

Portland State University

**PDXScholar**

---

Portland City Archives

Oregon Sustainable Community Digital Library

---

1-1-1990

## Portland Residents Discuss Community Values

Decision Sciences, Inc.

Follow this and additional works at: [https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_cityarchives](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityarchives)



Part of the [Urban Studies Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

### Recommended Citation

Decision Sciences, Inc., "Portland Residents Discuss Community Values" (1990). *Portland City Archives*. 24.

[https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_cityarchives/24](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityarchives/24)

This Report is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Portland City Archives by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

# **PORTLAND RESIDENTS DISCUSS COMMUNITY VALUES**

**A Quantitative Research Project**

**Prepared for:**

**Policy Group of Portland Future Focus**

**By:**

**Decision Sciences, Inc.**

**Market, Public Opinion and Communications Research**

**June 1990**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. SUMMARY	1
II. INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY	5
III. THE PRESENT	8
A. Perceived Strengths	8
B. Perceived Weaknesses	10
IV. COMMUNITY VALUES	12
V. THE FUTURE	18
VI. DEMOGRAPHICS	20

## TABLES

APPENDIX      Questionnaire

# I. SUMMARY

As a part of Portland Future Focus, the city's strategic planning efforts, Decision Sciences, Inc. (DSI) through Cogan Sharpe Cogan was retained to conduct a public opinion survey to identify and quantify the qualities about the community that are the most important to Portland residents.

During the last two weeks in May, 1990, a total of 406 City of Portland residents were administered a scientifically designed telephone survey assessing Portland's strengths, weaknesses, qualities of life, expectations for the future, and future visions. Respondents were randomly selected through the use of random digit dialing and screened so that the sample included only people 18 years or older residing within the boundaries of the City of Portland.

From the demographic results of this survey, there is a close relationship to the most recently available demographic information for Portland: the Portland Civic Index Survey (November, 1989) and the 1986 Neighborhood Information Profiles Survey. The comparison indicates that the survey is a valid measurement of Portland demographics and therefore of the behavior and attitudes of Portland residents, within the survey's margin of error.

Results were analyzed by the basic frequency of response and by demographic sub-group interactions. Only those sub-group interactions which were statistically and practically significant were included in this report.

The questionnaire consisted of 25 questions and 74 different variables. Many questions in the survey were administered in an open-ended format, to which responses were recorded verbatim. Through the use of content analysis, responses were coded into a sets of 15 to 83 categories (depending on the question). For most open-ended questions, these detailed categories were organized into clusters, which included demographic, economic, land use, transportation, housing, energy, environmental quality, human services, education, public safety, parks and recreation, arts and culture, sense of community/quality of life, natural beauty, government, the weather, downtown, 'everything,' 'nothing,' 'other,' and 'don't know.' Up to four different responses per respondent were coded. It is important to note that percentages listed in this report and associated tables at the

---

~~~~cluster level may not equal the sum of the percentages in that cluster's  
~~~~ories as cluster level ~percenta~es were computed from the sum of  
responses in each cluster rather than the sum of categor~percenta~es.

---

## Portland's Strengths

At the individual category level, Portland's greatest strengths as a place to live are perceived to be its scenic beauty (9%), location in terms of recreational opportunities (8%), mild weather (8%), cleanliness (7%), and its friendly people (7%). Portland's environmental quality and its demographic characteristics were mentioned most often at the cluster level for the entire sample and for most age groups. While these two clusters were mentioned more so than the other clusters, responses to Portland's strengths can best be described as diverse. Closely behind environmental quality (14%) and demographic characteristics (13% } at the cluster level are parks and recreation (11%), sense of community and quality of life 10%), and natural beauty (10%). These results are generally supported by a survey conducted in November, 1989 by JW Research (Portland City Index Survey), in which an open-ended question, e.g. what two things about Portland made the respondent most proud, revealed that 'clean, no litter' and 'friendly community oriented people' were mentioned most often.

## Portland's Weaknesses

Regarding Portland's weaknesses as a place to live, respondents are clearly most concerned about public safety in general, and crime in particular, as well as Portland's government, including taxes being too high. Most frequently mentioned, at the category level, as Portland's greatest weakness as a place to live is crime (28%), followed distantly by 7% taxes too high. Another public safety category, gangs, finished in third place with most mentions (4%). Those categories with 3% each include too much traffic/traffic congestion, a negative comment about the police, and too much rain. All other individual categories finished with less than 3%. The public safety cluster accounts for 42% of the respondents, and the next largest, government, for 14% of the respondents. All other clusters of comments account for less than 5% each, including the economy and transportation clusters with 4% each.

## Community Values

Respondents were read a list of 21 qualities that can describe the community in which people live, ranging from respect for the environment and housing that most people can afford to a steadily growing economy and neighborhoods with distinct character. The qualities were rotated in administration to avoid potential errors related to administration order. As each quality was read, the respondent rated it on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1=not important at all, and 5=very important. All the qualities were rated above the mid-point of 3, indicating that the respondents perceived all 21 qualities as important.

Rated most important is a clean environment (4.56); and this also received the smallest standard deviation, indicating a greater degree of agreement among respondents. Rated almost as important is respect for the environment (4.46); this quality also had a relatively small standard deviation. In fact, this was the only quality in which no respondent rated it as not at all important. Not far behind, rated third, is quality public elementary and high school education (4.42), followed by feeling of personal safety in my neighborhood (4.35). Rated clearly the lowest (but still above the mid-point) is a small town feeling (3.37), and welcoming foreign money and people (3.44). A steadily growing economy received a rating of 4.11 and a relatively low standard deviation.

The most important qualities that a city should have include a clean environment, public safety, and an emphasis on education. The results revealed many demographic sub-group interactions. While respondents perceive Portland as high in environmental quality, public safety is the highest rated weakness. While high quality education is a 'non-issue' in terms of describing Portland's strengths and weaknesses, it also is rated an important quality that a city should reflect.

A set of agree-disagree statements established the importance of public safety. Public assistance, such as caring for the poor and mentally ill, are considered as important as things like public safety and public works. Further, additional support for the preservation of environmental quality, even at the expense of economic growth was identified. Finally, there is strong support for Portland **ul** growing like Seattle and, particularly, not becoming a large city such as San Francisco or Vancouver, B.C.

economic growth was identified. Finally, there is strong support for Portland ~ growing like Seattle and, particularly, not becoming a large city such as San Francisco or Vancouver, B.C.

### Portland's Future

Six out of ten respondents expect Portland's future to get better, mostly due to the people and their focus on a clean environment. Mentioned most often, 29% of the time, is that the people were getting better, more aware, and producing more efforts to improve things, particularly the environment. This is followed distantly by 13% mentioning the control of crime, 12% that the economy will grow, 10% a variety of 'other' reasons, 9% land use planning, and 5% that a new generation and/or new leadership will make things better. All other categories are less than 5% each.

Three out of ten respondents expect Portland's future to get worse, mostly due to it growing too fast (25%) and public safety decreasing (21%). In ten years, respondents want Portland public safety to improve, as well as environmental quality preserved and a strong economy.

## II. INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

As a part of Portland Future Focus, the city's strategic planning efforts, Decision Sciences, Inc. (DSI) through Cogan Sharpe Cogan was retained to conduct a public opinion survey to identify and quantify the qualities about the community that are the most important to Portland residents.

A particular specialty of DSI is surveying the public about the future. Clients for similar studies conducted locally are the City Club of Portland and the Oregon Community Foundation.

During the last two weeks in May, 1990, a total of 406 City of Portland residents were administered a scientifically designed telephone survey assessing Portland's strengths, weaknesses, qualities of life, expectations for the future, and future visions. Respondents were randomly selected through the use of random digit dialing and screened so that the sample only included people residing within the boundaries of the City of Portland. The sample was also limited to residents aged 18 and over.

DSI employed several quality control measures which included questionnaire pretesting, callbacks, and verification. Statistics were computed using the SPSSPC+ program.

