



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

MEMO

DATE: November 4, 2011

TO: Planning and Sustainability Commission

FROM: Joe Zehnder, Chief Planner

CC: Susan Anderson, Director and Eric Engstrom, Principal Planner

SUBJECT: Proposed Draft Portland Plan Memo 1: Summary of Comments and Corrections and Clarifications

Background and Schedule

On October 18, 2011, the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability released the Proposed Draft Portland Plan. The Portland Plan is a strategic plan for the City and its partners. It sets a 25-year direction for Portland's future and includes a five-year strategic action plan designed to address equity, job growth, education and a healthy environment.

The Proposed Draft Portland Plan reflects the input provided by Portlanders throughout the plan development process, as well as additional background data. The plan was developed through an iterative community-wide process, beginning in fall 2009. For more information on the plan development process, please review the information on process and public involvement on the About the Plan webpage at www.pdxplan.com.

The Planning and Sustainability Commission (PSC) will receive oral and written testimony at public hearings on November 8, 15 and 29, 2011. Written testimony submitted by mail or email will be accepted through November 30, 2011 at 4 p.m.

On December 13, 2011, the PSC will have a work session to discuss comments received, reactions to the Proposed Draft and issue a recommendation to staff. If needed, the PSC will have time on January 10, 2012, to continue their deliberations and issue a recommendation.

In addition to this memo, staff will provide the PSC with two additional memos on November 22 and December 13, 2011. Both memos will include summaries of the comments received orally and in writing, as well as copies of all letters and emails received. The December 13, 2011, memo will also include recommended revisions and a draft motion and resolution.



City of Portland, Oregon | Bureau of Planning and Sustainability | www.portlandonline.com/bps
1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7100, Portland, OR 97201 | phone: 503-823-7700 | fax: 503-823-7800 | tty: 503-823-6868

Printed on 100% post-consumer waste recycled paper.

Summary of Comments (through November 3, 2011)

Between October 18 and November 3, 2011, staff received five official public comment letters. There were comments on the content of the plan and on the relationship between the full-length plan and the summary document. There also were identification of typographical errors and clarification questions. Comments on the content of the report addressed a variety of topics, including, but not limited to the following:

- The need to improve conditions in East Portland through investments in transportation infrastructure and related amenities.
- A recommendation to add a section that focuses on opportunities for vital aging and intergenerational relationships.
- A desire to have additional actions, beyond the five-year timeframe of the plan.

As additional comments are received, they will be grouped by theme and plan section. The five public comment letters are provided in Attachment A: Public Testimony - October 18 through November 3, 2011.

Corrections and Clarifications

Citywide Measures

Complete Neighborhoods

On page 101, the objective statement is incorrect. The objective should read, “By 2035, 90 percent of Portlanders live within a quarter to half-mile sidewalk-accessible complete neighborhoods.” A residence is considered to be in a sidewalk-accessible complete neighborhood if it has a score of 70 or greater on the 20-minute neighborhood index. The 20-minute neighborhood index measures access to services and amenities. For more information on the 20-minute neighborhood index, please see the 20-Minute Neighborhoods Analysis report under the Learn About Your City/Background Reports page at www.pdxplan.com: http://www.portlandonline.com/portlandplan/index.cfm?c=51427&a=350181

The map on Page 103, which illustrates access to parks, needs to be revised. Currently, the map displays the parks access score as calculated as part of the 20-minute neighborhood index. The map needs to be revised to show park access by distance, (i.e., 0 to ¼ mile, ¼ mile to ½ mile, ½ mile to 1 mile).

Sub-area Scorecard Clarifications and Corrections

To show conditions at the local level, a set of fourteen local measures that mirror the citywide measures were developed (page 112 of the plan). A different set of local measures were needed because the data available at the citywide scale is not necessarily available at the local scale. The local measures were compiled for 24 geographic sub-areas of the city. (A map of the 24 sub-areas can be found on pages 113 and C-1 of the plan).

After the raw scores for each local measure and each sub-area were calculated, they were converted to a scale of 0 to 10. The raw scores were converted to a scale of 0 to 10 in order to make it easier to compare a sub-area’s performance in one area, such as third grade reading, to its performance in another area, such as tree canopy. The 0 to 10 scale was also developed to make it easier to compare performance between sub-areas.

Several scores in the Economic Prosperity and Affordability and Healthy Connected City columns in the scorecard summary, which includes the left-most columns on page 114, are incorrect. The Employment Growth column on page 115 is also incorrect. An updated version of the scorecard is provided in Attachment B: Revised Sub-area Scorecard.



Appendix C: Local Measures Clarifications and Corrections

1. “Goals” in the Local Indicators

In many of the local indicators a goal is listed as the standard by which the indicator is measured. It is incorrect to call these goals, but rather they represent benchmarks by which to measure the indicator. The benchmarks were determined by a variety of approaches - based on existing plans, performance in comparable cities, and other measures. This will be clarified in the next draft.

