-TOTAL	5	1.2 %
WEATHER		
Mid/Moderate	2	0.5%
4 Seasons	1	0.2
SUB-TOTAL	3	0.7 %
ARTS AND CULTURE		
Churches	2	0.5%
Accessibility of programs	0	0.0
Frequency and availability of programs	0	0.0
Library system	0	0.0
SUB-TOTAL	2	0.5 %
HUMAN SERVICES		
Care for elderly/Handicapped/Disabled/Disadvantaged	1	0.2%
Healthcare	0	0.0
SUB-TOTAL	1	0.2 %
GOVERNMENT		
Better taxation	0	0.0
People have a voice/Opportunities for citizen involvement	0	0.0
SUB-TOTAL	0	0.0
DOWNTOWN	1	0.2
EVERYTHING	2	0.5
NOTHING	0	0.0
OTHER	11	2.7
NO RESPONSE	20	5.0
TOTAL	404	99.4 %

Note: Percents do not add to 100 due to rounding errors. Sub-totals are sums of numbers or percents within each category.

TABLE 3
DISLIKES ABOUT NEIGHBORHOOD

Q. What do you dislike about living in your part of the metropolitan area? (RECORD VERBATIM AND PROBE.)

LABEL	NUMBER	PERCENT
TRANSPORTATION		
Too much traffic/Traffic congestion/Lack of parking	103	17.6%
Roads in bad shape, not well maintained	12	2.1
Need better mass transit system	9	1.5
No sidewalks	4	0.7
No bike trails/Walking paths	3	0.5
Speed bumps/Traffic controls	1	0.2
SUB-TOTAL	132	22.6%
PUBLIC SAFETY		
Crime	30	5.1%
Drugs	9	1.5
Don't feel safe	8	1.4
Gangs	8	1.4
Police - negative statement	4	0.7
Violence	4	0.7
Need more police	3	0.5
Cruising	2	0.3
More community working with police	1	0.2
Stiffer penalties for criminals	1	0.2
SUB-TOTAL	70	12.0%
DEMOGRAPHY		
Too many people/Over crowded/Growing too fast	38	6.5%
Is racist	4	0.7
Too many minorities	3	0.5
Too many Californians/People from other states	1	0.2
Too many people from other countries/Foreigners	1	0.2
SUB-TOTAL	47	8.1%
LAND USE		
Urban sprawl - more dense development	18	3.1%
Poor planning	16	2.7
Shopping place not convenient	8	1.4
Not enough space/Lots too small	5	0.9
SUB-TOTAL	47	8.1%
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY		
Noise pollution/Airport Noise	13	2.2
Deteriorating roads, bridges, sewers, etc./Need for money for	11	1.9
No concern for environment/Not ecology-minded	4	0.7
Not enough recycling/Solid waste problems	4	0.7
Polluted air	4	0.7
Polluted streams/Rivers/Water	2	0.3
SUB-TOTAL	38	6.5%

LABEL	NUMBER	PERCENT
SENSE OF COMMUNITY/QUALITY OF LIFE		
No civic pride/No pride in what they have	4	0.7%
Bad neighborhoods	8	1.4
People don't help others/No concern or care for others	7	1.2
Not neighborly/Not a friendly town/People don't get along/Racial unrest	3	0.5
No sense of responsibility	2	0.3
SUB-TOTAL	24	4.1%
GOVERNMENT		
Taxes too high	18	3.1%
Local government not effective	2	0.3
Commissioners and/or Mayor doing poor job (the politicians)	2	0.3
New local government structure needed/Need city manager	2	0.3
SUB-TOTAL	24	4.0%
HOUSING		
Home maintenance, upkeep declining	11	1.9%
Housing too expensive/Prices increasing	7	1.2
SUB-TOTAL	18	3.1%
ARTS AND CULTURE		
Not accessible	6	1.0%
Not enough programs/Not enough variety	5	0.9
SUB-TOTAL	11	1.9%
PARKS AND RECREATION		
Not enough parks	4	0.7%
Not enough activities for youth	3	0.5
Parks not well maintained	1	0.2
SUB-TOTAL	8	1.4%
ENERGY		
Energy/Utility costs too high	6	1.0%
WEATHER		
General negative/Not good	4	0.7%
Too much rain	2	0.3
SUB-TOTAL	6	1.0%
EDUCATION		
Schools not well funded/Need more support	4	0.7%
Poor quality education	1	0.2
SUB-TOTAL	5	0.9%
HUMAN SERVICES		
Homeless problem	4	0.7%
Need more child care	1	0.2
SUB-TOTAL	5	0.9%
ECONOMY		
Cost of living high (e.g., clothing, food)	3	0.5%
DOWNTOWN	3	0.5
NOTHING	58	9.9
OTHER	15	2.6
NO RESPONSE	64	11.0
TOTAL	584	100.1%

Note: Percents do not add to 100 due to rounding errors. Sub-totals are sums of numbers or percents within each category.

TABLE 4
DISLIKE MOST ABOUT NEIGHBORHOOD

Q. (IF MORE THAN ONE DISLIKE) Of all the things you dislike, which **one** thing do you dislike **the most**?

LABEL	NUMBER	PERCENT
TRANSPORTATION		
Too much traffic/Traffic congestion/Lack of parking	77	19.3%
Need better mass transit system	8	2.0
Roads in bad shape, not well maintained	7	1.8
No bike trails/Walking paths	2	0.5
No sidewalks	2	0.5
Speed bumps/Traffic controls	1	0.3
SUB-TOTAL	97	24.4%
PUBLIC SAFETY		
Crime	21	5.3%
Gangs	5	1.3
Drugs	3	0.8
Need more police	3	0.8
Cruising	2	0.5
Don't feel safe	1	0.3
More community working with police	1	0.3
Police - negative statement	1	0.3
Violence	1	0.3
Stiffer penalties for criminals	0	0.0
SUB-TOTAL	38	9.9%
LAND USE		
Poor planning	8	2.0%
Urban sprawl - more dense development	8	2.0
Shopping place not convenient	7	1.8
Not enough space/Lots too small	5	1.3
SUB-TOTAL	28	7.1%
DEMOGRAPHY		
Too many people/Over crowded/Growing too fast	18	4.5%
Is racist	3	0.8
Too many minorities	2	0.5
Too many people from other countries/Foreigners	1	0.3
Too many Californians/People from other states	0	0.0
SUB-TOTAL	24	6.1%
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY		
Noise pollution/Airport Noise	10	2.5%
Deteriorating roads, bridges, sewers, etc./Need for money for	7	1.8
Polluted air	2	0.5
No concern for environment/Not ecology-minded	1	0.3
Not enough recycling/Solid waste problems	0	0.0
Polluted streams/Rivers/Water	0	0.0
SUB-TOTAL	20	5.1%

LABEL	NUMBER	PERCENT
GOVERNMENT		
Taxes too high	13	3.3%
New local government structure needed/Need city manager	1	0.3
Local government not effective	0	0.0
Commissioners and/or Mayor doing poor job (the politicians)	0	0.0
SUB-TOTAL	14	3.6%
SENSE OF COMMUNITY/QUALITY OF LIFE		
Bad neighborhoods	4	1.0
People don't help others/No concern or care for others	4	1.0
Not neighborly/Not a friendly town/People don't get along/Racial unrest	3	0.8
No civic pride/No pride in what they have	0	0.0
No sense of responsibility	0	0.0
SUB-TOTAL	11	2.8%
HOUSING		
Home maintenance, upkeep declining	7	1.8%
Housing too expensive/Prices increasing	2	0.5
SUB-TOTAL	9	2.3%
WEATHER		
General negative/Not good	4	1.1%
Too much rain	1	0.3
SUB-TOTAL	5	1.4%
ENERGY		
Energy/Utility costs too high	5	1.3%
ARTS AND CULTURE		
Not enough programs/Not enough variety	3	0.8%
Not accessible	1	0.3
SUB-TOTAL	4	1.1%
HUMAN SERVICES		
Homeless problem	4	1.0%
Need more child care	0	0.0
SUB-TOTAL	4	1.0%
PARKS AND RECREATION		
Not enough activities for youth	2	0.5%
Not enough parks	1	0.3
Parks not well maintained	0	0.0
SUB-TOTAL	3	0.8%
EDUCATION		
Poor quality education	1	0.3%
Schools not well funded/Need more support	1	0.3
SUB-TOTAL	2	0.6%
ECONOMY		
Cost of living high (e.g., clothing, food)	2	0.5%
DOWNTOWN	1	0.3
NOTHING	58	14.6
OTHER	6	1.5
NO RESPONSE	67	16.8
TOTAL	398	101.2%

Note: Percents do not add to 100 due to rounding errors. Sub-totals are sums of numbers or percents within each category.

TABLE 5
APPEAL AS PLACES TO LIVE

Q. What things about these areas make them appealing to you as places to live? (RECORD VERBATIM BELOW AND PROBE.)

LABEL	NUMBER	PERCENT
Country feeling/Rural feeling	78	11.3%
Large lots/Houses apart from each other/More room/Not crowded	68	9.8
Nice houses/Nice yards/Well maintained houses/Well maintained yards	62	9.0
People/Nice, friendly people/Friendly neighbors	53	7.7
Close to shopping	49	7.1
Quiet/Peaceful	44	6.4
Good view	40	5.8
Low crime/No crime/Feels safe	33	4.8
Close to work	31	4.5
Small town atmosphere	30	4.3
Familiarity/I've always lived there	27	3.9
Clean/No litter/Smells good/Good air	18	2.6
Combination rural and urban atmosphere	18	2.6
Not low income/Better class of people/Expensive homes (the 'snob response')	18	2.6
Better schools	13	1.9
Downtown feeling/Urban feeling	11	1.6
Better weather	6	0.9
Close to entertainment/Culture/Church	6	0.9
Traffic not heavy	6	0.9
Close to mass transit	4	0.6
Pretty/Attractive streets	4	0.6
Suburban	4	0.6
Affordability/Less expensive	3	0.4
Favorable zoning	3	0.4
Lower taxes/Lower tax rates	3	0.4
Wide streets	3	0.4
More responsive government/Better politicians	1	0.1
Other	16	2.3
Don't know/Not sure	3	0.4
No response	37	5.3
TOTAL	692	100.1%

TABLE 6
APPEAL AS PLACES TO WORK

Q. What things about these areas make them appealing to you as places to work? (RECORD VERBATIM BELOW AND PROBE.)

LABEL	NUMBER	PERCENT
Accessible/Convenient	76	12.6%
Close to home	63	10.4
Easy transportation - general mention/Parking	49	8.1
Country feeling/rural feeling/Quiet/Slow paced	39	6.4
No traffic problem - specific mention	39	6.4
More or better job opportunities	38	6.3
Close to culture (entertainment, restaurants, etc.)	33	5.5
Downtown feeling/Urban feeling	30	5.0
Easy mass transit (bus, MAX, etc.)	28	4.6
Close to shopping	27	4.5
Not crowded/Not confined	20	3.3
The people/Nice/Friendly	17	2.8
Variety	16	2.6
Clean/No litter	11	1.8
Low crime/No crime/Feel safe	11	1.8
Combination rural and urban atmosphere	10	1.7
Not downtown Portland - specific mention	10	1.7
Familiarity	6	1.0
User friendly/Good technical support	5	0.8
Facilities available 24hrs/day	1	0.2
Other	9	1.5
Don't know/Not sure	10	1.7
No response	57	9.4
TOTAL	605	100.1%

TABLE 7
APPEAL AS PLACES TO SHOP

Q. What things about these areas make them appealing to you as places to shop? (RECORD VERBATIM BELOW AND PROBE.)

LABEL	NUMBER	PERCENT
Variety/Diversity/Wide selection	153	23.6%
Everything compact or close by	109	16.8
Near home	75	11.6
Availability of goods	47	7.3
Easy transportation - general mention	40	6.2
No traffic or parking problems	32	4.9
Good price	29	4.5
Good or friendly service	26	4.0
Feels open	17	2.6
Easy mass transit (bus, MAX, etc.)	10	1.5
New/Remodeled	10	1.5
Restaurants - specific mention	10	1.5
Familiarity	9	1.4
Near work	9	1.4
Pretty/Attractive	9	1.4
Help or support local businesses	8	1.2
Like small merchants/Shops	8	1.2
Low crime/No crime/Feel safe	7	1.1
Downtown/Urban	6	0.9
The people	5	0.8
Protected from weather	3	0.5
Childcare/Daycare	1	0.2
Less hilly	0	0.0
Other	1	0.2
Don't know/Not sure	3	0.5
No response	20	3.1
TOTAL	647	99.9%

Note: Percents do not add to 100 due to rounding errors.

TABLE 8
FUTURE: BETTER, SAME, OR WORSE

Q. In the next 20 years, do you see quality of life in the metropolitan area as getting better, staying about the same, or getting worse?

LABEL	NUMBER	PERCENT
BETTER	81	20.0%
SAME	67	16.5
WORSE	241	59.5
UNSURE	14	3.5
NO RESPONSE	2	0.5
TOTAL	405	100.00

TABLE 9
QUALITY OF LIFE GETTING BETTER

Q. (IF QUALITY OF LIFE IS GETTING BETTER.) Why?

LABEL	NUMBER	PERCENT
People getting better/More aware/More effort (environment)	28	24.1%
If land use planning/Planning	18	15.5
Economy will grow	18	15.5
Control crime	7	6.0
Just optimistic type person	6	5.2
More variety in entertainment/Culture/Food	6	5.2
Racial harmony/Neighborliness/People getting along	6	5.2
New generation will make things better/New leadership	3	2.6
Will be more help for homeless and/or others in need	2	1.7
People basically good	1	0.9
Will not grow too fast	1	0.9
Other	17	14.7
No response	3	2.6
TOTAL	116	100.10

Note: Percents do not add to 100 due to rounding errors.

TABLE 10
QUALITY OF LIFE GETTING WORSE

Q. (IF QUALITY OF LIFE IS GETTING WORSE.) Why?

LABEL	NUMBER	PERCENT
Growing too fast	156	34.5%
Crime/Gangs on rise/Public safety	82	18.1
Traffic congestion, slowdown/Transportation problems	57	12.6
Deteriorating environment, quality of life	38	8.4
Economy downturn	19	4.2
Government/Politics	16	3.5
Worsening housing costs/Availability	14	3.1
Moral decline/Breakdown of society	10	2.2
Taxes too high	10	2.2
Quality of education	8	1.8
Deteriorating roads, sewers, bridges, etc.	7	1.5
Growing racial tension	3	0.7
Timber industry endangered	2	0.4
Other	27	6.0
Don't know	1	0.2
No response	2	0.4
TOTAL	452	99.8

Note: Percents do not add to 100 due to rounding errors.

TABLE 11
GROWTH IN DEVELOPED AREAS VS. UNDEVELOPED AREAS

- Q. Some people believe that to provide public services and transit efficiently, maintain environmental quality, and protect farm and forest land, new growth and development should occur within existing neighborhoods and business districts. Others believe that focusing growth in existing areas will be expensive, even disruptive, and that new growth should occur on vacant land, moving out from the fringes of the existing developed area. Using the 7 point scale, where 1 is growth primarily in developed areas and 7 is growth in undeveloped areas, which number comes closest to the way you personally feel? You would use numbers 3, 2, or 1 depending on how strongly you feel that growth should primarily be in developed areas. Use 5, 6, or 7 if you lean towards feeling that growth should occur in undeveloped areas. If you feel both are equally important, try to make yourself fall on one side of the fence or the other, but if you still think both are of equal importance, select 4. If you are unsure (please try not to be!), just say so. Again, using the 7 point scale, where 1 is growth primarily in developed areas and 7 is growth in undeveloped areas, which number comes closest to the way you personally feel?

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
GROWTH IN DEVELOPED AREAS	1	100	24.7	24.7	24.7
	2	71	17.5	17.5	42.2
	3	63	15.6	15.6	57.8
BOTH EQUAL	4	55	13.6	13.6	71.4
	5	51	12.6	12.6	84.0
	6	25	6.2	6.2	90.1
GROWTH IN UNDEVELOPED AREAS	7	24	5.9	5.9	96.0
NOT SURE	8	8	2.0	2.0	98.0
NO RESPONSE	9	8	2.0	2.0	100.0
TOTAL		405	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 405 Missing cases 0

STATISTICS:

Mean 3.147 Median 3.000 Mode 1.000
Std dev 1.852

NOTE: Statistics exclude respondents who were unsure or did not respond.

TABLE 12
INVESTMENT IN ROADS VS. INVESTMENT IN MASS TRANSIT

- Q. Traffic congestion has increased as the Portland metropolitan area has grown. Some people believe that public funds should be used to widen existing roads and build new ones to preserve the convenience and freedom of driving a car. Others believe future transportation problems are best resolved by greater investment in mass transit. Again, using the same 7 point scale where 1 is investment in roads for cars and 7 is investment in mass transit, which number comes closest to the way you personally feel? Again, you can choose any number from 1 to 7.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
ROADS FOR CARS	1	36	8.9	8.9	8.9
	2	19	4.7	4.7	13.6
	3	21	5.2	5.2	18.8
BOTH EQUAL	4	50	12.3	12.4	31.2
	5	67	16.5	16.6	47.8
	6	60	14.8	14.9	62.6
MASS TRANSIT	7	144	35.6	35.6	98.3
NOT SURE	8	2	0.5	0.5	98.8
NO RESPONSE	9	5	1.2	1.2	100.0
	.	1	0.2	Missing	
TOTAL		405	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 404 Missing cases 1

STATISTICS:

Mean 5.139 Median 6.000 Mode 7.000
Std dev 1.952

NOTE: Statistics exclude respondents who were unsure or did not respond.

