

Community Involvement Committee

Meeting Minutes

November 17, 2010

Committee Members Present: Paula Amato, Jason Barnstead-Long, Judy Bluehorse Skelton, Liz Gatti, Anyeley Hallova, Brian Heron, Linda Nettekoven, Stanley Penkin, Howard Shapiro, Alison Stoll

Absent: Judith Gonzalez Plascencia, Shirley Nacoste, Lai-Lani Ovalles, Rahul Rastogi, Ryan Schera, Peter Stark

Staff (BPS): Susan Anderson, Raihana Ansary (Mayor's Office), Al Burns, Eden Dabbs, Troy Doss, Courtney Duke (PBOT), Bob Glascock, Alex Howard, Joan Frederikson, Marie Johnson (BES), Deborah Stein, Marty Stockton, Matt Wickstrom

Visitors: Hilary Olivos, Stephanie L. Scott, Kathy Fong Stephens, Pat Zimmerman

Welcome and Announcements – Howard Shapiro

Howard welcomed everybody and invited the visitors to introduce themselves.

Marty announced the following upcoming events.

1. 24th Annual Fix-It Fair at Ron Russell Middle School – Saturday, November 20th, 8:30am-2:00pm
2. Planning & Sustainability Commission briefing on the Portland Plan overview and update – Tuesday, Nov. 23, 6:00 pm; 1900 Building, Room 2500A

The Portland Plan – Inspiring Communities Series (December dates)

3. Dr. Robert Ogilvie on Healthy and Complete Communities – Wednesday, December 1st, 7:00pm
4. Judith Bell on Education – Wednesday, December 8th, 7:00pm
5. Dr. Julian Agyeman on Reimagining (E)quality – Wednesday, December 15th, 7:00pm

Linda asked whether the speaker series would be videotaped. Marty responded that Portland Community Media would be filming and broadcasting live on Channel 30. The events would also be webcast live on www.pdxplan.com.

Appreciation and Check in – Susan Anderson, Director of Bureau of Planning & Sustainability

Susan introduced herself and shared why she has affinity with the CIC due to her experience on a citizen advisory committee for the City of Eugene, while in graduate school at the University of Oregon. Susan thanked Howard, the CIC and BPS staff. Susan explained that the BPS managers meet on technical issues, community wisdom and practical solutions with the hope that we make a plan that incorporates all geographies and ethnicities input into the effort.

Susan asked the CIC for input on the coordination and communication to date; allowing for a continuation of the discussion led by Howard at October's meeting. Liz answered that she appreciates staff consistency. Alison shared that she does feel like the CIC is being effective; giving the advice on hiring the consultant for the focus/discussion group example. Jason shared that he is still concerned

about the lack of awareness and/or involvement of certain communities. Jason also expressed that there is the belief that the City is stalling; but fears the next phase is all talk and wonders where is the action, obtainable results and whether the budget will restrict the desired outcomes or not. Howard stated he's looking for more definitive action with the six proposed strategies being focused on in Phase 3. Linda expressed that tangible and visible results in each area of the city, prior to the Comprehensive Plan and on the ground details are her recommendation. Howard said he is hearing about the 20-minute neighborhood concept around town. Susan answered that demonstration projects in each part of town prior to the adoption of the plan or on adoption day is her desire. Linda wondered how the budget discussion would tie in with the Portland Plan.

Stan asked how we communicate these six proposed strategies is really important, but the public needs to know how and through what process the strategies were formed. Liz added that the context keeps coming up for the public, who needs to understand how their input will be used; something visual like a video or commercial could respond to this need. Stan stated the need to tie in the experts ideas into the input.

Judy expressed that people around Portland are already doing work that is desired in the Portland Plan and that this needs to be showcased; neighborhoods and organizations are already "living" the Portland Plan.

CIC Decisions and Follow up Actions – Howard Shapiro

Howard went through the items listed below:

1. Future CIC minutes will call out follow up actions and identify who is responsible and when.
2. More CIC participation in staff meetings would be productive.
3. Add DCL Update as a standing agenda item on future agendas.
4. The CIC recommends that the Mayor looks broadly in the community to identify a new community-at-large representative.
5. The group decided to keep the November and December meetings in their current time slot, and will have a January meeting in the evening to try it out.
6. It was proposed that the CIC serve as a second focus group to do the same exercise at the next CIC meeting on November 17 and that this meeting be extended by one hour.