Results were analyzed by the basic frequency of response and by demographic sub-group interactions. Age, income, education, length of residence in Portland, ethnic background, the presence of children in the home, employment status, gender, and area of residence were all analyzed for interactions with the sample's opinions. Only those sub-group interactions which were statistically and practically significant were included in this report.

The questionnaire consisted of 25 questions and 74 different variables. Many questions in the survey were administered in an open-ended format, to which responses were recorded verbatim. Through the use of content analysis, responses were coded into a sets of 15 to 83 categories (depending on the question). For most open-ended questions, these detailed categories were organized into clusters, which included demographic, economic, land use, transportation, housing,



energy, environmental quality, human services, education, public safety, parks and recreation, arts and culture, sense of community/quality of life, natural beauty, government, the weather, downtown, 'everything,' 'nothing,' 'other,' and 'don't know.' Up to four different responses per respondent were coded. It is important to note that percentages listed in this report and associated tables at the cluster, level may not equal the sum of the percentages in that cluster's categories, because cluster level percentages were computed from the sum of responses in each cluster, rather than the sum of category percentages..

#### Sample Validity and Reliability.

From the demographic results of this survey there is a close relationship to the most recently available demographic information for Portland. Considering that 1980 Census information is outdated and 1990 census information will not be compiled for at least a year, comparisons were made with the only other available sources of demographic information about Portland: the recently conducted Portland Civic Index Survey (November, 1989) and the 1986 Neighborhood Information Profiles Survey. The following table lists some of these comparisons and indicates that the survey is a valid measurement of Portland demographics and therefore of the behavior and attitudes of Portland residents, within the survey's margin of error.

|                                       | 1990 VALUES SURVEY | 1989 CIVIC<br>INDEX SURVEY | 1986 NEIGHBORHOOD<br>PROFILES SURVEY |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| VARIABLE                              |                    |                            |                                      |
| Age                                   |                    |                            |                                      |
| 18 - 44                               | 55%                | 58%                        | 55%                                  |
| 45-54                                 | 11                 | 12                         | 9                                    |
| 55-64                                 | 12                 | 13                         | 14                                   |
| 65+                                   | 21                 | 17                         | 21                                   |
| Education                             |                    |                            |                                      |
| High School<br>or less                | 29%                | 27%                        | Not available                        |
| At lest some<br>college               | 70                 | 74                         |                                      |
| Ethnic<br>Background                  |                    |                            |                                      |
| White                                 | 92%                | 88%                        | 91%                                  |
| Hispanic                              | 1                  | 1                          | 1                                    |
| Black                                 | 3                  | 5                          | 4                                    |
| Asian                                 | 2                  | 2                          | 2                                    |
| Native American                       | 1                  | 0                          | 1                                    |
| Other                                 | 0                  | 0                          | 1                                    |
| Refused                               | 2                  | 4                          | 0                                    |
| Number Of<br>Children<br>In Household |                    |                            |                                      |
| None                                  | 68%                | Not available              | 66%                                  |
| 1 or more                             | 31                 |                            | 34                                   |
| Area                                  |                    |                            |                                      |
| West                                  | 27%                | Not available              | 23%                                  |
| North & East                          | 73                 |                            | 77                                   |

NOTE: DUE TO ROUNDING ERRORS, PERCENTAGES MAY NOT ADD UP TO 100.

Statement of Limitations.. Any sampling of behavior and 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 406, 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 +/- 2.92. If they answered 50% each way, the error margin would be +/- 4.86. These plus-minus figures represent the differences between our sample and the real, total, population, at the 95% confidence interval.

### III. THE PRESENT

In this section, we will consider what Portlanders today consider to be the city's strengths and weaknesses.

#### A. PERCEIVED STRENGTHS

Respondents were asked what Portland's strengths were and the sample of 406 respondents offered a total of 982 responses which were coded into 83 categories, which were then organized into nineteen clusters. The most frequently mentioned strength, 9% of the responses, was Portland's location; being close to the coast, the mountains, and to Eastern Oregon, followed by Portland's weather, perceived as mild and/or moderate (8%), the scenic beauty and greenery (7%), the cleanliness, clean environment, taking care of the environment (6%), and Portland's neighborliness, the perception of Portland as being a friendly town where people get along with each other (also 6%).

The most frequently mentioned cluster of responses was that of parks and recreation (19% of all responses), which included its location (9%), parks (4%), rivers (3%), and recreational opportunities (3%), followed by Portland's demography (12%), which included its size (2%), its people (2%), and 1% each mentioning Portland's ethnic diversity, not being too crowded, being perceived as a small or big town with a small town feeling, the respondent having family and/or friends in the area, and general familiarity and comfort level. The cluster of environmental quality accounted for 11% of all mentions, and it included the 6% cleanliness mentioned above, plus 2% each mentioning clean air and quality of life, and 1% each mentioned clean water and willingness to recycle and manage solid waste. Two additional clusters accounted for 10% each of all mentions: Portland's perceived sense of community and quality of life (including neighborliness (6%), good neighborhoods (2%), and 1% each people helping each other and civic pride), and natural beauty (including 7% scenic beauty and greenery, and 1% each of nature and landscaping/yards/gardens). The cluster of weather accounted for 9% of all responses (8% mild climate and 1% positive comments about rain), and transportation accounted for 6%. All other clusters accounted for less than 5% each.

Respondents were then asked to specify Portland's greatest strength as a place to live (see Table 1), and comments were coded into the same categories and clusters used above, except that only one response per respondent was accepted. The results verified the findings reported above. Most frequently mentioned was Portland's scenic beauty and greenery (9%), followed by its location and mild weather (both 5%), neighborliness (7%), and clean environment (7%).

By clusters of responses, environmental quality accounted for 14% of responses, followed closely by 13% demographic characteristics, 11% parks and recreation, 10% each for sense of community and natural beauty, and 8% for weather.

There was one significant sub-group interaction. However, although statistically significant, caution must be exercised in the interpretation of sub-group interactions when there are more than two or three sub-groups, because cell sizes become quite small. However, by age group, the responses from ages 18-24 placed most emphasis on the clusters of environmental quality (18% of the responses of that age group), and parks and recreation (also 18%). Ages 25-34 placed the most emphasis on parks and recreation (16%), environmental quality (15%), and demography (14%). Ages 35-44 placed most emphasis on the clusters of sense of community/quality of life (18%), natural beauty (15%), and demography (14%). Ages 45-54 placed most emphasis on parks and recreation (22%), and demography (16%). Ages 55-64 placed most emphasis on environmental quality (19%) and demography (15%), ages 65-74 placed most emphasis on natural beauty (16%) and demography (14%). Finally, ages 75+ placed most emphasis on the clusters of weather (23%) and sense of community/quality of life (13%). In addition, ages 18-24 (16%) and ages 65-74 (13%) accounted for more than their shares of 'don't know' responses.

## B. PERCEIVED WEAKNESSES

Respondents were asked what they thought Portland's weaknesses were as a place to live, and the sample of 406 respondents offered 780 responses, placed into 69 categories and 21 clusters. Clearly, the greatest concern was in the area of crime, where 18% (n=141) of all responses fell. In addition, the next two largest categories fell into the same cluster of public safety; 8% of responses said that gangs were Portland's greatest weakness, and 6% said the same about drugs. An additional 6% of the comments said that taxes were too high.

By cluster, public safety came in first, accounting for 40% of all comments (18% crime, 8% gangs, 6% drugs, 3% negative comment about police with no age group variation, 2% said they did not feel safe, and 1% each mentioned violence, the need for more police, stiffer penalties for criminals, and more jail space). Coming in a distant second was the cluster of government which accounted for 15% of responses (6% taxes too high, 4% each for local government not effective and commissioners and/or Mayor doing a poor job, and 1% said there was a need for a new local government structure or city manager). Third place was the cluster of transportation, at 7% (4% too much traffic, 2% need better mass transit system, and 1% roads not well maintained). Fourth place was demography which accounted for 5% of all responses (2% the people and 1% each for small town, right size, and big town with small town feeling). All other clusters accounted for less than 5% each.