TABLE 13
SUBURBAN-LIKE GROWTH VS. DOWNTOWN-LIKE GROWTH

- Q. Though Portland will almost certainly remain the central city of the region, as growth occurs other urban centers will get larger. Some people feel that market forces will cause such growth to retain its suburban character, with mostly moderate concentrations of low-rise shopping centers and offices. Other people believe that public policy and investment should encourage the growth of new, large scale, high-rise office and commercial development in a few centers outside downtown Portland. Again, using the same 7 point scale where 1 is suburban-like growth and 7 is downtown-like growth, which number comes closest to the way you personally feel? You can choose any number from 1 to 7.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
SUBURBAN-LIKE GROWTH	1	69	17.0	17.1	17.1
	2	48	11.9	11.9	29.0
	3	51	12.6	12.6	41.6
BOTH EQUAL	4	56	13.8	13.9	55.4
	5	59	14.6	14.6	70.0
	6	42	10.4	10.4	80.4
DOWNTOWN-LIKE GROWTH	7	68	16.8	16.8	97.3
NOT SURE	8	8	2.0	2.0	99.3
NO RESPONSE	9	3	0.7	0.7	100.0
	.	1	0.2	Missing	
TOTAL		405	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 404 Missing cases 1

STATISTICS:

Mean 3.982 Median 4.000 Mode 1.000
Std dev 2.084

NOTE: Statistics exclude respondents who were unsure or did not respond.

TABLE 14
LIVE AND WORK: SAME AREAS VS. SEPARATION

- Q. Some people want to live close to where they work to reduce commuting time, perhaps close enough to walk or ride a bicycle to work. Other people prefer to live in an area with residences only for reasons of space, privacy, or design, and to rely on the car and mass transit to get to work. Using the 7 point scale where 1 is live and work in the same area and 7 is live separate from work area, which number comes closest to the way you personally feel? You can choose any number from 1 to 7.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
LIVE AND WORK IN SAME AREA	1	83	20.5	20.5	20.5
	2	70	17.3	17.3	37.9
	3	44	10.9	10.9	48.8
BOTH EQUAL	4	43	10.6	10.6	59.4
	5	39	9.6	9.7	69.1
	6	33	8.1	8.2	77.2
LIVE SEPARATE FROM WORK	7	89	22.0	22.0	99.3
NOT SURE	8	1	0.2	0.2	99.5
NO RESPONSE	9	2	0.5	0.5	100.0
	.	1	0.2	Missing	
TOTAL		405	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 404 Missing cases 1

STATISTICS:

Mean 3.848 Median 4.000 Mode 7.000
Std dev 2.255

NOTE: Statistics exclude respondents who were unsure or did not respond.

TABLE 15
RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL AREAS: MIXED OR SEPARATION

- Q. Some people feel that in the future, areas should be planned so that residential and commercial areas are mixed together and designed so that it is easy to walk or bicycle to shopping for everyday needs like groceries and the cleaners. Others feel that there should be a separation between residential and shopping areas to avoid any negative impacts on housing like noise and traffic and that people will always use their cars for shopping trips. Again, using a 7 point scale, where 1 is mixed use centers and 7 is residential-shopping separation, which number comes closest to the way you personally feel. You can choose any number from 1 to 7.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
MIXED USE CENTERS ONLY	1	78	19.3	19.4	19.4
	2	49	12.1	12.2	31.6
	3	62	15.3	15.4	47.0
BOTH EQUAL	4	39	9.6	9.7	56.7
	5	56	13.8	13.9	70.6
	6	36	8.9	9.0	79.6
RESIDENTIAL/SHOPPING SEPARATION	7	75	18.5	18.7	98.3
NOT SURE	8	4	1.0	1.0	99.3
NO RESPONSE	9	3	0.7	0.7	100.0
	.	3	0.7	Missing	
TOTAL		405	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 402 Missing cases 3

STATISTICS:

Mean 3.896 Median 4.000 Mode 1.000
Std dev 2.156

NOTE: Statistics exclude respondents who were unsure or did not respond.

TABLE 16

PUBLIC POLICY FOR HOUSING AFFORDABILITY: YES OR NO

- Q. Finally, some people believe that to ensure affordability of future housing, we should initiate public policies that encourage some smaller homes, smaller land parcels, more attached housing units, and other designs that reduce costs. Others believe such policies are not only unnecessary but perhaps wasteful, and that the market place will produce more affordable housing in response to demand from consumers. Again, using the same 7 point scale where 1 is public policy for housing affordability and 7 is no need for public policy for housing affordability, which number comes closest to the way you personally feel? You can choose any number from 1 to 7.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
AFFORDABLE HOUSING POLICY	1	91	22.5	22.6	22.6
	2	52	12.8	12.9	35.5
	3	59	14.6	14.6	50.1
BOTH EQUAL	4	44	10.9	10.9	61.0
	5	37	9.1	9.2	70.2
	6	45	11.1	11.2	81.4
NO POLICY NEEDED	7	62	15.3	15.4	96.8
NOT SURE	8	8	2.0	2.0	98.8
NO RESPONSE	9	5	1.2	1.2	100.0
	.	2	0.5	Missing	
TOTAL		405	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 403 Missing cases 2

STATISTICS:

Mean 3.685 Median 3.000 Mode 1.000
Std dev 2.164

NOTE: Statistics exclude respondents who were unsure or did not respond.

TABLE 17
LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

Q. How long have you lived in the Portland Metropolitan Area?

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
LESS THAN 1 YEAR	1	10	2.5	2.5	2.5
1-2 YEARS	2	22	5.4	5.5	8.0
3-5 YEARS	3	37	9.1	9.2	17.2
6-10 YEARS	4	46	11.4	11.4	28.6
11-20 YEARS	5	81	20.0	20.1	48.8
20+ YEARS	6	205	50.6	51.0	99.8
REFUSED	7	1	0.2	0.2	100.0
	.	3	0.7	Missing	
TOTAL		405	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 402 Missing cases 3

TABLE 18
COUNTY OF RESIDENCE

Q. What is the county in which you reside?

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
MULTNOMAH	1	212	52.3	52.6	52.6
CLACKAMAS	2	78	19.3	19.4	72.0
WASHINGTON	3	113	27.9	28.0	100.0
	.	2	0.5	Missing	
TOTAL		405	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 403 Missing cases 2

TABLE 19
RESIDENTIAL SETTING

Q. How would you describe the setting in which you reside: rural, rural changing to suburban, suburban, or rural?

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
RURAL	1	54	13.3	13.4	13.4
RURAL TO SUBURBAN	2	46	11.4	11.4	24.8
SUBURBAN	3	183	45.2	45.4	70.2
URBAN	4	115	28.4	28.5	98.8
REFUSED	5	5	1.2	1.2	100.0
	.	2	0.5	Missing	
Total		405	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 403 Missing cases 2

TABLE 20
MAJOR ACTIVITY

Q. What was your major activity during the week before last?

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
FULL-TIME	1	202	49.9	50.2	50.2
PART-TIME	2	34	8.4	8.5	58.7
HAVE JOB, NOT WORKING	3	29	7.2	7.2	65.9
UNEMPLOYED	4	10	2.5	2.5	68.4
SCHOOL	5	19	4.7	4.7	73.1
RETIRED	6	65	16.0	16.2	89.3
KEEP HOUSE	7	25	6.2	6.2	95.5
OTHER	8	17	4.2	4.2	99.8
REFUSED	9	1	0.2	0.2	100.0
	.	3	0.7	Missing	
TOTAL		405	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 402 Missing cases 3

TABLE 21
MASS TRANSIT USAGE

Q. How many trips have you taken on a Tri-Met bus or MAX in the last month? Count each direction as one trip.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
FREQUENT	1	40	9.9	10.0	10.0
INFREQUENT	2	81	20.0	20.1	30.1
NON-USER	3	280	69.1	69.7	99.8
REFUSED	4	1	0.2	0.2	100.0
	.	3	0.7	Missing	
TOTAL		405	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 402 Missing cases 3

TABLE 22
CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD

Q. Do any children under age 18 live in your household?

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
YES	1	135	33.3	33.6	33.6
NO	2	264	65.2	65.7	99.3
REFUSED	3	3	0.7	0.7	100.0
	.	3	0.7	Missing	
TOTAL		405	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 402 Missing cases 3

TABLE 23

AGE

Q. Is your age between:

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
18-24	1	43	10.6	10.7	10.7
25-34	2	84	20.7	20.8	31.5
35-44	3	98	24.2	24.3	55.8
45-54	4	65	16.0	16.1	72.0
55-64	5	36	8.9	8.9	80.9
65+	6	75	18.5	18.6	99.5
REFUSED	7	2	0.5	0.5	100.0
	.	2	0.5	Missing	
TOTAL		405	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 403 Missing cases 2

TABLE 24
GENDER

Q. Gender (DON'T ASK/RECORD)

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
MALE	1	202	49.9	50.1	50.1
FEMALE	2	201	49.6	49.9	100.0
	.	2	0.5	Missing	
TOTAL		405	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 403 Missing cases 2

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

VERBATIM COMMENTS: LIKES ABOUT NEIGHBORHOOD

Q. Think about the part of the metropolitan area where you live and that you consider to be your neighborhood. What do you like most about living there?

It's quiet. It's not a rowdy neighborhood. There are kids here, but you wouldn't know it. It's close to shopping and the bus.

It's all to myself, I'm isolated. I don't have to be quiet. I can make all the noise I want. It's not like I'm in an apartment where there are strangers living on the other side of the wall.

The people. The friendliness and sticking together. We're always helping each other out. It's quiet and peaceful, and there are lots of kids in the neighborhood, if you can figure that out.

I'd say accessibility to the rest of the city. The age of the houses and the character of the houses. Kind of like old Victorian barns. I guess one other thing is the affordability, together with the age and character of the house.

The park. It's pretty close by.

Sense of security, I guess. I go walking along a lot and I've never had to worry that someone is sneaking up behind me.

The quality of people. Everybody's nice. That's pretty general, I guess, but I don't know how else to say it. I like the weather. The mildness and that it never gets extremely hot or cold.

It's a very good area. Quiet. What can I say? I don't know.

Probably accessibility to bus lines. I guess it's quiet. I don't know of anything.

It's close to the Banfield. The gangs haven't infiltrated yet. It's a fairly integrated area, lots of interesting people.

The location. It's close to everything. The commuting is easy. We still have a lot of trees around here and stuff. It's close to a school, so there's a pool and a track we can use for exercise.

It's convenient to downtown Portland where I work. It's just a pleasant place to live. Nice people.

It's rural. The schools. I like the teachers. The people are nice. They say "hi" to you on the street.

It's convenient to town. It's quiet. I can't think of anything else.

Not in the heart of all the crime. Know all the people.

The quality of fruits and vegetable that I can buy here. Golf course.

Close to the city; it is only a 10 to 15 minute commute to work.

Small town atmosphere. I do much of my shopping here. I run into people I know.

Everybody is quiet and they keep to themselves. No problems; there is nothing stolen out of my car here.

It is friendly. The people are my age. They are nice people to live around.

It is a quiet street. The neighbors watch out like a neighborhood watch. Changes in traffic were made to make it a safer area for kids to be near the street.

Larger lots and not too congested. I moved out of California 12 years ago so this is nice.

I'm away from Beaverton and traffic. It is quiet. Beaverton is known for terrible traffic.

The Hollywood District. I'm near Sandy and near the shops. the old Fred Meyer store will have new shops in it. that will be nice.

Convenient for Shopping

Nothing. I hate Hillsboro.

Own home. I've lived here since 1942. Things are handy, like the bus. Neighborhood.

I own a small business in a rapidly growing area. Not a bad area to live in, has easy access to freeways.

Friendly people. House prices.

Fairly quiet, good schools, shopping close by.

Neighbors. Beauty. People keep things up. Convenient to hospitals and schools.

Schools. Close to stores.

Easy access to freeway. Grew up in area. Centrally located for extra curricular activities and work.

Quiet and livable.

Isn't part of the city. Country, small town.

Creek, trees, and owls in backyard. Quiet. Easy to get to shopping and school. Safe neighborhood.

Safe. Quiet park nearby. Schools are close.

Quiet. Convenient to everything.

Quiet. Close to parks and shopping. Easy to get downtown. Property has increased in value. Low crime.

Quiet. Nice neighbors. Retired people mostly. Close to work.

Not grown up real thick. I like subdivision we live in. Like the utilities and one acre we have.

Quiet, secure, and trees.

Everything. I've lived in this town for over 30 years. I love the atmosphere and the people. The business district has good merchants. Friendly people. The small town atmosphere is wonderful. I have a creek behind us, a lake across the street. There's a park near and a river.

It's a friendly, changing community. A few houses, grocery stores, churches. There's some enormously tall trees for shade and outline of the community. The schools are good.

It's a small community with access to things in the big city. It's close to the ocean and mountains. All of our recreational needs are near by.

It used to be the schools. When our children were young, that's what attracted us to this area. If I had a choice now, I'd move to the country. I can't say anything specific.

It's close to everything. Malls, fast food restaurants, there's a night club near here.

It's a rural area. It's close to Portland and shopping areas, yet separate from the urban and suburban areas.

The ease of freeway access.

It's green and it's quiet. The schools are good. All the necessary services are available, mainly shopping.

No likes.

It's far enough from town yet close enough to the city. There are stores everywhere along the major roads.

It's almost semi-rural. There are trees, a creek, and land. The people are not so crowded.

The neighborhood is family oriented. It's a well kept neighborhood.

The accessibility since this is a retirement center. It's got the bus, shopping, eating places all around us. I don't think there's a better place in Portland.

The quietness. It's nice. The neighbors are friendly.

Everything I need is convenient and close by. It's a halfway nice area.

The convenience of shopping centers. We're close to I-205. Eastport, Mall 205, and I don't have to cross the river.

The sense of community. Tigard has a small town feel to it. The ability to be involved in schools, churches, and the city.

It's quiet and not overrun with people. It smells good. A country smell.

The diversity in neighborhoods and closeness to downtown and things we do. A variety of ages are here and styles of houses. I like the people, nice people. I like the schools. Portland district has diversity in programs.

It's not a city. It's not a busy, crime infested and people infested. We're in the country.

We've been here since 1947. I have more dislikes. No likes.

Not as much traffic as Portland. Shopping center are easy to get to. Has a good hospital. You have confidence in going there and have good doctors in the area. Tualatin.

Not as much crime. I've lived here for years and it's quieter. Not as much violence in this area.

It's rural in East county. The school and neighborhood are friendly, family type atmosphere. It's middle class.

The accessibility to super markets and shopping near Beaverton Mall and Hillsboro. Rent on apartments are not out of line. I'm used to it.

The view. N. Willamette Valley. It is relatively remote. It's out in the country.

I live on Sauvie Island. It's nice and quiet. It's not congested.

St. Johns seems like people are friendly. I've only lived here 4 weeks.

Accessibility and yet it's suburban to Portland business districts. Traffic is not as bad on the Banfield as the Sunset or south of the city - Macadam. I can get to the CBD.

Hardly anyone else lives here. Quiet and clean. No gun play in the streets. No garbage in the streets. Building are taken care of. Green trees.

The location, near downtown.

It's not crowded. Relative quiet. Location itself, the proximity to mountains and river.

It's quiet and schools are close. Not much traffic on my street. Nice neighbors. Keep their places up. Hospitable. Lots of families, meaning kids in the neighborhood.

It quiet. Close to my work.

It's out of the city. I don't care for city congestion. The environment for my kids, the schools, and parks.

Nice and peaceful and quiet. Easy access to freeways and downtown. I can commute by bicycle. Real nice residential area. Nice houses and people. Well kept up and not much crime and good schools.

It's a nice neighborhood. We know everyone. They're friendly. The schools are close.

It's the best district in Portland. It's beautiful in the spring.

It's safe and well kept. It's on a street that's not busy. It has a sense of community.

It's a pleasant place to live.

I'm new. It's not too citified. Still country. The people are nice and the birds sing.

Being accessible to shopping and bus lines and it's quiet.

I like the neighbors at the present time.

It stays the same. It doesn't change in Hollywood.

I like the scenery we have. The environment is clean and green.

Probably because the crime rate is less in Gresham. I'm close to the community college.

It's quiet. There aren't a lot of people yet.

I guess the trees and it's pretty.

It's a clean area. The houses have been kept up. It's within 15 minutes of downtown.

It's close to where my husband goes to school.

Neighbors are cool.

I like that they plant trees on the sidewalk. Neighbors watch out for each other.

Quiet. I like my neighbors.

Neighbors. Good neighborhood.

I like the picture of the place. The small houses and fresh air, and the convenience of Tri-Met buses.

It's quiet. Everybody takes care of their yards.

The location. The landscape.

APPENDIX B
VERBATIM COMMENTS: LIKE MOST ABOUT NEIGHBORHOOD

Q. Of all the things you like, which one thing do you like the most?

Quiet.

Golf course nearby.