Discussion regarding Communication – Kathy Fong Stephens, Barney and Worth

Kathy introduced herself and described the focus/discussion group purpose, see below:

What staff is looking for: We need help in making sure that the words, phrases and images we use to describe draft Portland Plan strategies are relevant, meaningful and clearly understood by a variety of audiences. At this stage, we are looking for help with communication, rather than input on the content and substance of the drafts. With this assistance, we can improve the clarity of language and images for the drafts that are published for public review in the winter.

20-Minute Neighborhoods

Stanley said the concept is in lexicon but with 95 neighborhoods, people could be confused about geography. Anyeley said BPS needs to define the reality of 20-minute neighborhood better and to make all neighborhoods have the qualities.

Judy stated that elders or disabled get places in 20 minutes at a different pace. Tweak title so it doesn't imply able-bodied and to think of the 20-minute neighborhood concept as in how people get around in a snowstorm. Judy also expressed that the concept also implies safety and accessing services in an emergency.

Kathy asked: are there suggestions for different terms to describe concept?

Jason said the presentation of the strategy needs to stress that "20-minute neighborhood" accessibility is a goal because it does not exist in a lot of Portland yet. Better context necessary.

Susan asked should goals be defined? For example, should 80% of PDX have 20-minute neighborhoods? What about San Diego, it refers to itself as a city full of villages.

Paula asked to broaden the concept of services available in 20-minute neighborhoods. What if service comes to the neighborhood? Accessibility to organic foods. Accessibility in time.

Judy said the concept should ensure community gardens exist in each 20-minute neighborhood.

Liz stated that each group (cultural) has a different definition of "village." The concept is about the community defining what it wants. The local commitment is not defined. The concept on the Eastside is difficult to define. Liz raised the self-supporting neighborhoods concept.

Howard said the 20-minute neighborhood concept is about people taking ownership of where they live. Put a face on the definition – a local food store, local hardware store. Howard wondered what if we had 95 logos per neighborhood to help create identities. Success will be if people love living in their neighborhood and identify with it.

Anyeley asked if the group understood the "walk score", as used on the website www.walkscore.com and wondered if this was incorporated into the concept. Anyeley also expressed that use of the word "family" sounds like it excludes single people. Courtney Duke with PBOT shared that the walk score doesn't address infrastructure or topography. It also assumes people are able-bodied.

Brian felt that the first sentence seems confining – trapped in the 20-minute neighborhood and that the fourth line regarding "walk, bike, roll" seems to talk about life outside. The language needs to pass from planning to marketing to make it more visual.

Jason felt more attention needs to be paid to selection of photos. The current photos don't always address what people want.

City Green – Nature in the City

Stan stated that for clarity, we need to recall the four principles as we review the strategies.

Judy said defining resiliency as it applies to 20-minute neighborhoods would really help – it's about connectivity. Liz wondered what about pods all over the City that you move from one to another. Linda stated that access is a key concept in both 20-minute neighborhoods and City Green.

Howard pointed out that City Green doesn't speak about green buildings. "Green" has many definitions so it is confusing. This is about geography or the network.

Anyeley suggested to just call it “Nature in the City” and wondered what does “greener ways for kids to get to school” mean? It’s about greenery, not transportation.

Paula asked where the green building technology within the strategies is. Susan responded that it is within the 21st Technology strategy.

Brian expressed that a few decades ago we may have been weaving the City into nature, rather than now nature back into the City.

Jason stated that the goal should be stated first for each strategy. Jason suggested including open space in the description and to reference “healthy” ways to get around. Jason also shared that the use of “rolling” can be confusing. He requested that staff talk to Connected Communities Coalition (CCC) to find a more appropriate term. Jason suggested perhaps “traveling”. Courtney Duke responded that the CCC was the group that had recommended the use of “rolling” as the right term, but suggested it should be defined better.