Respondents were then asked to specify Portland's greatest weakness as a place to live (see Table 2), and comments were coded into the same categories and clusters used above, except that only one response per respondent was accepted. Responses paralleled those reported in the previous paragraph. Most frequently mentioned was crime (28%), followed distantly by 7% taxes too high. The public safety cluster accounted for 42% of the respondents, and the next largest, government, accounted for 14% of the respondents. All other comments accounted for less than 5% each.

There was one sub-group interaction. Respondents with no children at home (68% of the sample) placed greater emphasis on the cluster of government as

Portland's greatest weakness than respondents with children, 16% compared to 7%.

## IV. COMMUNITY VALUES

Respondents were read a list of 21 qualities that people use to describe the community in which they live. The qualities were rotated in administration to avoid potential errors related to administration order. As each quality was read, the respondent rated it on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1=not important at all, and 5=very important. Table 3 displays the means and standard deviations for all 21 qualities. Noted was that all qualities were rated above the mid-point of 3, indicating that the respondents perceived all 21 qualities as important.

Rated most important was a clean environment (4.56), and this had the smallest standard deviation, indicating a greater degree of agreement among respondents. Rated almost as important was respect for the environment (4.46), and this quality also had a relatively small standard deviation. In fact, this was the only quality in which no respondent rated it as not at all important. Not far behind, rated third, was quality public elementary and high school education (4.42), followed by feeling of personal safety in my neighborhood (4.35). Rated clearly the lowest (but still above the mid-point) was a small town feeling (3.37), and welcoming foreign money and people (3.44).

It was very encouraging that one of Portland's great strengths, environmental cleanliness, was also rated as the most important community value.

Respondents were asked, "Of the different qualities we've talked about, which one is the MOST important to you personally?" See Table 4. The best way to interpret these findings is to compare them to the results displayed in Table 2, where respondents were asked to identify Portland's greatest strength, and Table 4, where respondents were asked to identify Portland's greatest weakness.

In terms of different qualities, mentioned most often as the most important quality was public safety (18% of respondents), but only 1% of respondents said that public safety was Portland's greatest strength. Furthermore, 42% of respondents said public safety was Portland's greatest weakness. An additional

9% of respondents mentioned public safety as the second most important quality (a ranking of third behind education and environmental quality).

Mentioned second most often as the most important quality was environmental qualities (17% in all, 12% of which related specifically to a clean environment). It was also rated second highest (14%) as the second most important quality. As noted above, it received the highest mean rating and was also rated as Portland's greatest strength.

Only one other quality received many mentions; 14% of respondents said education was the most important quality (15% said it was the second most important quality), but interestingly, education was rated as Portland's greatest strength by only 1% and was rated as its greatest weakness by only 2% of respondents. On the other hand, while demographic characteristics were valued as one of Portland's greatest strengths, only 5% of respondents mentioned it as the most important quality (2% said it was the second most important quality).

Sub-group interactions: There were two significant sub-group interactions related to the choice of most important quality, and there were several sub-group interactions related to the mean ratings of qualities.

- \* Respondents with children (24%) mentioned education as the most important quality much more often than did respondents with no children (10%).
- \* Females (22%) placed more emphasis on public safety than did males (15%), and women (11%) also placed more emphasis on a sense of community and quality of life than did men (6%). On the other hand, men (8%) placed greater emphasis on the government than did women (1%).

For the 21 mean rated qualities, comparison to demographic variables was most fruitful when the multi-category demographic variables were re-coded into two or three groups. Age was coded into low (18-34), medium (35-54) and high (55 and over). Income was coded into low (\$20,000 and under), medium (\$20,001-\$40,000), and high (\$40,001 and over). Education was coded into high school



graduate and below versus some college and above. Length of residence in Portland was coded into short (5 years and under) and long (6 or more years). Number of children was divided into respondents with children versus those without children. However, number of children was also a continuous variable, and considering only respondents with children, there was a significant correlation.

- \* Comparing low and medium ages, low-aged respondents (4.05) placed greater emphasis on variety of arts and cultural events and programs than did medium aged respondents (3.79). Low-aged respondents (4.69) also placed more emphasis on a clean environment than did medium aged respondents (4.51).
- \* Comparing low and high ages, low-aged respondents (4.05) again placed more emphasis on variety of arts and cultural events and programs than did high aged respondents (3.66). In five other interactions, low-aged respondents scored higher than high-aged respondents. These included: respect for the environment (4.55 to 4.29), programs to help the homeless (4.00 to 3.31), an ethnically diverse community (4.15 to 3.75), a clean environment (4.69 to 4.49), and a tolerant attitude towards different types of people and people who hold different points of view (4.34 to 3.99).
- \* Comparing medium to high ages, six qualities were statistically different, and in all cases, medium-aged respondents scored higher than high aged respondents: well-run city government (4.25 to 3.94), respect for the environment (4.52 to 4.29), feeling of personal safety in my neighborhood (4.51 to 4.20), availability of good health care for everybody (4.30 to 4.02), programs to help the homeless (3.77 to 3.31), and a tolerant attitude towards different types of people or people who hold different points of view (4.28 to 3.99).
- \* Comparing low to medium income, low income respondents (4.04) placed greater emphasis on programs to help the homeless than did medium income respondents (3.64). Low income respondents (4.69) also placed more emphasis on a clean environment than did medium income respondents (4.50).

- \* Comparing low to high income, in five of six significant interactions, low income respondents rated the quality as more important than did high income respondents. These included: a small town feeling (3.60 to 3.19), neighborhoods with distinct characteristics (4.02 to 3.69), programs to help the homeless (4.05 to 3.63), a steadily growing economy (4.31 to 4.02), and high quality public community college and four year college education (4.43 to 4.15). Only for a well-run city government did high income respondents (4.45) offer a higher rating than low income respondents (4.12).
- \* Comparing medium to high income, in five of six significant interactions, high income respondents rated the quality as more important than did medium income respondents. These included: well run city government (4.45 to 4.03), respect for the environment (4.63 to 4.34), high quality of life-where there is a minimum of traffic congestion, smog, and sprawl (4.48 to 4.17), availability of good health care for everybody (4.43 to 4.13), and a clean environment (4.70 to 4.50). Only for a high quality public community college and four year college education did medium income respondents (4.40) outscore high income respondents (4.14).
- \* Gender revealed several significant differences, and in all cases, females rated the quality higher than did males. These included: well-run city government (4.32 to 3.98), a small town feeling (3.56 to 3.29), neighborhoods with distinct character (3.96 to 3.72), programs for the homeless (3.83 to 3.54), strong citizen participation in local government (4.11 to 3.88), and quality public elementary and high school education (4.58 to 4.36).
- \* Concerning the presence versus the absence of children in the home, four of five significant interactions favored families with children, including: housing than most people can afford (4.38 to 4.16), respect for the environment (4.62 to 4.40), feeling of personal safety in my neighborhood (4.51 to 4.29), and an ethnically diverse community (4.15 to 3.85). Respondents with no children at home (3.69) favored welcoming foreign money and people more so than did respondents with children (3.43).

- \* Considering only respondents with children, there was a significant negative correlation (-.24) between number of children at home and degree of importance placed on neighborhoods with distinct character. The greater the number of children, the lower the rating of importance on this variable.

#### Statements:.

Respondents were read five statements and asked to rate their agreement to each statement, using a five point scale where 1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree (see Table 5). Rated highest, with a mean of 4.04, was "Considering the kind of city I want to live in, such things as caring for poor people and the mentally ill are as important as things like public safety and public works." Rated a not too distant second, at 3.92, was, "It is important to preserve our environmental quality even if it means slower economic growth." Rated third, on the disagree side of the scale at 2.96, was "More people in my neighborhood will lower the quality of life." Rated fourth, near 'somewhat' disagree at 1.91, was "I would like Portland to grow like Seattle is growing." Rated lowest, at 1.79, was "I wish Portland was more big city like San Francisco or Vancouver, British Columbia."

There were several sub-group interactions.