Close to the city; it is only a 10 to 15 minute commute to work.

The people.

No crime.

Nice people who helped me out when I loss my husband.

The neighbors watch out for each other.

Not too congested.

Everything is convenient.

A library is close by. It is handy to have it within walking distance.

It's convenient.

It's close to shopping.

I can just be myself.

I don't think there is any one thing. It's a blending together of everything that makes it a pleasant place to live.

Affordability together with the age and character of the houses.

No likes.

The idea that I can be alone and feel safe.

Everybody's nice.

No likes.

Accessibility.

It's a fairly integrated area, lots of interesting people.

Trees.

No likes.

It's rural.

Neighborhood.

No likes.

House prices.

Fairly quiet.

Neighbors.

Schools.

Centrally located for work.

Quiet.

Small town.

Creek and trees.

Safe.

Quiet.

Quiet.

Quiet.

The one acre we have.

Secure.

Availability of the stores. I'm within walking distance of all stores and doctors.

Churches.

It's a small community with access to things in the big city.

No likes.

Close to malls.

It's a rural area.

The ease of freeway access.

It's green and it's quiet.

No likes.

It's far enough from town yet close enough to the city.

Trees.

The neighborhood is family oriented.

The accessibility.

The quietness.

Everything I need is convenient and close by.

The convenience of shopping centers.

Feeling of being safe.

It smells good.

I like the people, nice people.

Crime infested.

No likes.

Shopping center are easy to get to.

Not as much crime.

The school and neighborhood are friendly, family type atmosphere.

The accessibility to super markets.

The view.

It's quiet.

St. Johns seems like people are friendly.

It's suburban.

Quiet and clean.

The location, near downtown.

Location itself.

Lots of families, meaning kids in the neighborhood.

Close to my work.

The environment for my kids.

It's a real comfortable place for us to live.

We know everyone.

It's beautiful in the spring.

It's safe.

It's a pleasant place to live.

The outdoors.

Being accessible to shopping and bus lines.

I like the neighbors at the present time.

It stays the same. It doesn't change in Hollywood.

The environment.

Probably because the crime rate is less in Gresham.

It's quiet.

It's quiet.

It's a clean area.

It's close to where my husband goes to school.

Neighbors are cool.

Neighbors watch out for each other.

Quiet.

My family.

Association with our neighbors.

It's quiet.

The location.

APPENDIX C

VERBATIM COMMENTS: DISLIKES ABOUT NEIGHBORHOOD

Q. What do you dislike about living in your part of the metropolitan area?

I don't have any dislikes. I really like my neighborhood.

No dislikes.

I don't think I dislike anything, otherwise I wouldn't be here.

I guess I would say the properties that have gotten run down. The gun shots. Every other week we hear them.

It's close to downtown. I don't like the hoodlums and gang members that hang around.

Traffic. People have discovered that the street I'm on is a shortcut to one of the malls and they use it a lot now.

Actually, I really don't mind anything about it.

I couldn't tell you.

Maybe the rents are too high. The increase in traffic because of all the development in Washington County.

It's just not the area I really want to live. It's just surrounded by the Banfield and lots of other major street. I said I like being close to the Banfield because it's close to work, but I don't like to close to every major street and highway.

I don't dislike anything.

Traffic is a big problem. It's just hard to get from one place to another.

OK. They've got the hwy planning going on forever here and we don't know where we stand. Also the traffic is terrible. The community politics is ridiculous. They're trying to put sewers in here. More and more people are moving in.

I suppose the fact that it's older and some of the houses aren't kept up very well.

No dislikes.

Too many trees; it is too dark. Mixed multi family and single family dwellings.

High crime. Theft. Car insurance is expensive. I live in the most expensive zip code for car insurance.

MAX should run a greater distance. We need more public transportation.

Too crowded. Homes too close together.

No dislikes.

Crime. There needs to be a better handle on it. The police need to do better with vandalism.

Too many buildings and too many condos and apartment complexes that are taking away farmland.

Bunch of crime activity. Theft and graffiti.

Anti-social people. No consideration for pedestrians. Poor development of mall. No walking paths. Sewage plant, infected water.

Too far to food stores. One mile to Fred Meyer. Bad renters next door. Sometimes there are 3 around me like now. Plus, they don't check renters

Live on Main Street and busses go by too often.

Other peoples' concepts of this area.

Taxes, bad roads.

No dislikes.

Noise on street. Dusty sewers.

Taxes.

Too much development. Taxes are too high. They went up 20%. Too many California people. Too many rich people moving in controlling schools.

No dislikes.

Air quality is not good. Chemicals are polluting the creek. People have guns and shoot birds and ducks.

Not much room to walk and ride bicycles.

I don't like the neighbors. Road maintenance could be better.

Kids at school leave litter around. Traffic islands to slow down traffic.

My truck was broken into last week. Ratty and messy yards.

Gossipy neighbors.

Expensive.

The fire engines. The busy streets and cross streets. There's no parking for the businesses, they're very transient. A new business can't open here and succeed.

No dislikes.

The association we have with the big city crime like the gangs. They're already moving into this area.

The traffic. I don't like all the traffic.

Probably not enough playgrounds. We have 2 kids and there's not enough places for them.

The urban sprawl that's taken place. The overburden of the roads that were never meant to happen to.

Some of the residential traffic. The traffic is pretty heavy.

The people. There's a lot of antisocial behavior. Snobbishness and competitiveness. Over development and fast pace. The feeling development is out of control and not very well planned.

Everything. It's an awful run down neighborhood. The people are awful and rundown.

There's no parks. There doesn't seem to be any neighborhood things like crime watch.

There are more and more land developers with more houses coming in. That's the only thing.

The population density. The population growing so fast.

No dislikes.

Transportation. Trying to get to the store. The time it takes to get there. But, that's all right, you have to give up something. The weather here too. All the rain.

Not enough police. Of course, I realize they don't have the funds.

No dislikes.

The lack of sidewalks. It's growing so quickly. It's getting crowded and busier. Lots of traffic. I'm too far away from things going on. I have to travel at least 20 miles to get to where something is going on or to the doctor. My kids are too far away.

The crime.

Too far away from shopping. I don't know how good the schools are because I don't know if we get good funds in this area. The Clackamas school district. We are worried about the school consolidation with Molalla.

Garbage and sewer bills are high. They keep increasing and the water bill. All these big 2 story houses are being built around us. Most of the older housing is on one level and the new ones are big and tall.

The taxes.

No dislikes.

Traffic noise nearby.

Nothing except in Aloha area, there never seems to be a building code and a lot of trashy houses were thrown together.

No dislikes.

No dislikes.

It's very busy. The streets are always busy and people drive crazy. Everybody exceeds speed limit by 10 miles an hour.

No dislikes.

No dislikes.

No parking as I live downtown.

No dislikes.

No street lights. Not sidewalks. Potholes at end of street. I can hear the freeway.

I don't get to meet too many people, not much activity here.

Everything is so far away. Nothing is within walking distance like stores. The traffic going in and out of town.

It's growing up too fast. Urbanization. Too many people and too much traffic.

No dislikes.

High taxes in Laurelhurst.

It's wet. The ground tends to be wet. I border upon a man-made wetland.

No dislikes.

I don't like the dirt that comes from a lot of paving around the area.

It's rapidly growing and no room left.

No dislikes.

No store has opened up to replace Fred Meyer.

Too crowded. Too high of crime.

The cost of living is higher than closer to Portland. Because of the security offered, I think is the reason.

Traffic through the area. Too many cars.

No dislikes.

The street dividers on 21st, 24th, and 37th. I dislike what the agency did on 7th avenue between Fremont and Broadway to slow traffic.

We live a block from the freeway. A block from the railroad tracks.

Drug addicts across the street.

Not enough parking spaces. Of course, crime.

Drug related things. Illegal activities.

Not enough sidewalks. People who drive too fast through the residential area.

I live in a retirement home and the thing is we are all in the same age bracket.

Too much traffic that goes through town.

The growth that has happened.

APPENDIX D
VERBATIM COMMENTS: DISLIKE MOST ABOUT NEIGHBORHOOD

Q. Of all the things you dislike, which one thing do you dislike the most?

No dislikes.

Mixed multi family and single family dwellings.

High crime.

We need more public transportation.

Too many people.

No dislikes.

Crime.

The people are getting noisier.

Highway planning.

No dislikes.

No dislikes.

No dislikes.

The increased traffic.

No dislikes.

No dislikes.

No dislikes.

No dislikes.

Gun shots.

No dislikes.

No dislikes.

No dislikes.

No dislikes.

Crime.

No consideration for pedestrians.

Bad renters.

Live on Main Street and busses go by too often.

Other peoples' concepts of this area.

Bad roads.

No dislikes.

Noise.

Taxes.

Taxes.

No dislikes.

Air quality.

No dislikes.

Neighbors.

Kids at school leave litter around.

My truck was broken into last week.

Gossipy neighbors.

Expensive.

There's no parking for the businesses, they're very transient. A new business can't open here and succeed.

No dislikes.

The association we have with the big city crime like the gangs. They're already moving into this area.

The traffic.

Probably not enough playgrounds. We have 2 kids and there's not enough places for them.

The overburden of the roads that were never meant to happen to.

Some of the residential traffic.

Over development and fast pace. The feeling development is out of control and not very well planned.

Everything.

There doesn't seem to be any neighborhood things like crime watch.

There are more and more land developers with more houses coming in.

No dislikes.

No dislikes.

No dislikes.

Not enough police.

No dislikes.

Lots of traffic.

I'm too far away from things going on.

The crime.

Too far away from shopping.

Garbage and sewer bills are high.

The taxes.

No dislikes.

Traffic noise nearby.

Nothing except in Aloha area, there never seems to be a building code and a lot of trashy houses were thrown together.

No dislikes.

No dislikes.

The streets are always busy.

No dislikes.

No dislikes.

No parking as I live downtown.

No dislikes.

No street lights.

I don't get to meet too many people, not much activity here.

The traffic.

I can't choose. To me, too many people means too much traffic. It all goes together.

No dislikes.

High taxes in Laurelhurst.

It's wet.

No dislikes.

I don't like the dirt that comes from a lot of paving around the area.

No dislikes.

No dislikes.

No store has opened up to replace Fred Meyer.

Too crowded.

The cost of living is higher than closer to Portland.

Traffic through the area.

No dislikes.

The street dividers on 21st, 24th, and 37th.

We live a block from the freeway.

Drug addicts across the street.

Crime.

Disrespect.

People who drive too fast through the residential area.

I live in a retirement home and the thing is we are all in the same age bracket.

Too much traffic that goes through town.

The growth that has happened.

APPENDIX E
VERBATIM COMMENTS: APPEAL AS PLACES TO LIVE

Q. What things about these areas make them appealing to you a places to live?

(Hillsboro, Sandy, Orchards area of Vancouver, WA.) Quieter.

(Lake Oswego and Estacada.) Not over populated. Trees and hills.

(Bull Mountain, Eastmoreland, Oregon City, Canby, and Aurora.) Out in the country.

(Southwest Hills.) In comparison to other areas, it is more crime free.

(Lake Oswego and Hillsboro.) School district, community events, and convenience to stores.

(Tigard and southwest Portland.) Crime not as bad. Good schools. Don't have to deal with bums.

(Tigard.) Smaller than Portland.

(NW Portland, Laurelhurst area, and Reed College area.) Public transportation is closer. Finer old homes. Stable neighborhood and more cultural offerings.

(Beaverton area.) Centrally located for work and stores.

(West hills, Laurelhurst, and downtown.) I love the views. Park in neighborhood. A lot of variety of things to do.

(Salem, country, and Forest Grove.) Not so much violence.

(Allenbock acres.) It's in the country. A quiet place.

(Lake Grove.) Nice homes and by the lake.

(Washington County.) The weather is nicer here, I think.

(Southwest.) I've always lived in SW.

(Murray Hill.) It's close to work. Has community activities like the recreation hall.

(Hillsboro.) It's not in the middle of gangs and drugs.

(The west side of Portland, over the hill, and northwest.) Access to hiking. A lot more association to natural surroundings.

(Washington County.) More responsive government.

(Gresham and Hillsboro.) Quiet and more rural.

(Multnomah area, Burlingame, Metzger-Cedar Hills, and Raleigh Hills.) Older, well kept neighborhoods. Close to town. Charm. Not sub-divided.

(Allenbock areas near Union road.) Some people of all communities live there. No discrimination. House construction is good.

(I live in northwest. I like it and also northeast where I grew up. Laurelhurst and Hollywood area. I live in the Rock Creek area.) They are well planned out and well kept up. Easy out of neighborhood to where you need to go. Homes in northeast have a lot of character.

(Parts of Tigard, more rural parts of Tualatin.) The easy access to all the urban you want, but you are not in the middle of it. The perceived safety of a lower crime rate.

(Forest Grove and Vernonia.) I used to live in Forest Grove. Then I was gone 10 years and moved back. I like the trees and flowers.

(West side area.) Easy access to everything. Nice neighbors and good schools.

(Tualatin.) Close to downtown Tualatin. It's peaceful.

(The West Hills is my favorite. The Lake Oswego or Mountain Park.) Nice houses and nice size lots. Fair proximity to center of town and freeways. Houses are kept up nicely.

(Where I live. That's the SW suburban area.) The mix of openness as well as the convenience of shops and shopping centers.

(In Hillsboro. I like it a lot. Cedar Hills is nice. Off Hart and 160th in Beaverton.) Quiet, peaceful areas. Family kind of communities. Here where we live, we can leave our house open for days and not worry about it. More sense of a community. Neighbors working and talking together.

(Aloha and the north end of the valley.) The openness. I love the country.

(Irvington and Kings Heights.) I love the older architecture. The big homes and Irvington has gorgeous tree-lined streets. Irvington has a liberal political climate. Kings Heights would be the view. The port and river partial city view.

(Gresham.) Clean and looks nice.

(Northeast Portland and Hillsboro area.) Northeast - I'm familiar with it and a lot of nice homes. Well kept. In Hillsboro, the ruralness.

(Rose City areas and downtown areas.) Convenience of knowing where access to freeway is. We are comfortable. It's like home. Downtown, husband feels would be exciting. Close to the action. You can get out, go to park, and walk to activities held downtown.

(Gateway where I live.) Nice and quiet. It's safe and convenient to bus and stores. I like SE 82nd and Powell because Kirkland Manor is there.

(Sandy and St. Helens.) They are smaller. They are more rural.

(North and Northeast.) Friends and family.

(Westside.) More shopping and bigger industries.

(Clackamas and Hillsboro.) Open spaces. Neighbors aren't very close.

(Eastside.) Easy to get to.

(Sandy.) Smaller and quieter.

(Gresham or almost Sandy area. Or Happy Valley.) The land. We want about 10 acres. You can't get that close in. We just want land. For privacy and no traffic.

(I'm satisfied where I'm at. There isn't any other place. 143rd and Morrison. It's mid-county.) It's a nice area. It's close to everything.

(I'd probably go to the westside. The Beaverton area. I don't know the specific areas.) It's just different. It's quieter than here if you get the right place.

(I like SE Portland. Between Eastport Plaza and Mall 205. Gladstone area.) Clean. Air is more clean. Streets are wider than some areas of town. There's more parking for shopping.

(The West Hills and Wilsonville.) West Hills - the view of the city. Wilsonville - the open spaces.

(The St. Johns area. That's where I live. Some people wouldn't live here, but I like it.) All the facilities are close. Rivers, parks, schools, and the town.

(Irvington district. Around 23rd and Glisan.) The beautiful old homes in Irvington. A lot of creativity and interesting people live at 23rd and Glisan area. A sense of community in both area. A lot of pride of the people who live there. They feel they are part of the environment. I have welfare of neighborhood in mind.

(I thing Lake Oswego would be an ideal spot. Milwaukie isn't too bad.) As a landscaper, Lake Oswego has a lot of rich people. Californians who hire landscapers for their fancy houses.

(The Multnomah district, Sellwood, and Sylvan Heights.) Lack of high density, close to city, rural feeling.

(Out towards Troutdale, Estacada, or Gresham.) They're less crowded, or they seem to be. They're further away from Portland.

(Gresham and Troutdale.) Out in country.

(I like Portland, so any part is fine.) We've got pretty scenery. Oregon is prettier than California.

(Laurelhurst, East and Westmoreland, Grant Park, and Alameda.) Old home and big trees.

(Sweetbriar and Troutdale.) On sewer. Property will increase in value.

(Laurelhurst is the only place I know.) People, nice neighbors. It's my home where I'm most familiar.

(Hollywood and Rose City.) Small town living.

(Hollywood and Fairview.) Uniqueness and history. Hollywood is like a little city and has good restaurants and entertainment.

(Central City.) Familiar with it.

(Melino, Sylvania campus.) Melino is out in the country. I'd like an acre of ground or two. Sylvania is good, clean, kept up places.

(Laurelhurst.) I just have always been happy here.

(St. John's and Laurelhurst.) I know St. John's and I think Laurelhurst is nice, with tree-lined streets. They both have nice parks.

(Beaverton. Maybe out towards Lake Oswego or Milwaukie.) Their location, maybe the clean air, the type of home and the type of people that live there.

(SE Portland, the Woodstock area, or south of that, or NE Portland around Halsey. Around Reed College, is that Eastmoreland?.) Well maintained houses and yards and what appears to be quiet neighborhoods. The neighbors talk to each other and look out for each other.