Anyeley proposed the rename “Nature in City and Access to Public Spaces” and commented that including gaps in transportation system seems to not quite fit. Stanley mentioned that he didn’t understand the use of “rolling.” Anyeley stated that three miles to a community center is a great goal. Stanley stated that people will ask where targets came from (i.e. three miles to community center). Susan commented that where we’ve got numbers, there is a lot of research. Brian suggested that imagery and stories can help with the immediate reaction, more than numbers. Linda stated that targets need context; asking what percentage of tree canopy are we at now? Linda agreed to the phrasing of weave (nature) back in, but also strengthening and enhancing nature is important.

Judy expressed that this strategy has notions of FUN when some are really struggling. There’s a need to address nature in city’s benefits for depression, providing mental and spiritual health. Portland already does this well, some may say. Judy said the strategy needs to again go back to principles – gave Reed Canyon as an example of success today to build upon, specifically referring to the salmon that have returned to the canyon.

Kathy offered that one idea is to include a preamble for all strategies.

Alison said the strategy should also reflect waterways and to mention fish. Anyeley suggested use of photos to help address waterways.

Paula asked how the resiliency principle was created. It should include global issues.

Brian offered a title of Portland, The City in the Forest.

Howard stated that emotional and physical well-being are important to all strategies and should be included in preamble.

Jason said that it needs definition to show how this would be accomplished equitably to get buy-in from minority groups.

21st Century Technologies

Anyeley stated that “Sustainability” should be added to the title; continuing that this strategy isn’t ONLY about NEW technology – it can be about basic technology as well. Success can also include waste reduction.

Stanley said to bring in PDC's target industries. Tie it all together so it doesn't seem like separate efforts. Also "training and education" should be included.

Howard commented that Portland is also home to media and communications companies. Public/private partnerships with these companies should be included.

Linda expressed that access of people to technology is also a measure of success.

Jason asked what this strategy is about. It could be about jobs, tech, etc. Susan responded that this strategy emerged because it kept falling out of other strategies. It is future-related objectives and actions looking for a theme. It is about how technologies help us be sustainable.

Deborah shared that comments about confusing descriptions are what we need to hear.

Brian asked could the technology angle be placed in other strategies. Susan responded the same could be said for equity and asked should they be pulled out separately?

Paula agreed to create a separate strategy.

Courtney stated technology issues e.g., broadband access, were included by the Transportation TAG but they didn't fully get included in this strategy.

Judy brought up the PSU Campus of the Future effort. This strategy is about the economy of current college students. Judy suggested to add language to feature how this strategy addresses economy, education.

Stanley stated that arts, culture and innovation aren't showing up in the strategies. This strategy has aspects of innovation.

Susan asked is it okay to be redundant between strategies? Judy responded that traditional storytelling is all about repeating things. Anyeley added that it must fit. Howard stated that redundancy is critical and is an advertising tool.

Liz said we should discuss inter-relationships between action areas but in a grounded way so they don't sound like wishes. Nature in the City also needs to show how strategy is critical to meeting more basic needs. Eden shared there is a desire for goal/wish statements, as well as examples to make things seem more real, less abstract.

Linda said City Green should reflect the community's co-creation and shared City agenda. That way it doesn't seem territorial and gave the example that trees benefit all.

Eden asked the group to please share ideas to convey information. Brian responded that the first paragraph could be photo and then keep list.

Economic Opportunity and Affordability

Liz suggested when it comes to images, what about cutting out magazine photos to create a collage?

Deborah asked that the CIC to explain what they think the strategy is about because intent is to create coherent story.

Linda asked should this strategy go to business community, all strategies.

Anyeley stated the first sentence is wrong because many in Portland who are unemployed are very educated. It says to get a job training is needed, but really, one might just need a job. Portland needs to attract new business as well. Anyeley asked what about increasing flights and air travel?

Jason stated the focus appears to be on industry and big business workings and asked what about small businesses? Jason asked about moving products AROUND Portland? Need photos of small businesses.

Howard expressed the need to encourage entrepreneurship.

Jason asked to explain concept of DECENT housing. Decent isn't a good description. Eden asked what about the term "comfortable"? Judy responded that the term "decent" may come from Habitat for Humanity.

Anyeley stated to focus on small growing businesses, but also on attracting big business.

Anyeley stated this strategy lacks targets.

Judy said attracting businesses should be those that reflect our values. Paula added and should include public/private partnerships.

