Defining Issues:
An Outline for the Future of Our Region

Version 1.0

Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies
School of Urban Studies and Planning
Portland State University
July 1999

CONTENTS

Introduction 3

Metropolitan Urban Growth 7

The I-5 Trade Corridor 13

Columbia River Channel Deepening 17

Air Quality in the Portland Metropolitan Area 21

Salmon and the Endangered Species Act in the Portland Metropolitan Area 27

Building the Regional Community 35

- How We Use the Natural Landscape 35
- The Lewis and Clark Bicentennial 39
- Resources for Neighborhood Involvement 40
- Media 42

INTRODUCTION

In November, 1998, the Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies and Washington State University Vancouver convened the second Bistate Governor's Conference on the Future of the Bistate Region. An audience of about 300 heard presentations from Oregon Governor John Kitzhaber, Washington Governor Gary Locke, former Oregon Governor Neil Goldschmidt, and Bill Dodge, Executive Director of the National Association of Regional Councils. In addition, Ethan Seltzer, Director of the Institute, provided an update on the state of the metropolitan area.

Through small group discussions, the participants identified five bistate issues of critical concern:

- Transportation - the groups were quite clear about the need to approach this as a "system" rather than "road" issue. Also included here was the channel dredging issue, funding, the airport, the links to the economy and to industrial lands, and the elimination of toll charges and use of technology to eliminate/reduce the need to travel.

- Growth Management - sprawl, jobs/housing balances, the provision of affordable housing, access to services, the region's carrying capacity, and simply coordinating land use planning were all included here.

- Environment - responding to the listings of steelhead and salmon led the list. Water quality and quantity, the river, the gorge, air quality, and creating common environmental standards through a bistate environmental commission all received mention.

- Building the Regional Community - the notion of the metropolitan area as a place, with a common culture and shared values, and being able to engage people in that idea received a lot of attention. In addition, groups identified getting the media engaged, governance, connecting Olympia and Salem, leadership, creating a long-range vision for the region, and sharing responsibility for children as important issues.

- Education - creating a seamless "k-higher ed" system, with easy access and common tuition charges.

Since the conference, we've used the issues outlined above and other information to begin to identify a short list of "super-regional" issues, issues critical to the future of this metropolitan area but for which there is no single institution capable of carrying them forward. Metropolitan areas today are rarely represented well by one institution. Their economies and ecologies play out over a much more complex landscape. Today, this metropolitan region spans parts of two states, six counties, and includes over 1.8 million people. In the next decade, we will likely see the territory associated with the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area increase in size. Consequently, the list of issues requiring new working relationships among communities and institutions will get longer.

This list of super-regional issues will begin to define both our future and redefine the metropolitan area. Today, we believe that the super-regional issues for our metropolitan area include:

- Salmon and steelhead recovery - this is a watershed issue, both from a geographic and a policy standpoint. This is an issue of natural resource and habitat quality. It is also a crucial test for the culture of the Pacific Northwest and our collective sense of place.

• The I-5/I-205 Corridor - moving goods and people along our region's major interstate highways will become increasingly difficult as growth outpaces the ability and willingness of local communities to reserve highway capacity to serve the region's economy. The requirement for local roads and mobility options will come into sharp focus as this issue proceeds.

• The Columbia River Shipping Channel - deepening the channel brings into focus the economic and environmental challenges facing the region and the entire Columbia Basin. This is an issue that will require difficult discussions about "trade-offs" and "balance", and they will last long after the Corps of Engineers makes its decision on the most recent dredging proposal.

• Regional Air Travel Demand - Portland International Airport serves both metropolitan Portland and the economy of the Columbia Basin. Projected increases in air travel and air freight have huge implications for the existing facility, impacted communities, and possible alternative sites and options. The Institute will be convening a task force for the Port of Portland this fall to review these issues.

• The Geography of Jobs - job growth in the region has been dramatic in recent years. However, not all jobs are equal. In addition, the location of firms and industries does not happen just anywhere. The economic geography of the region is changing, and that has huge implications for the competitiveness of the entire metropolitan area. The Institute's *Regional Connections* project is beginning to investigate this issue.