- \* Comparing the low to the high ages, low-aged respondents (4.03) agreed more strongly with the statement of preserving the environment even if it means slower economic growth than did the high-aged respondents (3.75). High-aged respondents (1.68) disagreed, more strongly with the statement about wanting Portland to be more like San Francisco or Vancouver, B.C. than did low-aged respondents (2.01).
- \* Medium-aged respondents (4.01) agreed more strongly with the statement about preserving the environment even if it means slower economic growth than did high-aged respondents (3.75).

- \* Females agreed more strongly than males about two statements: preserving the environment even if it means slower economic growth (4.08 to 3.80) and public assistance being as important as public safety (4.23 to 3.91). Further, females (1.90) disagreed more with the statement about wanting Portland to grow like Seattle is doing more so than males (2.19).

Considering only the respondents with children, there was a negative correlation (-.18) between the number of children and agreement with the statement about preserving the environment even if it means slower economic growth. The greater the number of children, the lesser the agreement with this statement.

## V. THE FUTURE

Respondents were asked, "In terms of the things you value most about this community, do you see Portland's future getting better or worse than the present?" There were 60% (n=242) of respondents who chose better, 30% (n=123) chose worse, and the remaining 10% were unsure. See Table 6.

There were two sub-group interactions. By education, respondents with no high school diploma chose better only 25% of the time and they chose worse 57% of the time, while their percent of unsures was larger than the other age groups, at 18%.

By length of residence in Portland, respondents who had been here less than one year differed from the other length of residence groups, where 50% said better, 25% said worse (which was similar to the total sample result), but, understandably, 25% were unsure.

The 242 respondents who chose better were asked why, and a total of 322 responses were recorded (see Table 7). Mentioned most often, 29% of the time, was that the people were getting better, were more aware, and were producing more efforts to improve things, particularly the environment. This was followed distantly by 13% mentioning the control of crime, 12% mentioning that the economy will grow, 10% mentioned a variety of 'other' reasons, 9% mentioned land use planning, and 5% mentioned that a new generation and/or new leadership will make things better. All other categories were less than 5% each.

The 123 respondents who chose worse were asked why, and a total of 208 responses were recorded (see Table 8). Mentioned most often, 25% of the time, was that Portland was growing too fast, followed closely by 21% mentioning public safety decreasing while crime and gangs were increasing. These were followed distantly by 13% mentioning a variety of 'other' reasons, 10% mentioning government and politics, 8% mentioned deteriorating environment and quality of life, and 6% mentioned worsening housing costs and/or availability. All other categories were less than 5% each.

Respondents were also asked, "Looking into the future -- 10 years from now -- what do you want Portland to be like?" A total of 772 responses were recorded, using some of the categories and clusters that were used in discussing Portland's strengths (see Table 9). Mentioned by 12% of the responses was a reduction in the crime rate or an increase in general personal safety, and this was followed by 8% each mentioning that there would be no significant change, that the economy will grow and prosper, and that the environment would be kept clean and taken care of.

By cluster, public safety accounted for 14% of responses (including 12% crime rate down and 3% public safety), followed by 12% environmental quality (including 8% clean environment, 2% quality of life maintained, and 1% more recycling), 11% economy (including 8% economy growing, 3% more better jobs and employment opportunities, and 1% growth of tourism), 7% mentioned avoiding traffic and transportation problems, 5% mentioned demography (including 4% no more people, remain the same size), 5% mentioned sense of community/quality of life (including 3% neighborliness/friendly town/getting along/less racial tension), and there were 5% 'other' comments.

## VI. SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHY

Percents for some collapsed demographic items (age, education, ethnic background, and number of children) were displayed in comparison to other data bases pertinent to the same City of Portland population in the Introduction and Methodology section. Listings with no collapsed categories, and for all demographic information, can be found in Tables 10-17.

In highlight, the most numerous age category was the 25-44 range, the most numerous income category was the \$20,001-\$30,000 range, the most numerous education category was that of some college, a numerous 58% of respondents reported living in the City of Portland for 20 or more years, 92% of the sample was White, 32% of the households had children living in them, and among this 32%, the mean number of children was 1.79, with a standard deviation of .86 and a median of 2 (range 1-4), 46% of the sample was employed at least 30 hours per week, and gender was split 50% male, 50% female.

# **TABLES**



# TABLE 1

## PORTLAND'S GREATEST STRENGTH

Q. What is Portland's greatest strength as a place to live?

NOTES:

- QUANTITY IS LESS THAN .5 PERCENT.

PERCENT OF SUB-TOTALS ARE CALCULATED FROM SUB-TOTAL FREQUENCY.

DUE TO ROUNDING ERRORS, PERCENTS MAY NOT ADD UP TO 100.

SAMPLE SIZE 406

|   | Frequency | Percent |
|---|-----------|---------|
| <u>DEMOGRAPHY.</u>                              |           |         |
| The people                                      | 15        | 4       |
| Growing population-positive                     | 2         | 1       |
| Ethnic diversity-positive                       | 3         | 1       |
| Not too crowded/not too big                     | 7         | 2       |
| "Small town"                                    | 7         | 2       |
| Right size                                      | 8         | 2       |
| Big town with small town feeling                | 4         | 1       |
| Family/friends                                  | 4         | 1       |
| Familiarity/comfort level                       | 3         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL  | 53        | 13      |
| <u>ECONOMY</u>                                  |           |         |
| Good business climate                           | 1         | -       |
| Jobs/job advancement opportunities              | 14        | 3       |
| Growing economy                                 | 4         | 1       |
| Diversified economy                             | 1         | -       |
| Cost of living manageable (e.g. clothing, food) | 4         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL  | 24        | 6       |
| <u>LAND USE</u>                                 |           |         |
| Good planning/zoning                            | 2         | 1       |
| Suburbs convenient, not too far away            | 1         | -       |
| Everything convenient                           | 10        | 3       |
| SUBTOTAL  | 13        | 3       |
| <u>TRANSPORTATION.</u>                          |           |         |
| Mass transit/light rail                         | 5         | 1       |
| Traffic minimized/no traffic congestion         | 1         |         |
| SUBTOTAL  | 6         | 2       |

# TABLE 1 (CONT..)

|  | Frequency | Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|
| <u>HOUSING.</u>  |           |         |
| Affordable housing/housing cost low                        | 3         | 1       |
| Nice homes   | 2         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL   | 5         | 1       |
| <u>ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY</u>                               |           |         |
| Quality of life  | 15        | 4       |
| Cleanliness/clean environment/<br>take care of environment | 29        | 7       |
| Concern for environment/ecology minded                     | 5         | 1       |
| Clean water  | 1         | -       |
| Clean air  | 3         | 1       |
| Quiet  | 3         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL   | 56        | 14      |
| <u>EDUCATION</u>   |           |         |
| Education/schools  | 2         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL   | 2         | 1       |
| <u>PUBLIC SAFETY</u>                                       |           |         |
| Safety/public safety                                       | 3         | 1       |
| Police force-quantity and/or quality                       | 2         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL   | 5         | 1       |
| <u>PARKS AND RECREATION,</u>                               |           |         |
| Location close to coast, mountains, E. Oregon              | 32        | 8       |
| The river(s): Willamette and/or Columbia                   | 2         | 1       |
| Recreational opportunities                                 | 7         | 2       |
| Availability of parks/name of specific park                | 1         |         |
| Parks well maintained                                      | 1         |         |
| Professional sports teams, events/Trailblazers             | 1         |         |
| Coliseum/stadium   | 1         |         |
| SUBTOTAL   | 45        | 11      |
| <u>ARTS AND CULTURE,</u>                                   |           |         |
| Accessibility of programs                                  | 1         |         |
| Frequency and availability of programs                     | 3         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL   | 4         | 1       |