Howard said to stress intentional nature on behalf of City in this strategy.

Linda asked what does "quality neighborhood jobs" mean to this strategy?

Stanley repeated the need to tie in PDC's four target industries.

Paula said the strategy should recognize population growth and increased diversity.

Brian asked could this strategy also talk about urban renewal areas?

Liz expressed that the affordability piece doesn't seem fully flushed out.

Education / Student Success

Stanley commented on the narrow focus only on youth and asked what about adults and changing workforce?

Brian raised the need to reinforce good citizenship and community involvement. Brian asked where did the percentage of community of color come from and whether this included the Slavic community.

Anyeley suggested how about AFFORDABLE family supportive services and a focus on elementary education as well.

Howard stated that we should broaden the strategy. For example, intergovernmental agreements (IGA) with other agencies, such as PPS to say that school yards are part of community.

Stanley suggested we address the importance of art with education.

Linda said creative and flexible schools are necessary to reflect adjusting enrollment.

Paula asked: what about investment in educators?

Judy shared in 2035 students of color will exceed 50% and that “leading productive lives” sounds corporate. Judy continued that there are lifelong learners and we should include recent immigrants with specific educational needs. Judy stated a priority is that no child is homeless OR hungry.

Equity in Decision-Making

Jason stated that this strategy sounds like business, not decision-making. The focus is on jobs, not community life or well-being.

Liz asked: is the title out of whack with the language or vice versa? Anyeley suggested a title of “Equal Opportunity” with a focus on empowerment.

Stanley asked whether the phrase “all Portlanders can work at a living wage job” doesn’t reflect higher aspirations. Judy added that the phrase “meeting basic needs” doesn’t reflect a thriving city. Include community engagement of underrepresented and to include AUTHENTIC accountability in decision-making.

Howard stated that access to the internet is very important because it causes kids to fall behind in school when they do not have access.

Anyeley broke the strategy down into the following: 1) community engagement. 2) equal opportunity, and 3) equitable environment. Linda agreed that the title is wrong. Paula stated that equity needs to address age, gender, sexual orientation – all groups. Jason referred to the strategy title, suggested either “Equity” or “Equity and Access”.

Approval of Minutes from October 20, 2010 Meeting

Quorum was not achieved for the CIC to vote on the minutes from the previous meeting.

Next Steps:

The next CIC meeting is as follows:

- **Wednesday, December 15, 8:00-10:00 a.m., Rm. 7A (7th Floor, 1900 Bldg.).**

CIC Decisions and Follow up Actions

Due that the bulk of the meeting focused on communication around the six proposed strategies, no CIC decisions or follow up actions arose, but the items from the previous October 20th meeting are still timely and are to be carried forward.

Follow up items:

- 1. Future CIC minutes will call out follow up actions and identify who is responsible and when.***



2. *More CIC participation in staff meetings would be productive to help advance the work.*
3. *Add DCL Update as a standing agenda item on future agendas.*
4. *The CIC recommends that the Mayor looks broadly in the community to identify a new community-at-large representative.*
5. *The group decided to keep the November and December meetings in their current time slot, and will have a January meeting in the evening to try it out.*
6. *It was proposed that the CIC serve as a second focus group to do the same exercise at the next CIC meeting on November 17. It was further proposed that this meeting be extended by one hour to accommodate this.*

Meeting adjourned.

Attachments

The following documents should be considered part of the minutes for this meeting:

Phase II Survey Summary, dated August 30, 2010



Phase II Survey
Results as of August 30, 2010

Findings from the Phase II survey results.

6,541 surveys – 5,702 mail-in, 839 online

Survey statements for the Draft 2035 Objectives are at the end of the summary.

Observations

- Overall, most of objectives are “On The Right Track” based on a composite score of “Just Right” plus “Not Aggressive Enough”. Only 4 out of 22 objectives scored less than a 70% rating.
- The Top Priorities ranking is based on an open ended question in which respondents were asked to write down the number of their top three priorities out of the objectives that were presented. See the attachment for the full text for each objective.