(Clackamas County, Carver, Estacada, and Clark County.) Close to fishing and hunting.

(Wilsonville and Tualatin.) Location and current development. The growth rate. Pretty soon it will be like Beaverton and I like that.

(Clackamas area. It's as good as any I can think of. Or Gresham area.) Traffic is not as congested. Just prefer these areas. I just like it in these areas, other than the traffic.

(Out south. Oregon City or Gladstone.) Not as crowded. You don't have the hustle and bustle of the big city.

(I've lived in the Milwaukie area for some years. I don't think I'd like to live any place else. I'd like to live in Forest Grove, my nephew lives there.) My nephew lives in Forest Grove. It has a hospital. It's a lovely area with residential homes. They have everything there you would need.

(Beaverton.) I think it's still country.

(SE on 122nd.) We have beautiful yards and it's close to everything.

(NE, SE, NW, SW, Mt. Tabor, and the West Hills.) Good shopping. Good mass transit. Great number of entertainment and cultural opportunities. Easy to get to.

(Lloyd Center area and Alameda.) Nice homes, pretty streets, and quiet.

(Gresham.) Community college swimming pool. Nice, friendly people.

(East country.) Not as congested people wise and traffic wise.

(SE.) I've lived in SE Portland all my life. Transportation is very good in SE Portland. I've always been one block from the bus.

(Beaverton and Lake Oswego.) Quiet, Not much crime, nice homes and apartments.

(Laurelhurst.) Houses are big and well kept. Wide streets. Looks nice. The park adds to the beauty.

(Beaverton, Gresham, and downtown.) More community oriented. Beaverton and Gresham are smaller, clean.

(SE, Westmoreland, and NW 21st and Glisan.) More residential. Quieter. More trees.

(NE. I've lived NE all my life.) Familiar with it.

(Parkrose, Centennial, and David Douglas.) Convenient to freeway and good schools.

(NW Portland, West Hills, and Lake Oswego.) Generally speaking, the people there are people like me. Income, cultural values, and age wise.

(Eagle Creek.) Beautiful area. The area is fresh and clean.

(Oregon City, Canby, and Estacada.) Out towards the country. No downtown like Portland.

(Estacada.) Quiet. I'm not a city girl. I like the country.

(First addition. Lake Oswego Lake.) A very sweet place to live.

(Multnomah county on the east side of the river.) Not so congested. The other side of the river is too crowded, too much traffic, not enough shopping and restaurants.

(Lake Grove, Sandy, and Sherwood.) They are treed and are hilly.

(SW and NW Heights.) Views. Age of homes - older with character or brand new with elegance.

(Clackamas and Canby.) Small town atmosphere. It's still rural.

(Sherwood.) I own property out there. I'm going to build on it. I'll have space around my house.

(Wilsonville and Stafford.) Nice houses with lots of property surrounding them. It's horse country. I love horses.

APPENDIX F
VERBATIM COMMENTS: APPEAL AS PLACES TO WORK

Q. What things about these areas make them appealing to you as places to work?

(Tigard.) Close to home.

(Beaverton, downtown Portland, and Tigard.) Close to home. Easy access.

(Tigard.) People are great. Not as much crime.

(Southwest area, Tigard, and Beaverton.) Close to home. Traffic about same. Easy access to freeways.

(NE Portland, industrial part of downtown, Hillsboro is county seat and makes paperwork easy.) Warehouse work.

(Anything suburban where you don't have to get on the freeway.) More personal.

(Beaverton and downtown.) Close to home. Short commute. Like downtown. Opportunities for shopping and entertainment.

(Beaverton and downtown.) I can walk to work. A lot of things to do.

(Nike, Beaverton, and Tigard.) Easy to get to.

(Beaverton and Lake Oswego.) Close to my home.

(Sherwood.) It's closer to where I live.

(Inner Washington County and inner east side Portland.) Closer to where I live. Less crime rate.

(Tigard.) It's close to home.

(Hillsboro, Tigard, and Beaverton.) Environment. The trees. Have kept trees.

(Hillsboro.) I can get to work in a short period of time. Don't have the traffic. Can get to work in two songs and a commercial.

(Downtown would be handy.) Easy access.

(Washington County.) Better design for the business of the 1990s.

(Hillsboro, Beaverton, and Forest Grove.) Familiar with Beaverton. Hillsboro is not congested. Forest Grove is a quiet area.

(Downtown.) A lot of activity. Close to shopping. Endearing place to work. Lots of restaurants.

(Beaverton area and downtown Portland.) They welcome people from all countries. Beaverton is closer to my house. Downtown is colorful, you have free mobility and can switch to more jobs. The university area is colorful.

(Downtown Portland and Beaverton.) Beaverton is close to my house. Downtown are places to go at lunch and close for appointments for doctor and dentist.

(Along Sunset Corridor, Tigard, Wilsonville, and Beaverton.) Easy access along Sunset. The commute is easy. I wouldn't want to go into Portland because of the traffic and public transit is not that great. These areas seem lower key than town environment. Downtown everyone is dressed in a certain way and it seem faster paced and less patient in suits and heels.

(Forest Grove.) I used to work in Forest Grove. Your electric is cheaper in Forest Grove than in Hillsboro.

(Anywhere. No difference.)

(West side of Portland, downtown or northwest Portland, and Beaverton.) It's close in. Close to where I live. Proximity to where I live. Nice environment.

(Southwest suburban area. I currently work 3 days a week downtown, but I would prefer the SW suburban area.) It would be closer to home.

(On the west end. Hillsboro, Aloha, and Beaverton areas.) Easy access to everything without having to commute to Portland and all the traffic. The companies seem more responsive to the community. Like associated with the schools. They try to give back to the community. Close to where I work.

(I work all over. I'd say Washington County. Let's say anywhere in the Sunset Corridor.) It's just not the city atmosphere, that's all.

(Northwest, the flats, and downtown Portland.) You can walk to restaurants and nice places for a stroll to meet friends. It's centrally located. They are vital and upbeat. I like the activity. We run into people we know. People at restaurants know us and I like to frequent places where people know who you are.

(Northeast Portland and downtown Portland.) Northeast Portland is close to my home. Downtown, the activity is close to shopping.

(Lloyd Center and downtown Portland.) Downtown - excitement and exhilaration. Feeling of being downtown. Lloyd Center - we've always worked there.

(Gateway district.) It's convenient, close to where I live, and not too hard to get to and from. Walking distance. The class of people out here are working and middle class people. No hang ups and wild parties.

(NE, SE, and E county area.) Easier access, they are close to where I live.

(North and northeast.) Close to home.

(Downtown.) Public transportation.

(Hillsboro and Clackamas.) The quietness.

(Downtown.) Convenient to get to. Variety of shopping areas.

(East county and SE.) No traffic congestion. Slower pace.

(SE area. Gresham or Clackamas area.) I don't think they have as much crime. The traffic is not as crowded. Easy access roads.

(I don't work any more, but if I did, I'd like to work downtown.) Transportation. You can take the bus. You wouldn't have to drive, just hop on the bus.

(SE Portland or the Gladstone area.) My work would be close by and I wouldn't have to get on the freeway. I hate freeways.

(I work all over the metropolitan area. I like to work downtown Portland.) A lot of people and stores. The little coffee shops. It's nice down there.

(Gresham and Beaverton.) Gresham and Beaverton don't have many Asian employers and employees and they pay more money as it's more all American and in Portland are more Asians.

(Downtown Portland.) A lot of vitality. A lot of businesses and people. Shops are there and restaurants.

(Downtown and Multnomah district.) Downtown is exciting with lots of things to do. Multnomah district is cute, neighborhood feeling, small businesses.

(Beaverton.) They have a lot of big companies there, with jobs for women. St. John's is a good industrial area too, but they mostly have jobs available for men, not women.

(Out towards Wilsonville. The industrial area - Swan Island. Probably just downtown Portland.) Wilsonville is growing and expanding. The industrial area is already settled, and downtown has a lot of new businesses starting up.

(Gresham.) Less hassle with traffic.

(SE because that's where I live.) So it would be convenient to home.

(Close to home.) Convenience and commute time.

(Gresham.) Close to home.

(Hillsboro and Tigard.) Easy to get to for me.

(Downtown.) It's easy to get to and I used to work there, so I'm familiar with it.

(St. John's because it's close.) Good bus service and it's relatively quiet.

(I used to work in downtown Portland, I guess that would be a nice place.) I don't know, the convenience I guess. Because all the buses and MAX go there, it's easy to get to.

(Downtown.) I like the river, being able to walk along the river or do business or shop without having to drive.

(Beaverton.) It's a straight shot. Easy to get to.

(Not downtown Portland.) You don't have to deal with getting in and out of town. All the driving and traffic.

(Clackamas area.) It's in between a couple of hospitals and that's what I used to do. That's the main reason. It would be close to work.

(Swan Island area.) I worked there for years. The traffic is not as bad as other places.

(Downtown.) It's convenient to get to.

(Downtown.) It's easy access to a lot of things. You can catch a bus.

(Downtown.) Easy to get to - entertainment and cultural things.

(Downtown. Artifacts around. Town area pretty. I love the water fountains.) Lots of places to shop after work and during lunch.

(Close to home in Gresham.) Convenience - less commuting time, less fatigue.

(Any place but downtown Portland.) Not so much traffic to get to work.

(Downtown.) Transportation. Convenient to get to town.

(Some place without a lot of traffic. I work all over town. It makes no difference where it is.) Quieter. Less traffic to get to work.

(Downtown.) Lots of things to do. I could learn my way around downtown.

(Downtown.) A lot going on. Lunch hour events at Pioneer Square. Convenient to get to work. I walk to work.

(Downtown.) The line of work I'm in, I'd have to be downtown.

(NE - I worked on the NE side.) Close to home. Get around easy. Don't have to cross the river.

(Downtown and Lloyd Center.) I can use MAX.

(John's Landing and downtown.) Convenient. Access to lots of services, post office, printing, and good restaurants to take clients.

(Sandy.) Close to home. 4.5 miles to Sandy.

(Milwaukie.) Close to home.

(Downtown.) Better paying jobs.

(Tigard.) It was easy to get to.

(Lake Oswego.) Closeness and friendliness.

(Downtown.) The sophistication and hustle and bustle of it.

(Wilsonville, Portland, Tigard, and Tualatin.) Close. Wilsonville is out of the heat of traffic. Location is good.

(Honest and friendly people on the westside.) Closer to my home.

(Gladstone.) Friendly people. My husband makes enough money there.

(McMinnville, Tualatin, and Canby.) I'd be leaving congestion, going away from traffic instead of with traffic.

(Away from downtown. Eastside or Westside. I feel hemmed in when I'm downtown.) Less traffic. Parking is easy.

APPENDIX G
VERBATIM COMMENTS: APPEAL AS PLACES TO SHOP

Q. What things about these areas make them appealing to you as places to shop?

(Clackamas Town Center and Lloyd Center.) Big and everything is there.

(Washington Square, Beaverton Mall, and Costco.) Clean. Close to where we live. Easy access.

(Clackamas Town Center and Washington Square.) Feel safe. Well lit. Convenient. Lots of different shops.

(Washington Square and Clackamas Town Center.) Easy getting in and out.

(Washington Square, Mall 205, Clackamas Town Center, downtown, and Beaverton Mall.) Convenience and bargains because of competitive pricing.

(Washington Square, Clackamas Town Center, and Beaverton Canyon Place.) Feel safe there. Inside shopping and good atmosphere.

(Tigard, Beaverton, and Tualatin.) Close to home. Availability of what we want to purchase.

(Clackamas Town Center, downtown, and Beaverton.) Major department stores, electric shops, variety of activities, and funky things to buy.

(Tigard, Beaverton areas, and Washington Square.) Choice of stores.

(Washington Square.) Because it's close.

(Washington Square, Beaverton Mall, K-Mart, Fred Meyer, Clackamas Town Center, and Lloyd Center.) Tired of shopping in same place. Closer to home.

(Tanasborne Mall and Portland.) Lots of variety. It's new to me.

(Washington Square.) They have all the stores there.

(Washington County.) It's not a long distance and I can get anything I want.

(Washington Square.) It's close.

(Sunset Center, Washington Square, and Costco.) Mainly location, price, and convenience.

(Washington Square.) Everything is together. Easy access.

(Downtown and Washington Square.) Downtown they have variety. Washington Square has convenience.

(Sunset Espanade and Hillsboro.) Quality goods. Conveniently located.

(Clackamas Town Center, Washington Square, and Beaverton Mall.) Large and many stores in one location.

(Downtown, Beaverton, 217 Corridor, Washington Square, Beaverton Square, Hawthorne, and NW Portland.) Different kinds of shops. Variety of things. Convenient.

(Southwest, Aloha, Thriftway, Beaverton area, and Canyon area.) Safeway and Albertson's are there. I like the Aloha Thriftway. In the Canyon area all the shops are there and also an Asian shop I go to.

(Downtown Portland, Washington Square.) Have a wide variety and you can usually find what you need.

(Washington Square, downtown Portland, and Bernard Mall in Beaverton.) Washington Square - variety of stores and merchandise. Bernard Mall - close by and easy access. Downtown - different merchandise. Not just standard brands. Not stores that have all the same looking things. More variety.

(Malls in Beaverton, K-Mart, Payless, and mall in Hillsboro that has Oregon Craft and Floral.) I do a lot of craft works and go to the malls for crafts and ceramics.

(All the shopping malls. Downtown is fun too.) They are nice to shop in.

(Downtown Portland.) There is a larger selection of stores than in Tualatin.

(Downtown, northwest Portland, also Washington Square and in Beaverton.) They are conveniently located. Easy to get to and a variety of merchants.

(I don't drive, so any place close to my home. I really don't do a lot of shopping. It would be the SW suburban area. I do some shopping downtown.) Simply because it's close to where I live. I do some downtown because I work there and it's convenient.

(The fun place is the Hawthorne area. Lloyd Center is nice. Hillsboro area, Clackamas Town Center, but it's a long way to go so we don't go very often.) Puttering through the old shops in the Hawthorne area. Convenience and closeness of Hillsboro. At Lloyd Center, it's nice to get a breath of fresh air. Layout of the stores.

(Downtown and Lloyd Center. The core area is a nice place, both sides of the river. The east side is getting more appealing.) The way they are laid out. Central locations. Easy access. Lots of stores. Same with downtown, there is easy access to the freeways.

(Downtown, Lloyd Center and Broadway area.) Downtown, I like Pioneer Place. It's upbeat and pretty. Lloyd Center I like, there are more privately owned businesses and easier to park.

(Clackamas Town Center, Mall 205, and Washington Square.) Convenient to Mall 205. Do all shopping in one stop.

(Downtown Portland and Clackamas Town Center.) The variety of selection. You can find what you want.

(Lloyd Center and downtown Portland.) Lloyd Center - I know where the stores are. More variety of specialty shops downtown. Interesting places for lunch.

(Gateway district, 122nd and Division, and 122nd and Powell.) Most everything is right there. Mall is close to me. I can walk there on good days. Albertson's, Safeway and Payless are on 122nd.

(Gateway, Vancouver, and Lloyd Center.) Gateway is close. Vancouver is a new place to shop for me. Lloyd Center is fixed up now.

(Lloyd Center and Clackamas Town Center.) Wide variety.

(Clackamas Town Center.) A lot of stores. Don't have to go anywhere else. Only 5 minutes away.

(Downtown, NW Portland, and Hawthorne.) Easy commute and things I want to shop for are available.

(Fred Meyer on Division, Safeway, Mall 205, and Clackamas Town Center.) Easy to get to.

(Clackamas Town Center.) More variety.

(Gateway.) Because it's convenient to get to.

(Gresham, Clackamas Town Center, Troutdale Discount, and Columbia Ridge.) Not a lot of traffic. Easy to get in and out of. Cheaper than downtown Portland.

(Clackamas area.) Easy to get to. I have what I need in one area.

(I'm in an area that's convenient to shopping. There's no other place I need to be a part of. I'm in mid-Multnomah county.) It's convenient for most anything I need.

(Downtown and Lloyd Center.) You can buy everything there you can think of. You don't have to go anywhere else.

(Clackamas Town Center, Eastport Plaza, and Mall 205.) They have everything I want. They're not too costly. I live between all of them.

(The mall areas. Washington Square and Clackamas Town Center.) The number of choices available at one site.

(Downtown.) Everything is so concentrated. You can get to everything by foot.

(GI Joes on 82nd.) It's the place I know and it's close to my home.

(Downtown Portland, NW 23rd and Glisan, and Washington Square.) Washington Square is convenient to where I live. Downtown and the 23rd area have shops, restaurants, gifts, and clothing stores. They are attractive. Architecture and landscaping for both areas. Downtown has a variety of architecture.

(Washington Square.) They've got all kinds of gift shops and stereo stores, even clothes stores. I think they have an ice rink don't they?

(23rd Street - NW Portland.) The little stores, the coffee houses, funky old clothes stores, funky stores.

(I like the North area as a place to shop. I'm right in between Jantzen Beach and Lloyd Center. Probably the SE out toward Clackamas.) They have more grocery stores than we do out here. We just had a big grocery store close down.

(I usually shop around my home.) I can go to a fast food restaurant or hop over to Lloyd Center, or just go to Fred Meyer if I want to.