2. Relationship between the Maps and Data Presented

For each local measure, there is a graph and a map. The graphs show the raw score for each of the 24 sub-areas. The maps show the relative performance of each sub-area as defined by the index, which is described on page 2 of this memo. The color coding shows how the raw scores relate to the map category.

For example, the bar graph on page C-2 of the plan shows the percentage of third grade students that met the reading benchmark for the third grade, (89 percent of the students that attend school in the Hollywood area meet the third grade reading benchmark).

3rd grade reading (2010–11)



The index scores shown on each map correspond to the information provided on the scorecard on pages 114 and 115.



3rd grade reading (2010–11)



3. Poverty

The poverty measure shows the number of households who have been in poverty in the last 12 months. The stated “goal” is to have no more than 10 percent of households in poverty. In this case, the benchmark should be thought of as a threshold that should not be crossed. The benchmark statement could be read as, “No more than ten percent of the households in an area of the city should be in poverty.”

The bars in this graph are labeled with the wrong colors. Sub-areas with a rate of 10 percent or lower should be green. Sub-areas with poverty rates that just exceed ten percent should be green and areas with rates that far exceed 10 percent should be blue.

4. Unemployment

The stated “goal” for this measure is to have 95 percent employment or five percent unemployment. The intention is to reduce unemployment to no more than five percent in every area of the city. In this case, the goal is to have each bar get shorter until it reaches or goes below five percent. Five percent unemployment is often considered to be full employment, as it captures the normal ebb and flow of people changing jobs and other life changes. Today, the national average unemployment rate is approximately nine percent.

The bars in this graph are labeled with the wrong colors. The bars shown as green on the graph should be yellow; the bars shown as yellow should be blue; and there should be no green bars on the graph.

5. Employment Growth

The stated “goal” on this graph is shown as zero, which equals no net loss in employment. The goal line should be relabeled to be baseline. It is a floor, which no area should be below.

Staff received a few questions about the job loss number in area 12, which is labeled Sellwood-Moreland-Brooklyn. This area, like others, includes surrounding land; in this case, the adjacent industrial areas are included. An analysis of the data shows that two factors contribute to negative job growth shown in this area. Part of the explanation for the shift in jobs in this area is that NAICS



code 55 Management of Companies did not exist until 2002. It is possible that either a large retail or transportation and warehousing firm (these two industries saw the largest drop in employment in that period) switched reporting to Management of Companies in 2008, which would account for a reported job loss. However, there were notable actual job losses in the area. There were approximately 2,432 job losses in the transportation and warehousing category, alone.

6. No More than 30 percent Cost-Burdened Households

The title of this measure has generated some confusion. This local measure should be given a new title, “Cost-burdened Households.” A cost-burdened household is defined as a household that spends more than 30 percent of the household income on housing costs.

The graph shows, on average, the percentage of household income spent on housing. For example, on average, households in Raleigh Hills spend 30 percent of their income on housing. In contrast, on average, households in Lents-Foster, spend 48 percent of their income on housing.

7. Walkability and Accessibility Rating

The walkability and access rating in the local measures is based on the 20-minute neighborhoods index. The stated “goal” for this local measure is to have 70 percent of land area in each sub-area have a high level of access to activities and destinations and safe ways to travel on foot to those destinations. This is a very high standard and numerous factors can lower a rating, including large open space areas and transportation facilities.

The 20-minute neighborhoods index was developed as part of the Portland Plan to provide a more localized version of walkscore. For complete information on the methodology, please review the 20-Minute Neighborhoods Analysis document available here:

<http://www.portlandonline.com/portlandplan/index.cfm?c=51427>.

8. Most Workers Commute less than 30 Minutes

This local measure shows the average commute time in each sub-area. The label on the Y-axis of this graph should be changed from percent to minutes. This graph shows the average commute time, in minutes, for individuals in each sub-area. For example, this graph shows that workers in West Portland spend, on average 26 minutes commuting to work. On the other hand, workers in Centennial-Glenfair-Wilkes, spend an average of 37 minutes getting to work. The title of this measure should be revised to improve clarity.

9. Transit and Active Transportation to Work

In the 2000 census, respondents were asked whether they drive alone to work. The information provided in this section is the inverse of the number of Portlanders that drive alone to work. The basic assumption here is that if a person does not drive alone to work that they either take transit, walk, ride a bicycle or carpool to work or work from home.

The data source for this local measure is ESRI Business Analyst and is based on 2000 census data. The transportation commute mode data provided in the Citywide Measures on page 97 is from the 2009 American Community Survey. Information from the 2010 census is not yet available at the local level and American Community Survey data from intervening years is also unavailable at the local level. The different data sources account for discrepancies between the information in shown on page 97 and the information should on page C-12.

Attachments

Attachment A: Public Testimony - October 18 through November 3, 2011

Attachment B: Revised Sub-area Scorecard