On The Right Track

1. Healthy Watersheds
2. Maintenance First
3. Raising the Bar
4. Sense of Safety
5. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Top Priorities

1. More Living Wage Jobs
2. Raising the Bar
3. Maintenance First
4. Sense of Safety
5. Healthy Watersheds

- Survey responses from People of Color¹ only represented 12% of responses, significantly less than the 26% of Portland’s population. The responses were weighted to account for this gap, but there was no change in the Top Priorities.

Total	People of Color	Weighted Results
1. More Living Wage Jobs	1. More Living Wage Jobs	1. More Living Wage Jobs
2. Raising the Bar	2. Raising the Bar	2. Raising the Bar
3. Maintenance First	3. Sense of Safety	3. Maintenance First
4. Sense of Safety	4. Higher Education	4. Sense of Safety
5. Healthy Watersheds	5. Housing	5. Healthy Watersheds

- Cross-tabulation analysis of the results based on Race/Ethnicity and Household Income characteristics show some shifts in relative priorities.

Top Priorities

People of Color	Low Income ²	Low Income/People of Color ³
1. More Living Wage Jobs	1. More Living Wage Jobs	1. More Living Wage Jobs
2. Raising the Bar	2. Housing	2. Housing
3. Sense of Safety	3. Healthy Watersheds	3. Higher Education
4. Higher Education	4. Higher Education	4. Educational Equity
5. Housing	5. Raising the Bar	5. Healthy Watersheds

¹ “People of Color” are respondents other than “White/Caucasian” or “No Response”.

² “Low Income” is lowest income category – households earning less than \$20,000 per year.

³ “Low Income/People of Color” represent a relatively low sample size of 157 responses.

- Different geographic districts⁴ show a similar consistency in relative priorities:

Top Priorities

North	Northeast	East	Southeast	West	Central City
More Living Wage Jobs	Raising the Bar	Sense of Safety	More Living Wage Jobs	Raising the Bar	More Living Wage Jobs
Raising the Bar	More Living Wage Jobs	Raising the Bar	Raising the Bar	More Living Wage Jobs	Raising the Bar
Higher Education	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	More Living Wage Jobs	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Maintenance First	Sustainable Transportation
Healthy Watersheds	Maintenance First	Maintenance First	Sustainable Transportation	Sense of Safety	Housing
Healthy & Affordable Food	Healthy Watersheds	Healthy Watersheds	Maintenance First	Healthy Watersheds	Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Respondents were given an opportunity to list any objectives that they thought were missing or ones that needed to be changed. Many of the respondents used the space to offer general comments:

- Most controversial issues: Diversion of sewer contract savings for green streets (bike lanes) and community policing
- More comments about disc golf, Sellwood Bridge, dog parks, and MLS soccer than CRC (2)
- Many people are impatient and do not understand why the objectives, which are expressed in terms of targets for 2035, will take 25 years to accomplish. This is the underlying theme to many of the comments related to "Not Agressive Enough" ratings.
- A thread of comments related to the City's role and relationship to other agencies (especially schools) and personal choices/behavior – implying that it is not a City function to get involved in these matters.

Missing Issues most often mentioned in written comments:

- Historic preservation
- Toxics - air/noise/light pollution
- Homelessness
- Earthquake/disaster preparedness
- Recycling (plastics) and composting.
- Health care and mental health services

⁴ Geographic districts are based on ONI Neighborhood Coalition boundaries sorted by zip code, so there is not always precise alignment. The biggest discrepancies came with some of the zip code boundaries that overlap between West Portland and the Central City, in which responses were assigned to West Portland.

All Survey Responses (weighted scores)

On the Right Track		Top Priorities	
Healthy Watersheds	89%	More Living Wage Jobs	1597
Maintenance First	87%	Raising the Bar	1534
Raising the Bar	87%	Maintenance First	1130
Sense of Safety	87%	Sense of Safety	1015
Higher Education	82%	Healthy Watersheds	982
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	81%	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	939
Educational Equity	81%	Sustainable Transportation	928
More Living Wage Jobs	79%	Complete Neighborhoods	911
Home Energy Use	79%	Higher Education	903
Arts Education	77%	Housing	872
Equal Employment Opportunity	75%	Healthy & Affordable Food	804
Household Budget	75%	Educational Equity	763
Active & Healthy Lifestyle	74%	Competitive Economy	730
Complete Neighborhoods	72%	Home Energy Use	686
Sustainable Transportation	72%	Arts Education	635
Housing	72%	Active & Healthy Lifestyle	603
Healthy & Affordable Food	71%	Household Budget	444
Participation & Change	70%	Equal Employment Opportunity	321
Access to Recreation	69%	Participation & Change	181
Competitive Economy	67%	Access to Recreation	169
Satisfaction	60%	Satisfaction	102
Arts Attendance	52%	Arts Attendance	66