(Food for Less, Mall 205, Gresham Mall, and mini-malls.) No hassle with traffic, convenient and close.

(Mall 205, Gateway, Clackamas Mall. We shop all over for prices.) Prices.

(Downtown.) More variety than in a mall. The feel of downtown. Choice of River shops or Pioneer Square shops.

(Gresham.) Has everything I could want. Has enough stores for competitive pricing.

(Lloyd Center.) I used to like Lloyd Center until they remodeled it. I don't like it any more. Can't find my way around.

(NE Portland, Lloyd Center, and Hollywood.) Close by.

(Downtown.) Different shops. Window shopping is good downtown. Lots to see.

(Washington Square.) Lot of variety.

(Lloyd Center, Gateway, and Gresham.) The Lloyd Center appeals to me because for one thing, now you are inside and there are lots of little shops, more than there used to be. I just go out to Gateway and Gresham occasionally on MAX.

(Lloyd Center, Jantzen Beach, and the Peninsula area around St. John's.) Easy to get to Lloyd Center and Jantzen Beach, but there are more shops at Lloyd Center I think.

(The good places to shop are Lloyd Center, Clackamas, out at 122nd, and Eastport Plaza.) Their convenience, period. Except for Lloyd Center, that's a nice place to go now that it's been fixed up and you can just sit and watch the people.

(Clackamas Town Center, Mall 205, and Woodstock Blvd.) For after work, I like the Woodstock area because it's close to home and I like the other malls because there's more variety than in the shops on Woodstock.

(Clackamas Town Center.) Lots of variety.

(Clackamas Town Center.) the convenience. Everything is there. If they make it you will find it there. All in one place.

(This area - Clackamas, Oregon City, or Gresham.) They are close. It's close to Fred Meyer and Clackamas Town Center.

(There is plenty around here. Gladstone or Oregon City area.) It's easy to get there. It's close and convenient for us.

(I like Clackamas Town Center. We have a new shopping center here near me in the Milwaukie area on McLoughlin Blvd.) It has everything. Everything is there. You can shop there all day long. There's access for my electric car on the elevators and in the stores. Places to eat there too.

(Clackamas Town Center.) It's easy to get to.

(Mall 205 and Eastgate.) We know the vicinity and the area.

(Hawthorne, downtown, and Lloyd Center.) Everything you need or want.

(Clackamas Town Center.) Better prices. Target and Cub Foods are not in NE Portland.

(Stores close to me. Closeness is more important to me than what the store is.) Close.

(Clackamas Town Center.) Easy access off freeway for me.

(Meier and Frank.) I worked at Meier and Frank for 31 years.

(Clackamas Town Center.) Everything is there that you want. I live close to Eastport Plaza. It was convenient, but so many stores have closed.

(Lloyd Center.) Remodeling made it look nice. Every store is there. Easy to get there from freeway.

(Downtown, Pioneer Place, and Lloyd Center.) I work and live downtown. Lloyd Center is not as crowded as Washington Square. Easy to get to from downtown.

(Downtown.) Convenient.

(Anywhere I can find a good bargain. Lloyd Center.) Beautiful now since they remodeled.

(Close to home.) Convenient.

(Downtown.) Small stores. Variety of selection and types of goods available. Close proximity of ten to twelve blocks worth of downtown shopping. Easy walking.

(Gresham and Clackamas Town Center.) Cheaper than in the neighborhood.

(Clackamas Town Center.) Close to home.

(Clackamas Town Center.) Lots of variety.

(Clackamas Town Center.) You can walk around and you can watch the skaters.

(Downtown, but it's tough to find parking.) I'm tired of malls where they are a clone of each other. Downtown is not so cloneish. It's more original downtown.

(Washington Square, Clackamas Town Center, and John's Landing.) Convenience, wide variety of stores, and good atmosphere.

(Downtown, NW Portland, Hawthorne, and NE Broadway.) Outdoor shopping. Small owners vs. big chains. I don't like the closed in feeling of malls.

(Cornelius.) Close to home. Familiar faces. Support the local businesses.

(Neighborhood stores and downtown Portland.) I like the feeling of the city to shop. Clean. Non-threatening people on the streets. Downtown merchants have done a good job.

(Washington Square.) More spread out. One level. Closest to my home.

APPENDIX H
VERBATIM COMMENTS: QUALITY OF LIFE GETTING BETTER

Q. Why do you see the quality of life in the metropolitan area getting better in the next 20 years?

If we fix the traffic mess with a good transit system, I think it will get better.

The gang task force. There is a lot going on with gangs. In 20 years they could be gone if the task force works on it.

The police will make it better by policing the area better and cracking down on the violence. My area has gotten better.

Getting bigger, more international city.

Constantly improving housing and transportation.

Growing rapidly. Getting more shops that only used to be in big cities.

Transportation planning will make it easier to get around.

Necessity. Things will have to improve, e.g., transportation, schools, and that type of thing, because of increased population.

Lot more homes and businesses sprouting up.

It depends on the people moving into the area. They can bring good or bad, but I just think new blood in an area generally brings good.

It's improved a great deal over the last 10 years even though the crime rate has gone up. Cultural life has improved 100% over the last 10 years. New parks and recreational facilities are growing.

The decisions we make in putting people in office in the next few years will make a big difference. We need some new people and new ideas to spend our money wisely and things will get better.

It seems there is so much awareness of gangs now and people do want to help. I want to believe it will be better, as where will we all go.

They are trying to modernize and update the roads, buildings, and business areas. The Convention Center makes Portland more appealing to national market.

If we keep our land policies in force to keep lands for forests and farms, so they aren't overrun.

I may have blinders on, but Oregonians care about their surroundings. It's not dirty and withered up.

Hopefully there will be people who are concerned and will make it better.

The city planners have done a good job of keeping ahead of the population.

Because people are more educated.

I'm being optimistic.

Because more people are moving in and will have more money.

Because we are learning more. We are learning to use the resources better. The tools to do the job or the technology.

APPENDIX I
VERBATIM COMMENTS: QUALITY OF LIFE GETTING WORSE

Q. Why do you see the quality of life in the metropolitan area getting worse in the next 20 years?

More people coming in. Fifteen years ago you could walk down the street and leave your house wide open. Now you can't even walk down to the end of the driveway with the door left open.

More crime. I think there are less police and they don't come when you call them anyway.

For example Beaverton and the Hwy 217 traffic. Also the Sunset corridor.

Just gangs, drugs, and being overpopulated. Just those, primarily.

As long as the population increases, it will get worse and worse in the suburban areas, I'm afraid, because so many people are moving out here.

Well, the areas that I grew up in, that I know, are now lower-income areas. The gangs are starting to move out here.

I have not seen much being done to change it. Gangs and drug situations are worsening. It is hard to eliminate because of monetary importance to some people. I don't think they want to eliminate it.

Lots of California people are moving up causing housing and rent costs to go up. Concerned about traffic. Pollution is getting worse.

I've grown up in the NW and watched Seattle and Spokane become a mess. Portland has gone from moderate size town to 1/2 million. It can only get worse.

Too many people. The problems aren't handled now, so they can't be handled as the area grows.

Crime. Public officials are too soft on criminals. Portland is becoming more populated which will make things worse.

Taxes and expenses to keep household.

Too many foreigners. Too many people.

Population increase brings more crime and drugs. Continuation of high taxes.

Too many people. Growing too fast. More crime, not safe.

Crime increase. Loss of control of youth. Police and judicial system don't have any power to control things. Larger population.

Combination of things. Population growth and there are already problems. Politicians aren't going to solve anything.

The more people, the worse it will get. Increased cost of living. Low wages. A lack of unionization.

Because the influx in our population and society is becoming so dysfunctional with families falling apart.

I can see what's happening in California in relation to gangs. I really have doubts that Portland will be able to handle it adequately with police and therefore will spiral out into the suburbs. Funding isn't going to be there for the schools and the policing because of Measure 5.

More buildings, more people, more apartments. More crowded conditions.

Overcrowding. It's really getting overcrowded. We're from Klamath Falls. Here it's really getting crowded.

The growth. That's why I moved here in the first place twenty year ago because of the lack of development.

Because of the increase of people in this area. It's harder to get to work because of the traffic. I also think the increase in population has something to do with the increase in crime.

I feel Oregon is becoming a mini California. It's becoming too corporate. There's too many businesses and not enough wildlife.

There's more people selling off their land. Big developers are coming in and building more and more houses. I just see the land going.

The increased population density. Also the increased traffic.

Everybody is doing their own thing. Serving themselves instead of thinking of someone else. When everyone is so self-serving, things can only get worse.

I don't think funds are being put to what they should be. Like the streets. The gangs. I moved out here from SE 76th to get away from the gangs. Just the recession. That's all I can say, people are getting poorer.

A lot of crowding, more people and traffic. More crime, more deterioration and problems. More crack and a scarier place to live. Harder to protect yourself and kids.

I think all areas of the country will get worse including Portland. The criminals are taking over. Justice system doesn't work. I feel political system needs changing in order to better the quality of life you're telling me about. They are not doing the job.

As numbers of people increase, more crime and more traffic problems in getting around.

The gangs are moving into the suburbs. The fact all the smaller towns may go under, due to timber problems. They don't have money for schools as nobody is working. More people are coming out to the suburbs and getting away from the city.

I've read they steal cars and damage them and police put it on low priority and this will get worse. Break-ins in homes will be worse. We don't have enough police.

Will be hectic if projections come true. More traffic and more people in shopping areas. More fumes from cars.

Too many people and crime is going up and violence due to too many people.

Increased population and probably crimes. With increased population goes crowding and more difficult transportation problems.

Increased population. More crowded, more crime.

Because of the congestion. The influx of people coming in. The pollution from automobiles.

So overpopulated. Even in the country. People are starting to realize the city is not a place to raise kids. Atmosphere. Air will be worse because cars and more population.

It continues to grow and we don't have the tax base. It will lose community services and the police services will decline.

More people. More crime, pollution, and worse parking. Prices will be worse.

The crowds and the crime. The pollution. Less police protection. Vehicle and industrial emissions. Parking will be worse and traffic and taxes will sky rocket.

The traffic will become worse. In 2 years I've seen it get worse. It's off the freeway. Freeways are full and going over to surface roads to get to town. I fear more crime and more drugs and tougher for my kids.

There will be too much traffic and no efficient way to travel and no interesting things to do. I'd like to live in New York City where there are places to go and things to do. No efficient mass transit.

The population will increase and the amount of crime with it. Taxes will go higher as different agencies try to provide.

Population growth, pollution, environmental problems, and economic difficulties. I'm not optimistic that schools will improve. Air, water pollution, and loss of land. Farm land around the edge of town will disappear, not much will be left. Don't know if population base will be supported by the economy. Will not be enough jobs.

It will be more crowded.

Because more people are coming in.

I'm not a native Oregonian. When I first came here, it was so beautiful here 30 years ago. The big buildings downtown create a wind and you can't see the West Hills.

It's going to be overpopulated and the crime rate will go higher.

Too many people. It's growing way too fast.

Because of the influx of people coming in.

Influx of people.

Because people are becoming ruthless and there is no role models anymore.

Because of the increase in population. I don't see the politicians taking care of the problems.

APPENDIX J
METRO 2040 SURVEY
MARCH, 1992

Interviewer Name: _____

Date: _____ Questionnaire Number: _____ 1 _____ 2 _____ 3

Hello, my name is _____ from Decision Sciences, a public opinion research firm. We're conducting a short confidential survey on the future of the greater Portland metropolitan area which includes the urban, suburban, and rural areas of Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington counties. Your opinions are very important to us. Your answers are completely confidential.

1. Think about the part of the metropolitan area **where you live and that you consider to be your neighborhood**. What do you like most about living there? (RECORD VERBATIM AND PROBE.)

DO NOT RECORD IN THIS SPACE			
4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11
DK = 88 NR = 99			

2. (IF MORE THAN ONE LIKE) Of all the things you like, which **one** thing do you like **the most**? (CIRCLE LIKE ABOVE: ONLY WRITE IN THIS SPACE IF RESPONDENT GIVES NEW LIKE NOT MENTIONED ABOVE.)

DO NOT RECORD IN THIS SPACE	
12	13
DK = 88 NR = 99	

3. What do you dislike about living in your part of the metropolitan area? (RECORD VERBATIM AND PROBE.)

DO NOT RECORD IN THIS SPACE			
14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21
DK = 88 NR = 99			

4. (IF MORE THAN ONE DISLIKE) Of all the things you dislike, which **one** thing do you dislike **the most**? (CIRCLE DISLIKE ABOVE: ONLY WRITE IN THIS SPACE IF RESPONDENT GIVES NEW LIKE NOT MENTIONED ABOVE.)

DO NOT RECORD IN THIS SPACE	
22	23
DK = 88 NR = 99	

5. Thinking about all the different communities and neighborhoods that make up the metropolitan area, which ones would you find appealing as places to live? (RECORD VERBATIM BELOW AND PROBE.)

DO NOT RECORD IN THIS SPACE			
24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31
DK = 88 NR = 99			

6. What things about these areas make them appealing to you as places to live? (RECORD VERBATIM BELOW AND PROBE.)

DO NOT RECORD IN THIS SPACE			
32	33	34	35
36	37	38	39
DK = 88 NR = 99			

7. Now, consider appealing places to work in the metropolitan area. Regardless of your occupation, think about all the different communities and neighborhoods that make up the metropolitan area, which ones would you find appealing as places to work? (RECORD VERBATIM BELOW AND PROBE.)

DO NOT RECORD IN THIS SPACE			
40	41	42	43
44	45	46	47
DK = 88 NR = 99			

8. What things about these areas make them appealing to you as places to work? (RECORD VERBATIM BELOW AND PROBE.)

DO NOT RECORD IN THIS SPACE			
48	49	50	51
52	53	54	55
DK = 88 NR = 99			

9. We've considered places to live and places to work, what about different communities and neighborhoods in the metropolitan area that you find appealing as places to shop? (RECORD VERBATIM BELOW AND PROBE.)

DO NOT RECORD IN THIS SPACE			
56	57	58	59
60	61	62	63
DK = 88 NR = 99			

10. What things about these areas make them appealing to you as places to shop? (RECORD VERBATIM BELOW AND PROBE.)

DO NOT RECORD IN THIS SPACE			
64	65	66	67
68	69	70	71
DK = 88 NR = 99			

11. In the next 20 years, do you see quality of life in the metropolitan area as getting better, staying about the same, or getting worse?

- 72- 1. Better
2. Same
3. Worse
4. DK/NS
5 NR

12. (IF BETTER TO Q. 11) Why?

DO NOT RECORD IN THIS SPACE			
73	74	75	76
77	78	79	80
DK = 88 NR = 99			

13. (IF WORSE TO Q. 11) Why?

DO NOT RECORD IN THIS SPACE			
81	82	83	84
85	86	87	88
DK = 88 NR = 99			

Because of its quality of life, high quality work force, and location on the Pacific Rim, the economy of the metropolitan area is expected to grow. The growth of the economy will bring benefits and costs: more jobs and opportunities for shopping and entertainment, more need for and availability of public services, and more pressure on natural areas and environmental quality. I'd now like to ask you some questions about how you would like that growth to occur in the metropolitan area.

For each question, you will be asked to choose a number on a 1 to 7 scale that comes closest to the way you personally feel about the issues involved.

14. Some people believe that to provide public services and transit efficiently, maintain environmental quality, and protect farm and forest land, new growth and development should occur within existing neighborhoods and business districts. Others believe that focusing growth in existing areas will be expensive, even disruptive, and that new growth should occur on vacant land, moving out from the fringes of the existing developed area. Using the 7 point scale, where 1 is growth primarily in developed areas and 7 is growth in undeveloped areas, which number comes closest to the way you personally feel? You would use numbers 3, 2, or 1 depending on how strongly you feel that growth should primarily be in developed areas. Use 5, 6, or 7 if you lean towards feeling that growth should occur in undeveloped areas. If you feel both are equally important, try to make yourself fall on one side of the fence or the other, but if you still think both are of equal importance, select 4. If you are unsure (please try not to be!), just say so. Again, using the 7 point scale, where 1 is growth primarily in developed areas and 7 is growth in undeveloped areas, which number comes closest to the way you personally feel?

89-	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
								Don't Know	NR
	GROWTH PRIMARILY IN DEVELOPED AREAS			BOTH EQUAL		GROWTH IN UNDEVELOPED AREAS			

15. Traffic congestion has increased as the Portland metropolitan area has grown. Some people believe that public funds should be used to widen existing roads and build new ones to preserve the convenience and freedom of driving a car. Others believe future transportation problems are best resolved by greater investment in mass transit. Again, using the same 7 point scale where 1 is investment in roads for cars and 7 is investment in mass transit, which number comes closest to the way you personally feel? Again, you can choose any number from 1 to 7.

90-	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
								Don't Know	NR
	ROADS FOR CARS			BOTH EQUAL		MASS TRANSIT			

16. Though Portland will almost certainly remain the central city of the region, as growth occurs other urban centers will get larger. Some people feel that market forces will cause such growth to retain its suburban character, with mostly moderate concentrations of low-rise shopping centers and offices. Other people believe that public policy and investment should encourage the growth of new, large scale, high-rise office and commercial development in a few centers outside downtown Portland. Again, using the same 7 point scale where 1 is suburban-like growth and 7 is downtown-like growth, which number comes closest to the way you personally feel? You can choose any number from 1 to 7.