# TABLE 1 (CONT..)

|  | Frequency | Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|
| <u>SENSE OF COMMUNITY/QUALITY OF LIFE</u>                    |           |         |
| Good neighborhoods   | 5         | 1       |
| Neighborliness/friendly town/getting along                   | 30        | 7       |
| People helping people/<br>concern and care for others        | 3         | 1       |
| Civic pride/pride in what they have                          | 2         | 1       |
| Community involvement in events<br>(Rose Festival)           | 2         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL   | 42        | 10      |
| <u>NATURAL BEAUTY,</u>                                       |           |         |
| Nature   | 5         | 1       |
| Scenic beauty/the greenery/pretty town                       | 36        | 9       |
| Views  | 1         | -       |
| SUBTOTAL   | 42        | 10      |
| GOVERNMENT   |           |         |
| Good city management   | 4         | 1       |
| People have a voice/opportunities<br>for citizen involvement | 1         |         |
| SUBTOTAL   | 5         | 1       |
| <u>WEATHER</u>   |           |         |
| Mild/moderate  | 31        | 8       |
| Rain - positive comment                                      | 1         | -       |
| 4 seasons  | 2         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL   | 34        | 8       |
| DOWNTOWN - positive comment                                  | 4         | 1       |
| NOTHING  | 2         | 1       |
| OTHER  | 8         | 2       |
| DON'T KNOW   | 34        | 8       |
| NO RESPONSE  | 22        | 5       |

## TABLE 2

### PORTLAND'S GREATEST WEAKNESS

Q. What is Portland's greatest weakness as a place to live?

NOTES:

- QUANTITY IS LESS THAN .5 PERCENT.

PERCENT OF SUB-TOTALS ARE CALCULATED FROM SUB-TOTAL FREQUENCY.

DUE TO ROUNDING ERRORS, PERCENTS MAY NOT ADD UP TO 100.

SAMPLE SIZE 406

|   | Frequency | Percent |
|---|-----------|---------|
| <u>DEMOGRAPHY,</u>  |           |         |
| Too many people/overcrowded/<br>growing too fast                    | 6         | 2       |
| Too many Californians/<br>people from other states                  | 1         | -       |
| Too liberal   | 1         | -       |
| Is Racist   | 2         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL  | 10        | 3       |
| <u>ECONOMY</u>  |           |         |
| Not enough jobs   | 8         | 2       |
| Out-of-staters (U.S. and/or foreign)<br>moving here and taking jobs | 1         | -       |
| Wages too low   | 3         | 1       |
| Cost of living high (e.g. clothing, food)                           | 2         | 1       |
| Not growing fast enough (economically)                              | 2         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL  | 16        | 4       |
| <u>LAND USE,</u>  |           |         |
| Poor planning   | 2         | 1       |
| Urban sprawl - more dense development                               | 1         | -       |
| SUBTOTAL  | 3         | 1       |
| <u>TRANSPORTATION</u>   |           |         |
| Too much traffic/traffic congestion                                 | 12        | 3       |
| Roads in bad shape, not well maintained                             | 1         | -       |
| Need better mass transit system                                     | 3         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL  | 16        | 4       |

## TABLE 2 (CONT..)

|  | Frequency | Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|
| <u>HOUSING</u>   |           |         |
| Housing too expensive/prices increasing                            | 2         | 1       |
| Home maintenance, upkeep declining                                 | 2         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL   | 4         | 1       |
| <u>ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY</u>                                       |           |         |
| Polluted streams/rivers/water                                      | 1         | -       |
| Polluted air   | 1         | -       |
| Not enough recycling/solid waste problems                          | 1         | -       |
| Deteriorating roads, bridges, sewers, etc./<br>need more money for | 3         | 1       |
| No concern for environment/not ecology-minded                      | 2         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL   | 8         | 2       |
| <u>HUMAN SERVICES,</u>   |           |         |
| Homeless problem   | 8         | 2       |
| Inadequate care for elderly/handicapped/<br>disabled/disadvantaged | 1         | -       |
| SUBTOTAL   | 9         | 2       |
| <u>.EDUCATION.</u>   |           |         |
| Schools not well funded/need more support                          | 4         | 1       |
| Poor quality education   | 3         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL   | 7         | 2       |
| <u>PUBLIC SAFETY</u>   |           |         |
| Crime  | 113       | 28      |
| Don't feel safe  | 6         | 2       |
| Police - negative statement  | 11        | 3       |
| Need more police   | 3         | 1       |
| Drugs  | 12        | 3       |
| Gangs  | 17        | 4       |
| More jail space  | 1         | -       |
| More community working with police                                 | 1         | -       |
| SUBTOTAL   | 169       | 42      |

## TABLE 2 (CONT..)

|  | Frequency | Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|
| SENSE OF COMMUNITY/QUALITY OF LIFE   |           |         |
| Not neighborly/not a friendly town/<br>people don't get along/racial unrest                        | 6         | 2       |
| People don't help others/<br>no concern or care for others   | 2         | 1       |
| No sense of responsibility   | 1         |         |
| SUBTOTAL   | 9         | 2       |
| <u>GOVERNMENT</u>  |           |         |
| Taxes too high   | 27        | 7       |
| Local government not effective -<br>Commissioners and/or Mayor doing poor job<br>(the politicians) | 8         | 2       |
| 15   |           | 4       |
| New local government structure needed/<br>need city manager  | 5         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL   | 55        | 14      |
| <u>WEATHER.</u>  |           |         |
| Too much rain  | 14        | 3       |
| General negative/not good  | 4         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL   | 18        | 4       |
| DOWNTOWN - negative comment  | 5         | 1       |
| NOTHING  | 12        | 3       |
| OTHER  | 16        | 4       |
| DON'T KNOW   | 31        | 8       |
| NO RESPONSE  | 18        | 4       |

TABLE 3

## RATING FOR COMMUNITY QUALITIES

Q. Now I would like to read you a list of some qualities that people use to describe the community in which they live. As I read you each quality, please tell me how important it is to you personally today. Using a 1 to 5 scale where 1 is not at all important and 5 is very important, how important is\_\_\_\_\_?

|  | Mean | Std Dev | Min | Max | N Rating 1 |
|--|------|---------|-----|-----|------------|
| A clean environment  | 4.56 | .71     | 1   | 5   | 1          |
| Respect for the environment  | 4.46 | .80     | 2   | 5   | -          |
| Quality public elementary and high school education  | 4.42 | .91     | 1   | 5   | 7          |
| Feeling of personal safety in my neighborhood  | 4.35 | 1.02    | 1   | 5   | 10         |
| Quality public community college and four year college education                                   | 4.29 | .81     | 1   | 5   | 3          |
| Ample parks and recreational opportunities   | 4.26 | .82     | 1   | 5   | 5          |
| High quality of life, where there is a minimum of traffic congestion, smog, and sprawl             | 4.24 | .91     | 1   | 5   | 4          |
| Housing that most people can afford  | 4.21 | .99     | 1   | 5   | 6          |
| Availability of good health care for everybody   | 4.20 | 1.07    | 1   | 5   | 11         |
| A tolerant attitude towards different types of people and people who hold different points of view | 4.15 | .97     | 1   | 5   | 7          |
| Well run city government   | 4.13 | 1.20    | 1   | 5   | 23         |
| A steadily growing economy   | 4.11 | .95     | 1   | 5   | 6          |
| Strong citizen participation in local government   | 3.97 | 1.03    | 1   | 5   | 7          |
| Good business climate for small business   | 3.95 | 1.07    | 1   | 5   | 15         |
| An ethnically diverse community  | 3.85 | 1.03    | 1   | 5   | 11         |
| Variety of arts and cultural events and programs   | 3.81 | .99     | 1   | 5   | 12         |
| Neighborhoods with distinct character  | 3.77 | 1.02    | 1   | 5   | 12         |
| An exciting and prosperous downtown  | 3.74 | 1.08    | 1   | 5   | 15         |
| Programs to help the homeless  | 3.64 | 1.21    | 1   | 5   | 16         |
| Welcoming foreign money and people   | 3.44 | 1.08    | 1   | 5   | 23         |
| A small-town feeling   | 3.37 | 1.24    | 1   | 5   | 38         |

## TABLE 4

### MOST IMPORTANT QUALITY PERSONALLY

Q. Of the different qualities we've talked about, which one is MOST important to you personally?

NOTES:

- QUANTITY IS LESS THAN .5 PERCENT.