On the Right Track: Not Aggressive Enough plus Just Right

Not Aggressive Enough

1. Raising the Bar (49%)
2. GHG Emissions (47%)
2. Healthy Watersheds (47%)
4. Maintenance First (43%)
5. Sense of Safety (41%)

Too Aggressive

1. Complete Neighborhoods (17%)
2. Sustainable Transport (15%)
2. Access to Recreation (12%)
4. Healthy Food (10%)
5. Housing (9%)

Should Not Be An Objective

1. Arts Attendance (33%)
2. Satisfaction (23%)
3. Active & Healthy Lifestyle (15%)
4. Participation & Change (13%)
5. Healthy & Accessible Food (13%)

Survey Respondents Profile

Where do you live?

	2008	Phase II	People of Color	Low Income	Low Income People of Color
North	11%	10%	12%	13%	13%
Northeast	19%	20%	19%	15%	12%
East	24%	13%	18%	17%	25%
Southeast	26%	30%	25%	29%	17%
West	13%	22%	17%	17%	19%
Central City	7%	4%	6%	8%	12%
Outside		1%	3%	0%	1%

Note: Central City was undercounted due to zip code overlap with surrounding districts.

What is your household income?

	2008	Phase II	People of Color
Under \$20,000	16%	14%	24%
\$20,000 - \$50,000	30%	33%	31%
\$50,000 - \$100,000	38%	35%	32%
Over \$100,000	16%	18%	14%

What is your race or ethnicity?

	2008	Phase II	Low Income	Low Income People of Color
Asian or Pacific Islander	8%	3%	6%	22%
Native American	4%	2%	4%	13%
White/Caucasian	74%	85%	70%	-
Black/African American	7%	3%	6%	18%
Latino/Hispanic	9%	3%	6%	19%
Mixed/Other	2%	5%	8%	28%

Cross Tabulation Based On Demographics

On the Right Track	All Returns	Weighted	People of Color	Low Income	Low Income People of Color
Healthy Watersheds	89%	89%	87%	87%	83%
Raising the Bar	88%	87%	83%	80%	75%
Maintenance First	87%	87%	83%	83%	75%
Sense of Safety	87%	87%	86%	79%	77%
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	82%	81%	76%	81%	75%
Higher Education	82%	82%	81%	79%	82%
Educational Equity	81%	81%	78%	77%	82%
More Living Wage Jobs	79%	79%	79%	81%	79%
Home Energy Use	79%	79%	77%	80%	78%
Arts Education	78%	77%	74%	76%	76%
Equal Employment Opportunity	75%	75%	73%	74%	76%
Household Budget	74%	75%	76%	79%	82%
Active & Healthy Lifestyle	74%	74%	75%	76%	78%
Complete Neighborhoods	73%	72%	71%	75%	77%
Sustainable Transportation	72%	72%	73%	77%	73%
Housing	72%	72%	73%	78%	77%
Healthy & Affordable Food	72%	71%	71%	74%	71%
Participation & Change	71%	70%	69%	79%	78%
Access to Recreation	69%	69%	68%	69%	70%
Competitive Economy	67%	67%	68%	60%	62%
Satisfaction	60%	60%	61%	62%	67%
Arts Attendance	52%	52%	51%	53%	52%