91-	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
								Don't Know	NR
	SUBURBAN-LIKE GROWTH			BOTH EQUAL		DOWNTOWN- LIKE GROWTH			

17. Some people want to live close to where they work to reduce commuting time, perhaps close enough to walk or ride a bicycle to work. Other people prefer to live in an area with residences only for reasons of space, privacy, or design, and to rely on the car and mass transit to get to work. Using the 7 point scale where 1 is live and work in the same area and 7 is live separate from work area, which number comes closest to the way you personally feel? You can choose any number from 1 to 7.

92-	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
								Don't Know	NR
	LIVE AND WORK IN SAME AREA			BOTH EQUAL		LIVE SEPARATE FROM WORK AREA			

18. Some people feel that in the future, areas should be planned so that residential and commercial areas are mixed together and designed so that it is easy to walk or bicycle to shopping for everyday needs like groceries and the cleaners. Others feel that there should be a separation between residential and shopping areas to avoid any negative impacts on housing like noise and traffic and that people will always use their cars for shopping trips. Again, using a 7 point scale, where 1 is mixed use centers and 7 is residential-shopping separation, which number comes closest to the way you personally feel. You can choose any number from 1 to 7.

93-	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
								Don't Know	NR
	MIXED USE CENTERS ONLY			BOTH EQUAL		RESIDENTIAL SHOPPING SEPARATION			

19. Finally, some people believe that to ensure affordability of future housing, we should initiate public policies that encourage some smaller homes, smaller land parcels, more attached housing units, and other designs that reduce costs. Others believe such policies are not only unnecessary but perhaps wasteful, and that the market place will produce more affordable housing in response to demand from consumers. Again, using the same 7 point scale where 1 is public policy for housing affordability and 7 is no need for public policy for housing affordability, which number comes closest to the way you personally feel? You can choose any number from 1 to 7.

94-	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
								Don't Know	NR
	POLICY FOR HOUSING AFFORDABILITY			BOTH EQUAL		NO NEED FOR PUBLIC POLICY FOR HOUSING AFFORDABILITY			

I have just a few more questions for statistical purposes only. Again, your answers will be kept strictly confidential. This information will help us assure the validity of the study and analyze the survey results.

20. How long have you lived in the Portland Metropolitan Area?

- 95- 1- Less than 1 year
 2- 1-2 years
 3- 3-5 years
 4- 6-10 years
 5- 11-20 years
 6- 20+ years
 7- Refused

21. What is the county in which you reside?

- 96- 1- Multnomah
 2- Clackamas
 3- Washington
 4- Refused

22. How would you describe the setting in which you reside: rural, rural changing to suburban, suburban, or rural?

- 97- 1- Rural
 2- Rural changing to suburban
 3- Suburban
 4- Urban
 5- Refused

23. What was your major activity during the week before last?

- 98- 1- Working full-time (30 hrs. or more)
 2- Working part-time (Less than 30 hrs.)
 3- Have job but not at work because of illness, vacation, strike, etc.
 4- Looking for work, unemployed, laid off
 5- Attending school
 6- Retired
 7- Keeping house
 8- Other
 9- Refused

24. How many trips have you taken on a Tri-Met bus or MAX in the last month? Count each direction as one trip.

- 99- 1- Frequent user (13 trips or more)
 2- Infrequent user (2-12 trips)
 3- Non-user
 4- Refused

25. What is your zip code?

9 7
 100 101 102

26. Do any children under age 18 live in your household?

- 103- 1- Yes
 2- No
 3- Refused

27. Is your age between:

- 104- 1- 18 – 24
 2- 25 – 34
 3- 35 – 44
 4- 45 – 54
 5- 55 – 64
 6- 65+
 7- Refused

28. Gender (DON'T ASK/RECORD)

- 105- 1- Male
 2- Female

INTERVIEWER RECORD:

Respondent's First Name: _____

Respondent's Phone Number: _____ - _____

Verification Receipt: By this signature, I hereby certify that I have properly filled out the survey honestly, completely, and correctly. I understand that should I falsify, or in any manner misrepresent the information gathered on this instrument, I will be solely liable for damages that might accrue to Decision Sciences, Inc.

 Interviewer's Signature

 Date

REGION 2040: CHOICES FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

METRO



**Play an important
role in the region's
future**

Join the Metropolitan Service District (Metro) for workshop discussions that focus on **you** – what you like and don't like about the region, what you see as important issues during the next 50 years, how and where you believe growth should occur and what steps you believe we should take to further enhance this region's livability.

These workshops are an important part of the public involvement phase of Region 2040, a Metro planning project that will help people decide what this region will be, and look like, in the next 50 years – through the year 2040.

Please join us for one (or all) of these free, hands-on workshops that will allow you to make a difference in the region's future. For more information, call Mary Weber at Metro, 221-1646, ext. 117.

**Saturday, June 13
9-11:30 a.m.**

Westminster
Presbyterian Church
Great Hall
1624 NE Hancock
Portland

**Wednesday, June 17
7-9:30 p.m.**

Washington County Public
Services Building
Cafeteria
155 N First Ave.
Hillsboro

**Tuesday, June 16
7-9:30 p.m.**

Mt. Hood Community College
Town and Gown Room
2600 SE Stark
Gresham

**Thursday, June 18
7-9:30 p.m.**

Clackamas County
Department of Transportation
and Development
2nd floor, Room A
902 Abernethy Rd.
Oregon City

METROPOLITAN AREA URBAN RESERVES PROJECT

PRELIMINARY PROJECT OUTLINE 5/27/92

- 1) Initial Data Review - Panels of "experts" will be constituted to review the data in the RLIS system and rank its importance for locating lands best suited for residential development, employment, agriculture/forestry, and conservation. The product of this step will be maps for each of the land use categories listed above. To be completed by mid-June, 1992.
- 2) Map Review - Maps generated in Step 1 will be provided to jurisdictions, sewerage/storm drainage providers, water providers, transportation planners, parks/greenspaces agencies, and agriculture/forestry producers and processors for review. The purpose of this step will be to confirm or revise the expectations of the "expert panels". To be completed by late July, 1992.
- 3) Revise Maps - Based on the review in Step 2 and a follow-up meeting with the panels in Step 1, the maps will be revised. To be completed by mid-August, 1992.
- 4) Public Review - The set of maps generated in the first three steps will be reviewed by the public through a series of workshops. The purposes for the workshops will be to acquaint the public with the data and the process, to receive comments from the public regarding the map products, and to initiate a discussion regarding the synthesis of the map views into prospective urban reserve sites. To be completed by October, 1992.
- 5) RTAC/RPAC Proposed Reserves - RTAC will provide RPAC with a first-cut synthesis of the views into proposed urban reserves. Control totals for expected long-term growth will be provided by Metro in order to specify the size of the reserves and the land characteristics needed. Based on the nature of the mapped views, RTAC may decide to furnish a single set of urban reserves to RPAC. Alternatively, RTAC may decide to consider an urban reserves alternative for each of the alternatives emerging through the Region 2040 Study, and thereby provide RPAC with more than one set of proposed reserves. RPAC will recommend a set of urban reserves, responsive to the control totals and the Region 2040 alternatives, for public hearing and submission to the Metro Council. To be completed by January, 1993.
- 6) Public Review - The RPAC proposal will be taken to the public in the form of public hearings. To be completed by March, 1993.
- 7) Review and Revision - Based on the comments received at hearing, RTAC and RPAC will revise the urban reserves proposal. To be completed by May, 1993.
- 8) Metro Council Hearing and Adoption - The Metro Council will hold hearings on the urban reserves proposal and either remand the proposal to RPAC for additional work, revise the proposal and adopt it, or simply adopt the proposal as submitted. To be completed July, 1993.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE METROPOLITAN GREENSPACES MASTER PLAN

THE NEED TO PROTECT OPEN SPACE

An increase of 480,000 persons is projected for the Portland -Vancouver metropolitan area over the next twenty years, and more land will be developed to meet this anticipated growth.

If there are to be parks and open space areas in the future, we need to reposition our planning and funding priorities to reflect the importance of greenspaces in our urban fabric.

In 1989, Metro inventoried and mapped the remaining natural sites within a 372,682 acre study area. At that time approximately 29 percent (108,545 acres) of the metropolitan region's land (including the Columbia Gorge between the Sandy River and the Mt. Hood National Forest) was considered to be largely without human-made structures. Approximately 8.5% of the land in the entire study area is in public parks ownership and/or currently protected as natural areas or open space.

We cannot take it for granted that these green places will remain with us as we grow into the future. If the people of the Portland-Vancouver area seek to retain a green heritage as we grow, we must act now to protect significant natural areas, open spaces, parks, forests, wetlands, rivers and streams, riparian corridors, and wildlife habitat.

THE METROPOLITAN GREENSPACES VISION

We enjoy a high quality of life in the Portland, Oregon - Vancouver, Washington metropolitan area. The diversity of natural landscapes — broad river valleys stippled with wetlands, narrow river canyons veiled by green strips of riparian vegetation, buttes and forests, mountains and meadows, foothills and farms — impart a special sense of place and character to this metropolitan area.

To ensure that a green legacy is protected for ourselves and future generations, we have created the Metropolitan Greenspaces Program. It is a cooperative approach among many governmental and nongovernmental organizations to establish an inter-connected system of natural areas, open space, trails and greenways for wildlife and people throughout the four county metropolitan area.

The Metropolitan Greenspaces Program seeks to nurture rather than disfigure nature's landscape. It seeks to institutionalize a daily sense of stewardship for our remaining green places.

PURPOSE OF THE METROPOLITAN GREENSPACES MASTER PLAN

The Metropolitan Greenspaces Master Plan proposes a cohesive strategy to realize our vision. Through sustained implementation of its recommendations, we will continue to celebrate our special sense of place.

Protection of natural resource areas in the public interest is the primary objective of the Metropolitan Greenspaces Master Plan. The Master Plan is a policy document that includes specific tasks which need to be carried out over the coming years to achieve our goal of maintaining the quality of life for the region and protecting open space in perpetuity for the public good.

The patches of natural area within the human dominated urban landscape form the supporting remnant systems of native flora and fauna which once flourished throughout the area. They also form an integral part of the visual setting associated with the metropolitan region.

This Master Plan identifies the remaining natural areas within the urban and urbanizing parts of the region, evaluates their significance and relationship to the ecology of the regional landscape, and proposes a system of regional natural areas and connecting corridors to be designated for preservation.

The Regional / Local Partnership

A regional system of interconnected natural areas, parks, and open space, once established, will be managed and operated in partnership by Metro, local, state and federal agencies, nonprofit conservation organizations, land trusts, citizens and other stakeholders. Some lands will be owned by Metro, some lands by other park providers, some by nonprofit land trusts, individuals, and businesses. Emphasis is on interagency cooperation and partnerships. Metro will not assume management responsibility for existing parks and/or natural areas owned or managed by other agencies without the consent of both the current provider and the Metro Council.

Metro's Role

Growth management is a priority for Metro and most of the local jurisdictions in the region. Metro is responsible for coordinating the efforts of all agencies on growth management issues in the region. Metro's Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGOs) cover these growth management issues; RUGGO Goal II, Objective Number 9 lists natural areas, parks, and wildlife habitat as crucial issues to be dealt with within the regional perspective.

Regional planning authority is an important tool available to Metro for natural resources protection. Regional plans for issues of metropolitan significance like transportation, water quality, and urban growth are used to influence local comprehensive plans. Natural areas planning and protection are to be elevated to the same level of priority.

Metro, as the lead agency in the development and implementation of the Greenspaces Master Plan, will protect significant natural areas and open space using its various powers, which include its financial and land use authorities. Coupled with the authorities of cities, counties, special districts, state and federal agencies, much can be done to protect our natural resource lands.

The Metro Council will formally review and adopt the Metropolitan Greenspaces Master Plan during the spring and early summer of 1992. The Plan will serve as a policy document for the agency to begin various implementation activities to protect and potentially acquire regionally significant greenspaces.

Metro as overall coordinator of the Greenspaces Program will address the challenges of overcoming different perspectives and priorities within jurisdictional boundaries, limited long-term funding mechanisms, and a general community assumption that "our green spaces will always be here" that have hampered implementation of a comprehensive strategy to protect regional natural areas and open space for nearly a century.

IMPACTS OF HUMAN SETTLEMENT

Human settlement initiated a process which has resulted in persistent and massive alteration of the regional landscape. Because the regional landscape is a complex mosaic of topographic, geologic, and biologic features interacting with human uses, a new mosaic of human settlement often displaces large areas of native cover. This

causes fragmentation and requires adjustments to balances among pre-existing ecological systems.

Development for human uses or occupation results in fragmentation which is usually permanent. Many features of the human landscape block or inhibit natural connectivity and flow in the landscape and can limit biodiversity. These disruptions include transportation and utility rights-of-way and facilities, agricultural fencing, cleared agricultural lands, culverted sections of streams, and heavily altered riparian zones.

Animal species are inextricably linked to the habitat which sustains them, and assuring the survival of species requires that their habitat continues to sustain their needs.

Fragmentation of habitat continues today as we expand onto the landscape and construct barriers within formerly contiguous patches of the landscape. Within our living and working spaces - those places that are within easy reach for ourselves and our children - the rich diversity of plants and wildlife which thrived in the pristine state of this region continues to diminish.

Protection and enhancement of the habitat that remains within a rational overall system of greenspaces will assure its continuity for future generations to enjoy. Many of the needs of wildlife parallel those of our own, and the benefits to wildlife are mutually beneficial to human populations. Positive interaction with our native landscape can continue to coexist with efforts toward sustainable future development.

Existing Geographic Features

The topography of the region has been shaped by many events in its geological history, including the Bretz Floods, which were responsible for many of the landscape characteristics that make up the Portland metropolitan area. Many of these features provide green backdrops for portions of the city, distinct terrace forms, or elevated patches of green visible from many parts of the city.

Nine distinct geographic features are readily distinguished in the Oregon portion of the metropolitan region. These geographic units are:

1. The Columbia River
2. The Sandy River and Cascade Foothills
3. The Boring Lava Domes
4. The Clackamas River and Oregon City Plateau
5. Petes Mountain, Parrett Mountain, Chehalem Mountains
6. The Coast Range
7. Tualatin Mountains, Forest Park, and the West Hills
8. Tualatin River Valley
9. Willamette Valley

This variety of features supports a broad diversity of wildlife habitat and preserves the perception of open space within a built-up area. As urbanization continues to spread onto the countryside, our perspective must shift beyond the landmarks of earlier times. Mt. Tabor and Rocky Butte seemed impossibly distant for urbanization at the time of the Olmsted Report, and yet they are now islands in a sea of residential and commercial development. Our planning horizons must continue to expand as pressure for additional development pushes to grow beyond the current urbanized areas.

NATURAL HABITAT AND WATERSHEDS OF THE REGION

GOALS:

Identify and protect natural and scenic resources through programs which preserve and ensure open space and natural resources for future generations and promote healthy and visually attractive environments in harmony with the natural landscape character.

Preserve and enhance biological diversity and ecological integrity within the metropolitan area.

Create the Metropolitan Greenspaces Program in the context of ecosystems, using watersheds as primary units of analysis.

POLICIES:

Metro and Cooperators in the Metropolitan Greenspaces Program will:

3.1. Establish a natural area system following ecological considerations that encourage biodiversity and connections between watersheds.

Metro will:

3.2. Coordinate efforts by appropriate local, regional, state, federal, and citizen-based organizations to create a regional system of natural areas, open space, trails, and greenways for wildlife and for people in Multnomah, Washington, Clackamas (and Clark, WA) Counties. The geographic focus for protection and acquisition efforts in the Oregon component of the Greenspaces system will be bounded to the east by the Mt. Hood National Forest boundary, to the south by Oregon State Route 211 and the Chehalem Mountains, to the west by the Coast Range, and to the north by the Columbia River. (Clark County is responsible for the Washington State component of the system.)

3.3. Consider lands outside of the Urban Growth Boundary and Metro's jurisdictional boundary for protection and potential addition to the regional system when these lands enhance the system and protect natural resources and features of regional significance.

3.4. Negotiate public access agreements at key sites within greenspaces of regional significance, if the land is not in public ownership.

3.5. Potentially acquire and protect historic or cultural resource sites associated with urban natural areas.

The landscape of the Portland-Vancouver region is composed of interacting ecosystems, changing land features that are dissimilar in form and function but woven together in interacting ecosystems. This regional landscape ecology has been the context under which planning for the Metropolitan Greenspaces system has been undertaken.

In defining the vision and priorities for the Greenspaces Program, it is important to look at the context within which each natural area lies, including the structure and use of the surrounding landscape and how it fits within the region as a whole.

The destruction of natural habitats and conversion of land to other uses is the greatest threat to the biodiversity of relatively intact natural communities in and around the region. Loss of biological diversity is an irreversible process and is probably the most important effect of environmental change. Providing adequate habitat patches and defining thresholds of habitat fragmentation are important if we are to ensure the occupancy of habitats by desired species.

The basic landscape unit of a region is the watershed or stream basin. It relates directly to hydrology, a key parameter of the natural environment. Activities within the watershed have a cumulative impact, and each use must be balanced in order to maintain a healthy overall system.