PERCENT OF SUB-TOTALS ARE CALCULATED FROM SUB-TOTAL FREQUENCY.

DUE TO ROUNDING ERRORS, PERCENTS MAY NOT ADD UP TO 100.

SAMPLE SIZE 406

|   | Frequency | Percent |
|---|-----------|---------|
| <u>DEMOGRAPHY</u>                       |           |         |
| Growing population-positive             | 1         | -       |
| Ethnic diversity-positive               | 14        | 3       |
| "Small town"                            | 4         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL                                | 19        | 5       |
| <u>ECONOMY</u>                          |           |         |
| Good business climate                   | 13        | 3       |
| Jobs/job advancement opportunities      | 1         |         |
| Growing economy                         | 14        | 3       |
| Diversified economy                     | 1         |         |
| SUBTOTAL                                | 29        | 7       |
| <u>TRANSPORTATION</u>                   |           |         |
| Mass transit/light rail                 | 1         |         |
| Traffic minimized/no traffic congestion | 1         |         |
| SUBTOTAL                                | 2         | 1       |
| <u>HOUSING</u>                          |           |         |
| Affordable housing/housing cost low     | 17        | 4       |
| SUBTOTAL                                | 17        | 4       |



# TABLE 4 (CONT..)

|  | Frequency | Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|
| <u>ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY,</u>                              |           |         |
| Quality of life  | 11        | 3       |
| Cleanliness/clean environment/<br>take care of environment | 47        | 12      |
| Concern for environment/ecology minded                     | 8         | 2       |
| Clean air  | 2         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL   | 68        | 17      |
| <u>HUMAN SERVICES</u>                                      |           |         |
| Healthcare   | 7         | 2       |
| Care for homeless  | 6         | 2       |
| Care for elderly/handicapped/<br>disabled/disadvantaged    | 3         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL   | 16        | 4       |
| <u>EDUCATION</u>   |           |         |
| Education/schools  | 40        | 10      |
| High school education                                      | 4         | 1       |
| College education  | 5         | 1       |
| High value placed on quality of education                  | 9         | 2       |
| SUBTOTAL   | 58        | 14      |
| <u>PUBLIC SAFETY</u>                                       |           |         |
| Safety/public safety                                       | 68        | 17      |
| No/low crime   | 2         | 1       |
| Police force-quantity and/or quality                       | 4         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL   | 74        | 18      |
| <u>PARKS AND RECREATION,</u>                               |           |         |
| Location close to coast, mountains, E. Oregon              | 1         |         |
| The river(s): Willamette and/or Columbia                   | 1         |         |
| Recreational opportunities                                 | 5         |         |
| Availability of parks/name of specific park                | 1         |         |
| SUBTOTAL   | 8         | 2       |
| <u>ARTS AND CULTURE,</u>                                   |           |         |
| Frequency and availability of programs                     | 4         | 1       |
| Churches   | 3         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL   | 7         | 2       |

# TABLE 4 (CONT..)

|  | Frequency | Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|
| <u>SENSE OF COMMUNITY/QUALITY OF LIFE</u>                    |           |         |
| Good neighborhoods   | 6         | 2       |
| Neighborliness/friendly town/getting along                   | 22        | 5       |
| People helping people/<br>concern and care for others        | 6         | 2       |
| Civic pride/pride in what they have                          | 1         | -       |
| SUBTOTAL   | 36        | 9       |
| <u>NATURAL BEAUTY</u>  |           |         |
| Scenic beauty/the greenery/pretty town                       | 1         |         |
| SUBTOTAL   | 1         |         |
| <u>GOVERNMENT</u>  |           |         |
| Better Taxation  | 2         | 1       |
| Good city management   | 10        | 3       |
| People have a voice/opportunities<br>for citizen involvement | 5         | 1       |
| Honest city government                                       | 1         | -       |
| SUBTOTAL   | 18        | 4       |
| DOWNTOWN - positive comment                                  | 5         | 1       |
| NOTHING  | 1         | -       |
| OTHER  | 2         | 1       |
| DON'T KNOW   | 20        | 5       |
| NO RESPONSE  | 26        | 6       |

## TABLE 5

### COMMUNITY VALUES - AGREE/DISAGREE STATEMENTS

Q. Now, I would like to read you some statements. As I read you each statement, please tell me how much you agree with it. Using a 1 to 5 scale where 1 is strongly disagree and 5 is strongly agree, how do you feel about\_\_\_\_\_

|  | Mean | Std Dev | Min | Max |
|--|------|---------|-----|-----|
| Considering the kind of city I want to live in, such things as caring for poor people and the mentally ill are as important as things like public safety and public works. | 4.04 | 1.02    | 1   | 5   |
| It is important to preserve our environmental quality even if it means slower economic growth.   | 3.92 | 1.10    | 1   | 5   |
| More people in my neighborhood will lower the quality of life.   | 2.96 | 1.29    | 1   | 5   |
| I would like Portland to grow like Seattle is growing.   | 1.91 | 1.09    | 1   | 5   |
| I wish Portland was more big city like San Francisco or Vancouver, British Columbia.   | 1.79 | 1.09    | 1   | 5   |

TABLE 6

PORTLAND'S FUTURE: BETTER OR WORSE?

Q. In terms of the things you value most about this community, do you see Portland's future getting better or worse than the present?

|            |     |
|------------|-----|
| Better     | 60% |
| Worse      | 30  |
| Don't Know | 10  |

## TABLE 7

### WHY PORTLAND'S FUTURE BETTER

#### Q. (IF SEE PORTLAND'S FUTURE GETTING BETTER) Why?

NOTE:

DUE TO ROUNDING ERRORS, PERCENTS MAY NOT ADD TO 100.

SAMPLE SIZE = 242

|   | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |
|---|-----------|---------|
| People getting better/more<br>aware/more effort (environment) | 93        | 29      |
| Control crime   | 41        | 13      |
| Economy will grow   | 39        | 12      |
| If landuse planning/planning                                  | 28        | 9       |
| New generation will make things<br>better/new leadership      | 17        | 5       |
| Just optimistic type person                                   | 12        | 4       |
| Will not grow too fast  | 9         | 3       |
| Just do   | 7         | 2       |
| Will be more help for homeless<br>and/or others in need       | 7         | 2       |
| More variety in entertainment/culture/food                    | 7         | 2       |
| People basically good   | 6         | 2       |
| Racial harmony/neighborliness/people<br>getting along         | 5         | 2       |
| More tourism  | 2         | 1       |
| Other   | 33        | 10      |
| Don't Know  | 4         | 1       |
| No Response   | 12        | 4       |
| TOTAL   | 322       | 101     |

## TABLE 8

### WHY PORTLAND'S FUTURE WORSE?

Q. (IF SEE PORTLAND'S FUTURE GETTING WORSE) Why?

NOTES:

- QUANTITY IS LESS THAN .5 PERCENT

DUE TO ROUNDING ERRORS, PERCENTS MAY NOT ADD TO 100.

SAMPLE SIZE = 123.

|  | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |
|--|-----------|---------|
| Growing too fast                           | 52        | 25      |
| Crime/gangs on rise/public safety          | 44        | 21      |
| Government/politics                        | 21        | 10      |
| Deteriorating environment, quality of life | 16        | 8       |
| Worsening housing costs/availability       | 12        | 6       |
| Taxes too high                             | 9         | 4       |
| Economy downturn                           | 8         | 4       |
| Deteriorating roads, sewers, bridges, etc. | 4         | 2       |
| Timber industry endangered                 | 3         | 1       |
| Quality of education                       | 3         | 1       |
| Moral decline                              | 3         | 1       |
| Growing racial tension                     | 2         | 1       |
| Don't Know                                 | 27        | 13      |
| No Response                                | 4         | 2       |
| TOTAL                                      | 208       | 99      |

## TABLE 9

### KIND OF PORTLAND IN 10 YEARS

Q. Looking into the future --10 years from now -- what do you want Portland to look like?

NOTES:

-QUANTITY IS LESS THAN .5-PERCENT

PERCENT OF SUBTOTALS ARE CALCULATED FROM SUB-TOTAL FREQUENCY.