On the Right Track: Not Aggressive Enough plus Just Right

Top Priorities	All Returns	Weighted	People of Color	Low Income	Low Income People of Color
More Living Wage Jobs	1	1	1	1	1
Raising the Bar	2	2	2	5	8
Maintenance First	3	3	8	10	15
Sense of Safety	4	4	3	11	10
Healthy Watersheds	5	5	7	3	5
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	6	6	14	8	18
Sustainable Transportation	7	7	17	9	12
Complete Neighborhoods	8	8	10	15	14
Higher Education	9	9	4	4	3
Housing	10	10	5	2	2
Healthy & Affordable Food	11	11	9	6	7
Educational Equity	12	12	6	14	4
Competitive Economy	13	13	11	18	16
Home Energy Use	14	14	16	12	17
Arts Education	15	15	15	13	13
Active & Healthy Lifestyle	16	16	13	16	9
Household Budget	17	17	18	7	6
Equal Employment Opportunity	18	18	12	17	11
Participation & Change	19	19	19	19	19
Access to Recreation	20	20	20	20	20
Satisfaction	21	21	21	21	21
Arts Attendance	22	22	22	22	22

Cross Tabulation Based On Geography

Top Priorities	All Returns	North	NE	East	SE	West	Central City
More Living Wage Jobs	1	1	2	3	1	2	1
Raising the Bar	2	2	1	2	2	1	2
Maintenance First	3	6	4	4	5	3	9
Sense of Safety	4	7	11	1	9	4	7
Healthy Watersheds	5	4	5	5	7	5	6
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	6	12	3	9	3	9	5
Sustainable Transportation	7	13	6	16	4	10	3
Complete Neighborhoods	8	8	10	10	6	8	10
Higher Education	9	3	8	6	10	6	11
Housing	10	11	9	7	8	12	4
Healthy & Affordable Food	11	5	12	8	11	16	8
Educational Equity	12	9	7	15	13	11	12
Competitive Economy	13	15	16	11	16	7	13
Home Energy Use	14	10	13	12	12	15	14
Arts Education	15	14	15	17	14	13	16
Active & Healthy Lifestyle	16	16	14	13	15	14	17
Household Budget	17	17	18	14	17	17	15
Equal Employment Opportunity	18	18	17	18	18	18	18
Participation & Change	19	19	19	19	20	20	19
Access to Recreation	20	20	20	20	19	19	22
Satisfaction	21	21	21	21	21	21	20
Arts Attendance	22	22	22	22	22	22	21

Household Income

	<u>2008</u> <u>Portland</u>	<u>North</u>	<u>NE</u>	<u>East</u>	<u>SE</u>	<u>West</u>	Central <u>City</u>
Under \$20,000	16%	17%	11%	20%	13%	11%	25%
\$20,000 - \$50,000	30%	37%	31%	40%	35%	27%	30%
\$50,000 - \$100,000	38%	34%	38%	34%	35%	34%	28%
Over \$100,000	16%	12%	20%	6%	17%	28%	16%

Race or Ethnicity

	<u>2008</u> <u>Portland</u>	<u>North</u>	<u>NE</u>	<u>East</u>	<u>SE</u>	<u>West</u>	Central <u>City</u>
Asian or Pacific Islander	8%	3%	2%	5%	3%	3%	2%
Native American	4%	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	3%
White/Caucasian	74%	83%	87%	79%	89%	89%	82%
Black/African American	7%	3%	3%	3%	1%	1%	4%
Latino/Hispanic	9%	3%	2%	5%	1%	1%	5%
Mixed/Other	2%	5%	4%	5%	4%	4%	3%

Phase II Survey Statements

Draft Objectives for 2035: *What kinds of big changes should we aim for?*

1 - Arts Education: Today, Portland Public Schools has only 34 arts specialists for more than 46,000 students. *By 2035: Expand arts education by establishing arts learning programs in all of Portland's K-8 schools.*

2 - Arts Attendance: Today, more than 41% of Oregonians attend art events, well over the national average of 29%. *By 2035: Increase the percentage of Portlanders who attend arts events.*

3 - Complete Neighborhoods: Today, 26% of Portlanders live close enough to parks, businesses, frequent transit service, schools and other amenities to safely and easily walk or bike to meet their daily needs. *By 2035: Increase the percentage of Portlanders who can safely and easily walk or bike to services and amenities to 90%.*

4 - Raising the Bar: Today, around 61% of Portland's high school students graduate on time. *By 2035: Achieve a minimum 80% on-time high school graduation rate at all high schools.*

5 - Higher Education: Today, many of Portland's job seekers don't have sufficient skills or training to qualify for job openings. *By 2035: Ensure that vocational training and higher education provide a robust pool of skilled job seekers to match all job openings in each sector.*