The Master Plan includes descriptions and an analysis, by watershed, of the opportunities for establishing an ecologically based Greenspaces system, including recommendations of general priorities for protection in each of the 22 watersheds identified. The individual watershed analyses are organized to be consistent with the nine geographic units outlined above.

REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT TRAILS, GREENWAYS, & WILDLIFE CORRIDORS

GOALS:

Establish an extensive four-county system of interconnected natural areas, open space, parks, trails, greenways, and wildlife corridors so that each community in the region may benefit from access to at least one link in the system.

POLICIES:

Metro and Cooperators in the Metropolitan Greenspaces Program will:

- 4.1. Work in a coordinated manner to establish a comprehensive four-county system of interconnected trails, greenways, and corridors that will provide a variety of recreational and educational opportunities. This regional system will link urban communities and connect greenspaces with local, inter-regional, and national trails.
- 4.2. Facilitate planning efforts that ensure trail and greenway connections between the various jurisdictions. When possible and if appropriate, standard trail development guidelines will be used by the adjacent local jurisdictions.
- 4.3. Prioritize, on a regional basis, trails, greenways, and corridors according to the following criteria:
 - * trails and corridors which interconnect natural areas, parks, open space, and destinations of regional significance;
 - * length and continuity of trail and/or corridor;
 - * connections to inter-regional trails (trails which go outside the district's boundaries)
 - * wildlife usage;
 - * amount of local support for the trail and/or corridor;
 - * public accessibility;
 - * immediacy of decision when opportunities to establish corridors may be lost due to imminent development or changes in property ownership;
 - * abandoned rail corridors;
 - * trails along the Willamette Greenway;
 - * suitability to establish river trails.

Metro will:

4.4. Inventory and prepare a master map and list of trails, greenways, and corridors for the region.

4.5. Coordinate planning, funding, acquisition, design, development, and construction of three key trail alignments of regional significance: Hagg Lake to Mt. Hood National Forest Trails; Sauvie Island / Forest Park to Oxbow Park Trail; and Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge to Barton Park Trail.

Interconnections between natural areas, parks, and open spaces are crucial to the health and existence of the ecosystem. Wildlife corridors as well as recreational trails need to be continuous. It is, therefore, important that Metro, local, state, and federal agencies, along with interested businesses, citizens and neighborhood groups, work together to develop and implement a system of regional trails and greenways as part of the Metropolitan Greenspaces system.

A network of interconnected trails and corridors is a major component in the Greenspaces Master Plan. Linkages provided by such a network provide linear systems for recreation, transportation, and wildlife movement. The metropolitan region is fortunate in having access to a larger network of trails to which connections from the urbanized areas can be anticipated. Consideration of existing and proposed trails of wider influence provides a useful planning context for a four-county system, the focus of which will include both existing and proposed trails.

The definition and hierarchy of trails is as follows:

Regionally significant trails, greenways, and wildlife corridors

Of importance to the Metropolitan Greenspaces system are trails which connect to regionally significant sites, are multi-jurisdictional, multi-modal, and which connect to national, inter-regional, or other regional trails.

Land-based Trails

These are multi-modal / recreational (e.g. hiking, biking, pedestrian, equestrian, etc.) alignments primarily used by people.

Greenways:

These are linear vegetated corridors often associated with rivers and streams which could be shared by both humans and wildlife.

Wildlife Corridors

These are linear natural areas and habitats primarily reserved for wildlife needs.

River trails

River trails are rivers navigable by small craft which provide water-based recreational opportunities and offer connections which might not be possible on land-based trails. Where possible, opportunities for acquisition of additional lands along the rivers for public access will be explored as well as easements for land-based trails.

Using criteria delineated in Policy 5.3., representatives of local parks providers, interested citizens, nonprofit groups, and agencies have outlined and prioritized an inventory of trails, greenways, and corridors in order to create this system.

Trails and Greenways of Inter-Regional Significance
(The following list is not in any priority order)

INTERCONNECTION	TYPE OF CONNECTION	GEOGRAPHIC UNITS
Portland to Coast Trail	Land-based trail	Tualatin Mountains, Tualatin Valley, Coast Range
Greenway to the Pacific	Wildlife corridor/Land- based trail	Tualatin Mountains, Columbia River, Coast Range
Lower Columbia Gorge Trail	Land-based trail	Columbia River, Sandy River
Springwater Corridor Trail: Barton Park to Estacada	Land-based trail	Willamette Valley, Boring Lava Domes, Clackamas River, Cascade Foothills
Willamette Greenway: Wilsonville to Cottage Grove	River trail/Greenway/Land- based trail	Willamette Valley

**Regionally Significant Trails, Greenways & Wildlife Corridors
Clackamas County**

(The following list is not in any priority order)

INTERCONNECTION	TYPE OF CONNECTION	GEOGRAPHIC UNITS
North Clackamas Trail	Land-based trail	Boring Lava Domes, Clackamas River
Clackamas River Greenway Trail	River trail/Greenway/ Land- based trail	Clackamas River, Cascade Foothills
Newell Creek Canyon Corridor/Beaver Lake Trail	Greenway/Land-based trail/Wildlife corridor	Clackamas River/Oregon City Plateau, Willamette Valley
Portland Traction R-O-W: Portland to Oregon City	Land-based trail	Clackamas River, Willamette Valley
Willamette Greenway	River trail/Greenway/Land- based trail	Willamette Valley
Springwater Corridor Trail	Land-based trail	Cascade Foothills, Boring Lava Domes, Willamette Valley
Mt. Hood National Forest Trails	Land-based trail	Sandy River/Cascade Foothills, Clackamas River
Oregon Trail/Barlow Road	Land-based trail	Sandy River/Cascade Foothills, Clackamas River/Oregon City Plateau
East Willamette Greenway: Gladstone to Milwaukie	Land-based trail	Willamette Valley
Tualatin Greenway: Tualatin to West Linn	River trail/Greenway/Land- based trail	Tualatin Valley, Pete's Mountain, Willamette Valley
Tonquin Trail: Willamette Greenway to Tualatin River	Land-based trail	Tualatin Valley, Willamette Valley

**Regionally Significant Trails, Greenways & Wildlife Corridors
Multnomah County**

(The following list is not in any priority order)

INTERCONNECTION	TYPE OF CONNECTION	GEOGRAPHIC UNITS
Forty-Mile Loop	Land-based trail	Tualatin Mountains/Forest Park/West Hills, Willamette Valley, Boring Lava Domes, Sandy River, Columbia River
Springwater Corridor Trail	Land-based trail	Willamette Valley, Boring Lava Domes, Sandy River, Columbia River
Columbia Slough Trail	Land-based trail/Greenway	Columbia River
Beaver Creek Canyon Corridor Trail	Wildlife corridor/Land-based trail	Sandy River
Sandy River Greenway	River trail/Greenway	Sandy River/Cascade Foothills
I-205 Bikeway	Land-based trail	Willamette Valley, Columbia River
East Willamette Greenway Trail	Greenway/Land-based trail	Willamette Valley
West Willamette Greenway Trail	Greenway/Land-based trail	Willamette Valley
Forest Park Trails	Land-based trail	Tualatin Mountains/Forest Park/West Hills
I-5 Bridge	Land-based trail	Columbia River
Terwilliger/Marquam Trail	Land-based trail	Tualatin Mountains/Forest Park/West Hills, Willamette Valley
Tryon Creek Trail	Land-based trail	Willamette Valley, West Hills
Sauvie Island Bridge	Land-based trail	Willamette Valley, Columbia River
Mt. Hood National Forest Trails	Land-based trail	Sandy River/Cascade Foothills, Columbia River

**Regionally Significant Trails, Greenways & Wildlife Corridors
Washington County**

(The following list is not in any priority order)

INTERCONNECTION	TYPE OF CONNECTION	GEOGRAPHIC UNITS
Tualatin Greenway: Forest Grove to Tualatin	River trail/Greenway/Land-based trail	Tualatin Valley
Powerline Trail: St. John's Bridge to Tualatin River	Land-based trail	Columbia River, Tualatin Mountains/Forest Park, Tualatin Valley
Oregon Electric Railway Trail	Land-based trail	Tualatin Mountains, Tualatin Valley
Fanno Creek Greenway	Greenway/Land-based trail	West Hills, Tualatin Valley
Hagg Lake Trail	Land-based trail	Coast Range, Tualatin Valley
McKay Creek Trail	Land-based trail	Tualatin Valley
Rock Creek Trail	Land-based trail	Tualatin Valley
Beaverton Creek Trail	Land-based trail	Tualatin Valley
Bronson Creek Trail	Land-based trail	Tualatin Mountains/Forest Park, Tualatin Valley

REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT LARGE ACRE SITES

GOALS:

Identify regionally significant natural areas, open space, greenways, and wildlife corridors.

Initiate the creation of a regional system of greenspaces that are linked by wildlife corridors, greenways, and trails based on site analysis that balances human and wildlife needs.

POLICIES:

Metro and Cooperators in the Metropolitan Greenspaces Program will:

5.1. Focus on assembling natural area sites into and providing passive recreational opportunities within a regional greenspaces system.

5.2. Plan for the greenspaces system on an ecosystem or landscape ecology basis, using watersheds as primary units of analysis, so that a focus of planning remains on protecting and enhancing natural functions across jurisdictional boundaries as the region continues to urbanize.

5.3. Identify natural habitat and biological corridors and recommend programs to conserve, enhance, and secure appropriate management of existing habitat and nature reserves.

Metro will:

5.4. Coordinate efforts to protect natural areas and open space lands among local, state, regional, and federal agencies and nonprofit land conservation organizations to complement acquisition programs and maximize both financial and land resource potential.

5.5. Determine the priority and sequence of acquisition and protection of regionally significant greenspaces on a case by case basis, weighing human and wildlife needs, as well as factors related to the immediacy of potential loss of site.

Criteria to be used in prioritizing site selection

HUMAN COMPONENT

Geographic distribution
Connection to other sites
Natural qualities of the landscape
Proximity of sites to public access
Views and vistas
Local public support
Historical / Cultural context

BIOLOGICAL COMPONENT

Relative rarity of ecosystem
Connectivity to other habitat needs
Biological diversity
Parcel size
Wetlands and waterways
Feasibility of ecological restoration

Short Term Decisions

Inside Urban Growth Boundary • Few physical constraints on development • Transportation access •
Planning / Zoning for development

Medium Term Decisions

Outside UGB • Relatively large parcel without services • Limited transportation access •

Some physical limitations on construction

Long Term Decisions

Extreme limitations on construction • No current access to transportation •
Remote from existing development

Lands Protected by Other Means

REGULATION: State & Federal Wetlands fill and removal permitting programs • Comprehensive Plans, Zoning, and Environmental Zone overlay • Goal 5 inventories

PUBLIC CONTROL: Lands currently in public ownership • Land trust holdings • Easements

The Master Plan embraces the overall structure of the landscape and the habitats which are components of this framework. Through a combination of regional and local actions, the plan envisions building upon the existing structure and extending its influence into every community in the region.

The attached map presents "Regionally Significant Natural Areas, Greenways, and Trails". These are the major components of the proposed Greenspaces System that have been identified through Metro's inclusive and cooperative planning process. The map shows both existing regionally significant protected greenspaces and general geographic locations where Metro and cooperators in the Greenspaces Program should aggressively pursue additional large acreage protection. Once assembled together, these sites, will serve as "anchors" in the overall Greenspaces System. The existing and proposed regional trails system is also identified on the map.

The Master Plan lists each of the proposed large acre protection sites which appear on this map. It identifies the scale and categories of land assembly recommended. The watershed in which the potential protected areas are located is also identified. The four land assembly action categories are defined as follows:

River Access: 50 acres is felt to be sufficient for parking, limited picnic and passive recreation facilities, and small boat maneuvering and launching facilities. This should leave ample room for design compatible with natural features on the site and preservation of riparian vegetation.

Restoration: Restoration sites, or groups of sites, are sized at approximately 100 acres. Because these are in highly urbanized areas, fragmentation may make single parcels of this size impossible to obtain, but the cumulative effort will result in restoration of this magnitude.

Additions: These are lands added to an existing protected open space, natural area or park facility in order to buffer habitat or enhance the open space reserve. In general, these are assumed to be approximately 150 acres but could vary according to detailed studies.

Reserves: Reserves are large contiguous natural areas which vary in size from 250 to 1000 acres. As a reserve, capital improvements will be minimal, or at least lower priority than the previous categories. Where possible, these will be connected to biological corridors or other trail and greenway connections through the region, but will also function as large patches of self-sustaining landscape of high biological quality.

Assembly of the Greenspaces System and appropriate facility development will be an incremental process that comes about over a number of years. While a five-year acquisition and capital improvement plan will be prepared and periodically updated, it is also recognized that opportunism will be an important strategy that will affect the actual sequence of implementation of the plan relative to protection and improvement of specific sites and components of the Greenspaces System.

Regionally Significant Large Acre Sites Proposed for Protection

The sites in the following table are listed by watershed and geographic unit and are not in an order of priority themselves.

POTENTIAL SITES	ACTION CATEGORIES	WATERSHEDS
E. Columbia Shore	Addition/River Acss	Columbia River
Col. River Islands	Reserve	Columbia River
Heron Lakes	Restoration/Additn	Columbia River
Four Corners	Restoration	Columbia Slough
Johnson Lake	Restoration	Columbia Slough
Little Four Corners	Restoration	Columbia Slough
Peninsula Canal	Restoration/Additn	Columbia Slough
Fairview Headwaters	Addition/Rstoratn	Fairview Creek
Sandy River Gorge	Addition/River Acss	Sandy River
Boring Lava Domes	Reserve	Jhnsn Ck/Mt Scott Ck/Clackamas R
Mt. Talbert	Addition/Reserve	Kellogg/Mt Scott Ck
Scenic Clckms River	Addition/River Acss	Clackamas River
Rock/Sieben Creeks	Reserve	Clackamas River
Holcomb Trail Ruts	Restoration/Additn	Clackamas River
Beaver Lake	Reserve	Abmrthy/Newell Cks
Newell Creek Canyon	Reserve	Abmrthy/Newell Cks
Canemah Bluffs	Reserve	Willamette River
Petes Mountain	Reserve/Addition	Newland Ck/Wlmtte R
Hagg Lake	Addition	Tualatin River
Gales Creek	Reserve	Gales Creek
Council Creek	Reserve	Council Creek

Fern Hill Wetland	Addition	Tualatin River
Tualatin River	River Access	Tualatin River
Hedges Creek	Addition	Tualatin River
Sentinel Tree Park	Addition	Tualatin River
McKay/Dairy Creek	Reserve	McKay/Dairy Creeks
Rock Creek	Reserve	Rock Creek
Rock Creek Wetlands	Reserve	Rock Creek
Cedar Mill	Reserve	Bvrtn/Cedar Mill Ck
Cooper Mountain	Addition/Reserve	Tualtn R/Fanno Ck
Bull Mountain	Reserve	Tualtn R/Fanno Ck
Fanno Creek Grnway	Addition	Fanno Creek
Forest Park	Addition	Wlmtte R/Tualtn R
Tryon Creek Linkage	Addition/Rstoratn	Tryon Creek
Tonquin Geol Area	Reserve	Wlmtte R/Tualtn R
Willamette Narrows	Addition/Reserve	Willamette River
Wil River Islands	River Access	Willamette River
Finley Nature Rsrv	River Access	Willamette River
Milwaukie Wtrfront	River Access	Willamette River
Ross Island	Reserve/Access	Willamette River
Burlington Bottom	Addition	Willamette River
Kelly Butte	Addition	Willamette River
Northeast Portland	Restoration	Wlmtte R/Columbia R

COOPERATIVE AND COORDINATED PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Metro recognizes that successful implementation of the Metropolitan Greenspaces Master Plan depends on coordinated land protection efforts. Local, regional, state, and federal government agencies, nonprofit groups, and other stakeholders must work together to complement acquisition and protection programs. We must coordinate the development and application of land use and environmental regulations and educate and involve the public in issues and decisions related to greenspaces.

What follows are the goals and policies underlying a common agenda around which all cooperators in the Greenspaces Program can focus ongoing planning and future implementation efforts, including specific policy and funding discussions and land use regulatory actions that are statutorily and logically carried out at specific government levels.

GOALS: ACQUISITION, PROTECTION, AND ENHANCEMENT OF NATURAL AREAS

Maintain and enhance the livability of the urban region through initiatives which preserve environmental quality and inter-relate the benefits and consequences of growth in one part of the region with the benefits and consequences of growth in another.

Incorporate ecological considerations into regional development processes in order to protect sensitive natural areas and further nature conservation.

Acquire and/or promote conservation and enhancement of natural environments in the urban region for native plants and animals while providing a balance with human needs and recreational demands.

Create and implement a cooperative system of natural areas, open space, trails, and greenways for wildlife and for people in the four-county, bi-state Portland, Oregon / Vancouver, Washington metropolitan area.

POLICIES:

Metro and Cooperators in the Metropolitan Greenspaces Program will:

- 6.1. Develop system-wide guidelines and standards to be applied in operations and management of natural area and open space sites.
- 6.2. Prepare site-specific management plans for areas assembled as a part of the Greenspaces system.
- 6.3. Prepare and bi-annually update a five-year Acquisition and Capital Improvement Plan which will list land acquisition priorities and capital improvement projects on regionally significant sites and trails.
- 6.4. Execute inter-governmental agreements that are approved by the involved governing bodies whenever Metro agrees to assume responsibilities for a component of the Greenspaces system managed by another entity, or if another entity wishes to assume management responsibilities for a Metro-managed site.
- 6.5. Initiate a study of the long-term funding needs and options available for operating sites and programs in the Greenspaces system.