SAMPLE SIZE = 406

|  | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |
|--|-----------|---------|
| Same/no significant changes/like it is today   | 65        | 8       |
| Like it was _____ years ago                    | 7         | 1       |
| <u>Demography</u>                              |           |         |
| No more people/same size                       | 31        | 4       |
| Familiarity/comfort level                      | 4         | 1       |
| More ethnic diversity                          | 5         | 1       |
| SUBTOTAL                                       | 40        | 5       |
| <u>Economy</u>                                 |           |         |
| Good economy/prosperous/growing economically   | 64        | 8       |
| More of a tourist attraction/growth of tourism | 4         | 1       |
| More, better jobs/employment opportunities     | 20        | 3       |
| SUBTOTAL                                       | 88        | 11      |
| <u>Land Use</u>                                |           |         |
| No sprawl/control growth                       | 45        | 6       |
| <u>Transportation</u>                          |           |         |
| Avoid traffic, transportation problems         | 53        | 7       |
| <u>Housing</u>                                 |           |         |
| More/better housing                            | 17        | 2       |

## TABLE 9 (CONT..)

|  |     |    |
|--|-----|----|
| <u>Environmental Quality,</u>  |     |    |
| Quality of life maintained/Livability maintained                     | 18  | 2  |
| Kept clean/cleanliness/clean environment/take<br>care of environment | 64  | 8  |
| More recycling   | 8   | 1  |
| SUBTOTAL   | 90  | 12 |
| <u>Human Services,</u>   |     |    |
| Programs for the homeless  | 17  | 2  |
| Programs for the elderly/handicapped<br>/disabled/disadvantaged      | 5   | 1  |
| Healthcare   | 6   | 1  |
| SUBTOTAL   | 28  | 4  |
| <u>Education,</u>  |     |    |
| Better education, schools (quality)                                  | 19  | 2  |
| Affordable education   | 4   | 1  |
| School, education funding  | 3   |    |
| SUBTOTAL   | 26  | 3  |
| <u>Public Safety</u>   |     |    |
| Crime rate down/safer  | 89  | 12 |
| Public safety  | 20  | 3  |
| SUBTOTAL   | 109 | 14 |
| <u>Parks and Recreation,</u>   |     |    |
| Dome Stadium   | 1   |    |
| Professional football team, more<br>professional sports              | 2   |    |
| SUBTOTAL   | 3   |    |
| <u>Arts and Culture,</u>   |     |    |
| More night life  | 2   |    |
| Broad offering of cultural programs/events                           | 6   | 1  |
| SUBTOTAL   | 8   | 1  |



## TABLE 9 (CONT..)

|   |     |     |
|---|-----|-----|
| <u>Sense of Community/Quality of Life,</u>                            |     |     |
| Neighborhoodliness/friendly town/getting<br>along/less racial tension | 27  | 3   |
| People helping people/concern<br>and care for others                  | 11  | 1   |
| SUBTOTAL  | 38  | 5   |
| <u>Natural Beauty</u>   |     |     |
| Beautiful   | 7   | 1   |
| <u>Government</u>   |     |     |
| Reduced Taxes   | 13  | 2   |
| Improved government/politics  | 19  | 2   |
| SUBTOTAL  | 32  | 4   |
| <u>Downtown</u>   |     |     |
| Downtown not deteriorated - positive comment                          | 6   | 1   |
| <u>Other</u>  |     |     |
| Other   | 35  | 5   |
| <u>Don't Know</u>   |     |     |
| Don't Know  | 17  | 2   |
| <u>No Response,</u>   |     |     |
| No Response   | 58  | 8   |
| TOTAL   | 772 | 100 |

# TABLE 10

## AGE

Q. is your age between:

### FREQUENCY PERCENT

|         |     |     |
|---------|-----|-----|
| 18-24   | 45  | 11  |
| 25-34   | 89  | 22  |
| 35-44   | 89  | 22  |
| 45-54   | 45  | 11  |
| 55-64   | 47  | 12  |
| 65-74   | 56  | 14  |
| 75+     | 30  | 7   |
| Refused | 5   | 1   |
| TOTAL   | 406 | 100 |

# TABLE 11

## INCOME

Q. Which income category describes your household's total income from all sources before taxes during 1989?

### FREQUENCY PERCENT

|                      |     |     |
|----------------------|-----|-----|
| Less than \$15,000   | 70  | 17  |
| \$15,001 to \$20,000 | 51  | 13  |
| \$20,001 to \$30,000 | 96  | 24  |
| \$30,001 to \$40,000 | 63  | 16  |
| \$40,001 to \$50,000 | 34  | 8   |
| Over \$50,000        | 49  | 12  |
| Refused              | 43  | 10  |
| TOTAL                | 406 | 100 |

## TABLE 12

### EDUCATION

Q. What is the highest level of education you have had the opportunity to complete?

|                                    | FREQUENCY PERCENT |         |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|---------|
| Did not complete high school       | 28                | 7       |
| High school graduate or equivalent | 90                | 22      |
| Some college                       | 139               | 34      |
| College degree                     | 101               | 25      |
| Advanced degree                    | 43                | 11      |
| Refused                            | 5                 | 1       |
| <br>TOTAL                          | <br>406           | <br>100 |

# TABLE 14'

## ETHNIC BACKGROUND

Q. What is your ethnic background?

|                 | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|
| White           | 374       | 92      |
| Asian           | 7         | 2       |
| Native American | 3         | 1       |
| Hispanic        | 2         | 1       |
| Black           | 13        | 3       |
| Refused         | 7         | 2       |
| TOTAL           | 406       | 101     |

## TABLE 15

### NUMBER OF CHILDREN

Q. How many children under the age of 18 reside in your household?

| NUMBER OF CHILDREN | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |
|--------------------|-----------|---------|
| 0                  | 277       | 68      |
| 1                  | 55        | 14      |
| 2                  | 47        | 12      |
| 3                  | 17        | 4       |
| 4                  | 6         | 2       |
| No Response        | 4         | 1       |
| TOTAL              | 406       | 101     |

# TABLE 16

## MAJOR ACTIVITY

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

|   | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |
|---|-----------|---------|
| Working full time - 30 hours or more                                  | 188       | 46      |
| Working part-time - 30 hours or less                                  | 34        | 8       |
| Have a job but not at work due to<br>ill ness, vacation, strike, etc. | 11        | 3       |
| Looking for work, laid off, unemployed                                | 8         | 2       |
| Attending school  | 18        | 4       |
| On vacation from school   | 3         | 1       |
| Retired   | 77        | 19      |
| Keeping house   | 29        | 7       |
| Other   | 31        | 8       |
| Refused   | 7         | 2       |
| TOTAL   | 406       | 100     |

# TABLE 17

## GENDER

|        | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |
|--------|-----------|---------|
| Male   | 204       | 50      |
| Female | 202       | 50      |
| TOTAL  | 406       | 100     |



# APPENDIX

## City of Portland Values Survey

Date:

Q. Number:

1 2 3

Interviewer Name: , \_\_\_\_\_

Interview Length: \_\_\_\_\_ Minutes

Hello, my name is \_\_\_\_\_, representing Decision Sciences, an opinion research firm in Portland. We are conducting a scientific survey for the City of Portland on community values. What we mean by values are those qualities that are the most Important to you about the community In which you live, that is, Portland. Your responses to this survey will be kept strictly confidential.

### SCREENER:

Do you live within the boundaries of the City of Portland?

IF NO, POLITELY TERMINATE

1. First, let's talk about Portland. In your opinion, what are its strengths as a place to live? (RECORD VERBATIM. PROBE.)

|                             |   |       |    |
|-----------------------------|---|-------|----|
| DO NOT RECORD IN THIS SPACE |   |       |    |
| 4                           | 5 | 6     |    |
| 8                           | 9 | 10    | 11 |
| DKINS=88                    |   | NR=99 |    |

2. What is Portland's greatest strength as a place to live? (ACCEPT ONLY ONE/RECORD VERBATIM.)

|                                |       |
|--------------------------------|-------|
| DO NOT RECORD<br>IN THIS SPACE |       |
| 12                             | 13    |
| DKINS=88                       | NR=99 |

3. *What are* Portland's weaknesses as a place to live? (RECORD VERBATIM. PROBE.)