6 - Equal Employment Opportunity: According to the 2010 State of Black Oregon report, "The Black male labor force participation rate is about 9 percentage points less than that of White males." *By 2035: Achieve equitable participation in the labor force for Portlanders of all races, ethnicities and genders.*

7 - Educational Equity: In the 2007-08 school year, just over 43% of Latino students enrolled in Portland Public Schools as seniors graduated from high school. *By 2035: Bring the high school graduation rate for Portland's students of color, youth in poverty, and English language learning youth up to that of other students.*

8 - Housing: Today, many of Portland's neighborhoods do not offer a range of affordable and family-friendly housing choices. *By 2035: Increase the range of housing choices so that families have more options. Prioritize new housing development that is affordable to households earning less than half the area median income. (Half the median income is \$34,000 for a family of four).*

9 - Household Budget: Today, many lower income households spend more than 70% of their income on housing and transportation costs. *By 2035: Reduce the combined cost of housing and transportation to less than 45% of median income. This would include locating more new housing close to transit and within walking distance of services.*

10 – Active and Healthy Lifestyle: Today, 55% of Multnomah County adults and 10% of teens are overweight or obese. *By 2035: Create opportunities for active lifestyles and healthy eating, so that at least 60% of adults and 95% of children and teenagers are at a healthy weight.*

11 - Access to Recreation: Today, about 80% of Portlanders live within a ½-mile walking distance of a developed park or natural area. *By 2035: Increase access so that all Portlanders are within a ½-mile walking distance of a park, natural area, trail or greenway.*

12 - Healthy and Affordable Food: Today, 60% of Portlanders live within a ½-mile walking distance of a full service grocery store. *By 2035: Increase access so that 90% of Portlanders are within ½-mile walking distance of a grocery or market that sells affordable healthy and locally grown food.*

13 - Sense of Safety: Currently, 61% of Portlanders citywide report feeling safe walking alone at night in their neighborhoods. Several eastside areas reported a sense of safety as low as 35-48%. *By 2035: Improve safety so that 75% of Portlanders in every neighborhood feel safe walking alone at night.*

14 - More Living Wage Jobs: Today, Portland has a higher unemployment rate and lower median income than comparable West Coast cities. In the past 30 years, only the top 20% of Portland's earners have seen their incomes rise. *By 2035: Raise the income of Portlanders whose incomes have remained flat or declined. Decrease unemployment rates so they are lower than the average West Coast urban area.*

15 - Competitive Economy: In 2008, Portland area export businesses generated \$19.5 billion of income into the regional economy. *By 2035: Improve the competitive position of Portland businesses that buy and sell in global markets, and improve global market access for all Portland businesses. Increase the region's export income by an average annual rate of 5%.*

16 - Satisfaction: We do not currently measure residents' sense of connectedness and satisfaction with their neighborhoods and city. *By 2035: Establish a baseline and increase residents' sense of connectedness and satisfaction throughout Portland.*

17 - Participation and Change: Today civic advisory bodies and commissions generally do not reflect the diversity of Portland. *By 2035: Improve Portlanders' opportunity to participate and capacity to effect change in their community where advisory bodies and commissions reflect Portland's diversity.*

18 - Home Energy Use: Over the past 20 years, household energy use has increased by 19%. *By 2035: Reduce household energy use by at least 25% from current levels.*

19 - Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Today, 15% of local energy comes from renewable sources, such as hydro, wind and solar. *By 2035: Double the percentage of renewal energy sources to 30%.*

20 - Sustainable Transportation: Today, 27% of commute trips are made by sustainable transportation (pedestrian, bicycle, transit). *By 2035: Increase the percentage of sustainable commute trips to 60%.*

21 - Healthy Watersheds: Overall, the health of the Willamette River and its tributaries is improving, but more progress needs to be made. *By 2035: Improve the water quality of at least half of Portland's streams so they are healthy enough for people and salmon.*

22 - Maintenance First: Today, there is a backlog of deferred public facility maintenance (repairs to public buildings, water, sewer, streets, schools). *By 2035: Reduce the maintenance backlog for public facilities by 50%.*