6.6. Consider disturbed sites, such as mineral extraction sites and landfills, as potential areas for restoration of natural vegetation and wildlife habitat and for integration into the Metropolitan Greenspaces system once activities causing disturbance cease.

6.7. Consider, on a case by case basis, the desirability of accepting into the Metropolitan Greenspaces system proposals involving mitigation efforts and/or sites. Principal tests will be that such sites or proposals physically extend or enhance the quality and diversity of the existing greenspaces system and that they comply with state and federal regulatory programs, including U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Environmental Protection Agency wetland mitigation policies.

Metro will:

6.8. Acquire and/or protect land through purchase, gift, by dedication, or in a conservation agreement and will pursue appropriate local, regional, state, federal, foundation, and private funding sources in its acquisition and operations strategies.

6.9. Some of the lands which will be acquired will be owned and operated by Metro. Some of the lands will be owned and operated by other cooperators in the Program, including local governments, water quality agencies, nonprofit conservation organizations, business corporations, and land trusts.

6.10. Metro will negotiate acquisition agreements primarily with willing sellers. Metro will exercise its powers of eminent domain only in extraordinary circumstances.

6.11. Have the option to use in-house services and/or contract with other agencies and/or private vendors for operations and maintenance of the sites and trails.

6.12. Assume management responsibilities of any park or natural areas owned and managed by other entities only with the consent of the governing body of the provider and the Metro Council.

6.13. Coordinate and publish the system-wide acquisition and improvement plans and updates so as to facilitate coordinated planning and implementation efforts.

GOALS: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF PUBLICLY-OWNED, QUASI-PUBLIC, AND PRIVATE TAX-EXEMPT LANDS

Incorporate native plants to the maximum extent practicable as the dominant landscape material on publicly-owned, quasi-public, and tax-exempt lands.

Manage these lands for maximum wildlife potential in both rural and urban settings throughout the metropolitan region.

POLICIES:

Metro and cooperators in the Greenspaces Program will:

6.14. Encourage adoption of planting standards which promote the use of appropriate native plants in the extensive

highway and utility rights-of-way in order to restore the original native plant community to the extent possible.

6.15. Encourage management practices by all road and utility providers and maintenance operations which enhance the potential for wildlife along rights-of-way.

6.16. Seek to prevent fragmentation of natural areas, trails, and corridors that are part of the protected Greenspaces System, once established, and seek to minimize disturbances or impacts to ecological systems (such as by roads or utility linkages). When adverse impacts are unavoidable, Metro and cooperators in the Greenspaces Program will advocate for appropriate mitigation efforts to minimize damage and/or losses at the expense of the responsible individual, agency, organization, or corporation.

6.17. Encourage appropriate agencies to provide native plantings on publicly-owned lands, such as transportation corridors, sewer, and water rights-of-way, and manage them for wildlife habitat values appropriate to the setting.

6.18. Inventory surplus government lands and tax-foreclosed properties within each jurisdiction on a regular basis and evaluate their potential as a part of the regional network of greenspaces. Surplus and tax-foreclosed lands suitable for inclusion in the Greenspaces system should be retained in public ownership.

6.19. Encourage holders of large tracts of open space, like golf courses, and holders of underutilized public lands and private tax-exempt parcels, including cemeteries, churches, and schools, to establish plantings compatible with the surrounding natural landscape. Maintenance practices should include minimal chemical input and the maximum utilization of native materials.

GOALS: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF WATERWAYS AND FLOODPLAINS

Further develop the potential of the region's waterways for recreation, education, tourism, the enjoyment and attractiveness of nature while minimizing impacts on the ecological systems which use the associated habitats.

Protect and improve the environment of waterways and assure continuity of the habitat characteristics along the shorelines and promote ecological continuity of riparian systems through public and private enhancement projects.

Seek improvements to the appearance of waterways throughout the metropolitan area, as well as seek to continue improvement of water quantity and quality of the region's streams and rivers.

Promote land drainage functions which are consistent with ecological and environmental considerations.

Safeguard floodable open areas in the river valleys and discourage construction of buildings or other obstructions to the natural flow of river systems.

POLICIES:

Metro and Cooperators in the Greenspaces Program will:

6.20. Promote the protection of natural areas along waterways and will encourage continuous improvement of water quantity and quality through liaison with agencies which influence changes along streams and rivers in the metropolitan area.

- 6.21. Promote access to river systems for recreation, education, and the enjoyment of these regional resources by the public in a manner consistent with protection of natural resource values.
- 6.22. Promote the incorporation of natural drainage systems into future planning and design processes and balance their contributions to environmental improvement with recreational uses.
- 6.23. Planning for greenspaces protection, land use, transportation, and water resources management issues are interrelated. Metro and cooperators in the Greenspaces Program will seek to address these through comprehensive and coordinated management strategies.

GOALS: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF AGRICULTURAL AND TIMBER LANDS

Provide linkages to and enhance greenspaces by retaining prime soils outside of the urban growth boundary in the Willamette and Tualatin Valleys in productive agricultural use.

Encourage agricultural practices that result in minimum soil erosion, tight nutrient cycles, and minimum chemical input to the watershed and environment that rural and urban lands share.

Retain communities close by the metropolitan region that preserve the cultural landscape associated with agricultural uses, thereby strengthening the practice of preserving exurban lands as rural greenspaces.

Support sustained-yield and environmentally sound forest practices which will assure the existence of greenspaces near the urban area over time and provide future availability of forest resources with minimum degradation to the environment.

POLICIES:

Metro and Cooperators in the Metropolitan Greenspaces Program will:

- 6.24. Work with the Oregon Department of Agriculture's Extension Services and other resource entities to promote settlement expansion which retains a sustainable agrarian landscape in this region.
- 6.25. Support planning, design, and management practices that conserve prime agricultural lands outside of the urban growth boundary, that support biodiversity, and that preserve the ability of these lands to remain highly productive.
- 6.26. Support sound farming practices, including implementation of erosion control practices and protection and/or restoration of riparian vegetation along water courses that are connected to the Greenspaces system.
- 6.27. Support environmentally sound management of public and private forest lands within or on the edges of the urbanizing region and strict enforcement of the state Forest Practices Act, where applicable, or local regulations as they relate to harvest on steep slopes, lands adjacent to watercourses and waterbodies, timely and effective reforestation.

GOALS: RESTORATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF AREAS DEFICIENT IN GREENSPACES

Provide natural areas and/or open space through restoration efforts in neighborhoods that have been so intensely

urbanized that greenspaces have been all but eliminated.

Policies:

Metro and Cooperators in the Greenspaces Program will:

6.28. Identify portions of the region deficient in natural areas and identify opportunities for major ecological restoration programs in these deficient areas.

Criteria to be used in selection of restoration sites

HUMAN COMPONENT

Access to sites from large population groups
Near to schools
Potential linkages to regional trail system
Community support for projects

ECOLOGICAL COMPONENT

Feasibility of ecological restoration
Component of existing open space (i.e. park)
Nearness to other potential habitat or corridors
Sustainability of ecosystem relative to adjacent land use
Significance of contribution to other beneficial environmental functions (i.e. water quantity/quality, floodplain protection)

Metro will:

6.29. Work with government agencies and citizens' groups to identify potential restoration sites in areas deficient in greenspaces.

6.30. Provide technical and financial assistance to local restoration projects, as resources allow.

6.31. Extend the potential for wildlife to coexist within a framework of settlement patterns by promoting land use design and management which encourages ecological diversity and restoration in areas that are deficient in greenspaces.

GOALS: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT THROUGH LAND USE PLANNING

Protect and preserve natural areas and open space through coordinated land-use decision-making and development review processes.

POLICIES:

Metro and Cooperators in the Greenspaces Program will:

6.32. Review and improve planning policies and ordinances which support greenspaces protection, enhancement, and management.

6.33. Develop model greenspaces ordinances which can be adopted by local governments.

6.34. Coordinate greenspace-related policy development, its implementation and enforcement across jurisdictional boundaries.

6.35. Convene a focus group of individuals in the building/development industry and local government planners to suggest urban design measures that preserve greenspaces.

6.36. Identify opportunities for streamlining, and bringing consistency to, development review processes at various levels of government for issues related to natural resources.

6.37. Emphasize coordination of issues with multiple layers of government regulation and permitting, such as stream corridor protection, stormwater runoff, buffer zones, wetlands identification and mitigation.

Metro will:

6.38. Update the Greenspaces Master Plan on a periodic basis with the consultation of appropriate policy advisory and technical advisory committees, local, state and federal agencies, land trusts, conservation organizations, and the citizens of the region.

6.39. Use local park master plans and comprehensive plans as one set of building blocks for identifying and implementing a regionally interconnected Greenspaces system.

6.40. Update the regional natural areas inventory and mapping project every five years, with field verification and data collection continuing on an on-going basis, as resources allow, and produce and update a consolidated regional parks directory / natural areas directory.

6.41. Participate in development of open space plans at the federal, state, regional, county, and city levels and will assist these agencies in implementing their open space land acquisition plans and regulatory functions, as resources allow.

GOALS: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT THROUGH RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS

Ensure consistency and continuity through coordinated management plans delineating operating practices at natural area sites that are maintained in the metropolitan-wide Greenspaces system.

POLICIES

Metro will:

6.42. Prepare resource management plans for specific regionally significant natural area sites, in cooperation with local governments, special districts, and non-profit groups, within a specified time frame after securing them.

6.43. Potentially adopt interim protection guidelines during preparation of management plans for regionally significant sites.

GOALS: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT THROUGH CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT AND EDUCATION

Ensure that ecological knowledge and information is available and shared with citizens and other stakeholders in the Greenspaces Program to shape both the planning and management of the metropolitan area environment and encourage voluntary stewardship practices by people from all walks of life.

Promote and encourage citizen awareness of greenspace issues, involvement in, education about, and active stewardship of greenspaces and related issues.

Conduct periodic public review of the Greenspaces Master Plan and related plans.

Coordinate, on a regional basis, greenspaces related environmental education providers by building and supporting a communication network among these resource groups.

Interpret, with assistance from environmental education resource providers, the regional system of greenspaces.

Encourage, facilitate, and coordinate donations of land and conservation easements through development of informational programs and technical advice.

POLICIES:

Metro and Cooperators in the Greenspaces Program will:

6.44. Provide on-going opportunities for public information sharing and citizen involvement in Master Plan progress, land acquisition, resource development, and operations of greenspace related programs.

6.45. Serve as advocates for protection, restoration, conservation, and management of natural areas in and adjacent to the metropolitan area, including management of passive recreational opportunities where appropriate.

6.46. Encourage the public to understand and support the relationship between a sustainable environment and the economy and help people make and effect management decisions about natural resources.

6.47. Provide mechanisms for the business community to be effectively involved in protection of natural areas and work with neighborhood groups, individual businesses, civic and community organizations to encourage volunteer support of operations and maintenance programs and encourage appropriate use of publicly-owned natural areas.

6.48. Initiate education programs to inform the public about opportunities related to protection, restoration, or creation of greenspaces; about soil and water quantity / quality challenges; about how the public impacts these and other natural resources; and about how citizens can become involved in solving these problems.

6.49. Work with environmental education resource organizations and agencies to use natural areas as vehicles for learning about the environment, to prepare and provide materials and facilities, where appropriate, that interpret urban natural areas and the regional greenspaces system.

Metro will:

6.50. Continue to work with appropriate advisory committees including members of the general public, planners, and policy-makers to review key steps in greenspace acquisition and management planning.

6.51. Host forums for public participation in review of greenspace site management plans and thereby provide mechanisms for feedback on what people need/want to know about management and care of greenspaces in the region.

6.52. Periodically conduct public opinion polls and monitor the use and accessibility of greenspaces and related programs by the general and special publics.

6.53. Facilitate and coordinate, on a regional basis, environmental education providers with programs related to

greenspaces by building and supporting a communication network among these resource groups, including establishment of a clearinghouse for environmental education related to greenspaces.

6.54. Establish partnerships with appropriate public and private land holding entities, geographically-based community land trusts, and "friends" groups throughout the metropolitan area and establish a clearinghouse, referral, and information center in order to provide the public information on the private land trusts and public agencies in charge of open spaces, natural areas, wildlife corridors, trails, and greenways.

GOALS: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT THROUGH TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

POLICIES:

Metro and Cooperators in the Greenspaces Program will:

6.55. Propose and promote incentives for private landowners, developers, resource agencies, jurisdictions, and the public to conserve natural areas and their associated values.

6.56. Provide technical assistance and education to the general public and the work force.

Metro will:

6.57. In consultation with appropriate advisors and cooperators, prioritize ecological sites for the purpose of conservation, preservation, acquisition, and recreation and will set management guidelines for habitat, species, and recreational use throughout the metropolitan area.

6.58. As resources allow, coordinate and provide technical assistance and education to the general public, businesses, and industries related to land development (such as the real estate, development, and contracting communities) that encourages conservation techniques that protect urban natural areas.

FINANCE PLAN

Metro is currently undertaking a financial study to determine how to establish a regional funding source for Greenspaces acquisitions and capital improvements. It is also researching mechanisms to cover operations and maintenance costs. These studies are being coordinated with local, state and federal agencies, and non-profit groups. The studies address Metro's immediate revenue needs to acquire and manage Greenspaces of regional significance, as identified in the Greenspaces Master Plan. They will also outline long-term financing options of local governments, special districts, and Metro for additional acquisition, capital improvement, operations, and maintenance of greenspaces, parks, and recreational facilities.

GOALS:

Establish regional revenue sources for acquisition, capital improvements, and management of greenspaces through public financing alternatives.

Continue cooperative efforts among local, state, regional, federal agencies, and nonprofit land conservation organizations to acquire and protect natural and open space lands.

Coordinate donations of land, dedications, and conservation easements to be added to the Metropolitan Greenspaces

system.

Develop and raise funds for projects and programs that will help us conserve and preserve environmental values related to the Metropolitan Greenspaces system.

POLICIES:

Metro and Cooperators in the Metropolitan Greenspaces Program will:

7.1. Work together so that, where possible, deed restrictions which require use of the land for open space purposes in perpetuity will be included at the time of transfer of property, from private property owner to Metro, Metro to local government, or Metro or local government to non-profit organization.

7.2. Evaluate, on a case by case basis, lands of regional significance, so that existing park providers can have the "first right" to acquire and manage the sites within their boundaries.

Metro will:

7.3. Support development of new funding resources for the Metropolitan Greenspaces Program and encourage, facilitate, and coordinate donations of land and related scenic and conservation easements as a part of the Greenspaces system. Dedications of land, easements and cash to local jurisdictions will continue to be promoted.

7.4. Establish the Greenspaces Acquisition and Capital Improvement Fund in order to collect and manage funds dedicated for these purposes.

7.5. Make funding decisions that are consistent with the priorities of the Greenspaces Master Plan, acquisition, and capital improvement plans.

7.6. Facilitate establishment of a Greenspaces Foundation, a separate private nonprofit organization dedicated to the support of Greenspaces programs and operations, that would encourage and accept private donations of land, easements, and other tangible assets such as cash, stocks or bonds, which would further the regional natural areas system. Acceptance of management responsibility for areas of mitigation will be considered on a case by case basis.

7.7. Establish, manage, and fund a Metropolitan Greenspaces Dedicated Fund for acquisition, operations, and maintenance of sites, trails, and corridors.

7.8. Propose, promote, and implement a funding strategy to address ongoing operations and maintenance requirements of Metro-owned or operated greenspaces and parks.

7.9. Serve as a regional planning and financial information clearinghouse for projects related to the Greenspaces Program regardless of how they are funded.

Hand out at meeting

**DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT TASK GROUP
ON DEVELOPMENT INSIDE URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARIES**

METROPOLITAN REGION COMMENTS ON TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

SCHEDULE AND OUTLINE:

SCHEDULE:

RTAC DRAFTING OF COMMENTS JUNE 25, 1992
RPAC CONSIDERATION OF RTAC PROPOSAL JULY 8, 1992
METRO COUNCIL T+P COMMITTEE JULY 14
LCDC end of July

OUTLINE:

1) General:

- State's urban growth objectives need further clarification
- Urban Reserves, Transportation Rule, and Region 2040 work is extremely important and needs to be completed first...limited to nonexistent resources available to take on new projects

2) Substantive:

- Proposals for infill and redevelopment strategies (including minimum densities), annexation alternatives, transportation planning handbook, and specific development plans are acceptable and useful.
- Applicability should be based on more than size or growth rate...what is needed in a place to achieve the objectives?
- Strengthened service district agreements a good idea but should be done as a result of the planning work already underway, not as a separate task. Alternative service delivery structures as a periodic review task needs additional testing.
- Centralization of lead growth management authority may or may not be useful in metropolitan area since metropolitan area structured differently than rest of state. Urban reserves rule implementation will get at this for all urban land added in the future.
- Public Investment Area concept may not work well given complexity of urban area. However, regional adequate public facilities standards is an interesting idea and should be explored through a jointly funded grant application.