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

4. What is Portland's greatest weakness as a place to live? (ACCEPT ONLY ONE/RECORD VERBATIM.)

|                                |       |
|--------------------------------|-------|
| DO NOT RECORD<br>IN THIS SPACE |       |
| 22                             | 23    |
| DK/NS=88                       | NR=99 |

5. Now I would like to read you a list of some qualities that people use to describe the community in which they live. As I read you each quality, please tell me how important it is to you personally today. Using a 1 to 5 scale where 1 is not at all important and 5 is very important, how important is \_\_\_\_\_ ? (ROTATE.)

6=DK/NS  
7=NR

|  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
|--|------|---|----|---|---|---|---|
| A. Good business climate for small business.   | 24-1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
| B. Housing that most people can afford.  | 25-1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
| C. Well run city government.   | 26-1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
| D. Respect for the environment.  | 27-1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
| E. A small-town feeling.   | 28-1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
| F. Feeling of personal safety in my neighborhood.  | 29-1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
| G. High quality of life, where there is a minimum of traffic congestion, smog, and sprawl. | 30-1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
| H. Neighborhoods with distinct character.  | 31-1 | 2 | .3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>  |      |   |    |   |   |   |   |

|   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I. Ample parks and recreational opportunities.          | 32- 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:                                   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| J. Availability of good health care for everybody.      | 33- 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:                                   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| K. Variety of arts and cultural events and programs.    | 34- 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:                                   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| L. Programs to help the homeless.                       | 35-1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:                                   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| M. Strong citizen participation in local government.    | 36- 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |   |
| VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:                                   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| N. Quality public elementary and high school education. | 37-1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:                                   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| O. An ethnically diverse community.                     | 38-1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:                                   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| P. A steadily growing economy.                          | 39- 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:                                   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Q. A clean environment.                                 | 40-1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:                                   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| R. Welcoming foreign money and people.                  | 41- 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:                                   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <hr/>   |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |

|   |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| S. An exciting and prosperous downtown.<br>VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:  | 42-1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|   |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| T. A tolerant attitude towards different types of people<br>and people who hold different points of views.<br>VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS: | 43-1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|   |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| U. Quality public community college and four year<br>college education.<br>VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS:                                    | 44-1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|   |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |

6. Are there any other qualities of an ideal community that you consider very important?

- 45- 1-Yes  
2- No  
3- D K I N S  
4- NR

7. (IF YES TO Q. 6) What are they? (RECORD VERBATIM. PROBE.)

|                             |       |    |
|-----------------------------|-------|----|
| DO NOT RECORD IN THIS SPACE |       |    |
| 47                          | 48    | 49 |
| 51                          | 52    | 53 |
| DKINS=88                    | NR=99 |    |

8. Of the different qualities we've talked about, which one is MOST important to you personally?  
(ACCEPT ONLY ONE/RECORD VERBATIM.)

|                                |       |
|--------------------------------|-------|
| DO NOT RECORD<br>IN THIS SPACE |       |
| 54                             | 55    |
| DKINS=88                       | NR=99 |

9. Which one is second most important? (ACCEPT ONLY ONE/RECORD VERBATIM.)

|                                |       |
|--------------------------------|-------|
| DO NOT RECORD<br>IN THIS SPACE |       |
| 56                             | 57    |
| DKINS=88                       | NR=99 |

10. Looking into the future --10 years from now --what do you want Portland to be like?  
(RECORD VERBATIM. PROBE.)

|                             |          |       |    |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------|----|
| DO NOT RECORD IN THIS SPACE |          |       |    |
| 58                          | 59       | 60    | 61 |
| 62                          | 63       | 64    | 65 |
|                             | DKINS=88 | NR=99 |    |

11. Now, I would like to read you some statements. As I read you each statement, please tell me how much you agree with it. Using a 1 to 5 scale where 1 is strongly disagree and 5 is strongly agree, how do you feel about \_\_\_\_\_?  
(ROTATE.)

6=DK/NS  
7=NR

- A. More people in my neighborhood will lower the quality of life.  
66-1      2      3      4      5      6
- B. It is important to preserve our environmental quality even if it means slower economic growth.  
67-1      2      3      4      5      6      7
- C. I wish Portland was more big city like San Francisco or Vancouver, British Columbia.  
68-1      2      3      4      5      6      7
- D. Considering the kind of city I want to live in, such things as caring for poor people and the mentally ill are as important as things like public safety and public works.  
69-1      2      3      4      5      6      7
- E. I would like Portland to grow like Seattle is growing.  
70-1      2      3      4      5      6      7

12. Please rank the following things from 1 to 4 as to how important each one is in choosing where you live? (ENTER NUMBER IN APPROPRIATE SPACE.)

DK/NS=8  
NR =9

(ROTATE.)

- |  |                    |     |
|--|--------------------|-----|
| 1. Good schools.   | MOST IMPORTANT     | 71- |
| 2. Neighborhood qualities like parks, street trees, and beautiful yards. | 2ND MOST IMPORTANT | 72- |
| 3. Close to job.   | 3RD MOST IMPORTANT | 73- |
| 4. Feeling of personal safety and security.                              | 4TH MOST IMPORTANT | 74- |

13. If you had to leave Portland, what things about the city would you miss the most? (RECORD VERBATIM. PROBE AND UNDERLINE PROBED RESPONSES.)

|                             |          |       |    |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------|----|
| DO NOT RECORD IN THIS SPACE |          |       |    |
| 75                          | 76       | 77    | 78 |
| 79                          | 80       | 81    | 82 |
|                             | DKINS=88 | NR=99 |    |

14. In terms of the things you value most about this community, do you see Portland's future getting better or worse than the present?

- 83-1. BETTER
- 2. WORSE
- 3. DON'T KNOW

15. (IF BETTER TO Q. 14) Why? (RECORD VERBATIM. PROBE AND UNDERLINE PROBED RESPONSES.)

|                             |          |       |    |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------|----|
| DO NOT RECORD IN THIS SPACE |          |       |    |
| 84                          | 85       | 86    | 87 |
| 88                          | 89       | 90    | 91 |
|                             | DK'NS=88 | NR=99 |    |

16. (IF WORSE TO D. 14) Why? (RECORD VERBATIM. PROBE AND UNDERLINE PROBED RESPONSES.)

|                             |          |       |    |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------|----|
| DO NOT RECORD IN THIS SPACE |          |       |    |
| 92                          |          |       |    |
| 96                          | 97       | 98    | 99 |
|                             | DKINS=88 | NR=99 |    |

#### DEMOGRAPHICS.

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.

17. Is your age:

- 100-1 Under 18
- 2- 18-24
- 3- 25-34
- 4- 35-44
- 5- 45-54
- 6- 55-64
- 7- 65-74
- 8- 75+
- 9- Refused

18. Which income category describes your household's total income from all sources before taxes during 1989?

101-1- Less than \$15,000  
2- \$15,001 to \$20,000  
3- \$20,001 to \$30,000  
4- \$30,001 to \$40,000  
5- \$40,001 to \$50,000  
6- Over \$50,000  
7 - Refused

19. What is the highest level of education you have had the opportunity to complete?

102-1- Did not complete high school  
2- High school graduate or equivalent  
3- Some college  
4- College degree  
5- Advanced degree  
6- Refused

20. What is your zip code?

97

103 104 105

21. How long have you lived in the City of Portland?

106-1-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

22. What is your ethnic background?

107-1-White  
2-Hispanic  
3-Black  
4-Asian  
5-Native American  
6-Refused

23. How many children under the age of 18 reside in your household? (RECORD NUMBER OF CHILDREN. IF NONE ENTER '00')

108,109-\_\_\_\_\_  
DK/NS=88  
N R=99