This short list will undoubtedly grow. Affordable housing is an issue regionwide. Similarly, education (K-12, college, graduate, and continuing) is an issue in every community and, in a knowledge economy, for every household. However, at this time these two issues are still being addressed largely as local rather than regional issues. Air quality will almost certainly emerge in the years ahead as a crucial metropolitan issue, though right now it is being dealt with on a state by state basis. The question of water supply may also join the list in the years ahead. We expect these issues and others to emerge more convincingly as regional, metropolitan issues in the future.

Finally, simply having a place where super-regional issues can emerge will continue to be a challenge for this metropolitan area. Building community at a metropolitan scale is crucial work that will need sustained effort. Though the focus for our two "Governors'" conferences on the future of the bistate region focused on bridging a state line, our true challenge is metropolitan in scope. Oregon and Washington, east and west, Tualatin Valley and Willamette Valley, all point to shifting our focus from simply bistate challenges to a more encompassing metropolitan point of view. Simply stated, we share a common fate in this metropolitan area. Our future will be built on the effectiveness of our common sense of place.

Taken together, these issues will be the defining issues for the future of the metropolitan region. Retaining a vital and competitive economy, in a healthy and inviting built and natural landscape, has been the key to our success, and the essence for our future. One without the other won't give us much. Meshing the metropolitan economy with the landscape we're creating and privileged to inhabit remains our central challenge.

This report follows up on the work of the bistate conference and inaugurates our work on this region's defining issues by providing background and contact information for the broad issues identified at the November, 1998, event. There is a lot happening for each of the issues noted by conference participants. As noted above, though we've determined that concern for education runs deep on both sides of the river, true bistate initiatives are only just beginning to emerge.

The primary issue for many school districts and advocates, funding, is presently only being addressed state by state due to the differences in the mechanisms for funding education north and south of the Columbia. There are some interesting partnerships starting to shape up among school districts, particularly through the leadership provided by the Multnomah Educational Service District, and Portland State and Washington State are exploring new ways to enable students to access the offerings of both institutions. Though this is an issue that we'll be watching in the years ahead, we will not report on education in this document.

Note that we've labelled this as "Version 1.0". This is intentional. We will be updating our list of issues, and refining our presentation of them, in the years ahead. This document is being circulated in "hard copy" to all attendees of the 1998 Bistate Conference. In the future, both this document and its updates will be posted on our web page, along with the proceedings from the conference and other information about the region.

Finally, this work could not have been done without the efforts of Jonathan Dent, Kate Bowie, and Ted Knowlton, whose work follows. We hope you find their efforts worthwhile. Matt Michels also contributed to this report.

Please feel free to contact us should you have any comments or questions. Thanks!

Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies
Portland State University
P.O. Box 751
Portland, Oregon 97207
503-725-5170
503-725-5162 fax
seltzere@pdx.edu
www.upa.pdx.edu/IMS/

Kate Bowie

METROPOLITAN URBAN GROWTH

I. Definition

The entire Portland Metro region has felt the affects of the massive growth of the past ten years. The region has grown 17% from 1990-1998. This growth has brought changes and concerns for all of the communities in Oregon and Washington located in the Portland metropolitan region. Two of the major impacts of this growth on the region as a whole are the growing lack of affordable housing and the changing jobs/housing balance within the region.

The recent rapid growth in the Portland region has brought with it rapidly rising housing costs. The median price of a home has increased from $84,200 in 1989 to $156,900 in 1998. This increase is second in the nation, after Salt Lake City. This is coupled with a growing income disparity has caused a shortage of homes to low-income and moderate-income households. Many governmental and non-profit organizations in the region have studied and developed programs to address this problem.

The Portland Metro area has experienced a tremendous amount of job growth along with population growth during the past ten years. The large amount of job growth has been in Multnomah and Washington Counties. There has been a large amount of housing growth, without equivalent job growth, in Clark and Clackamas Counties. This imbalance has impacts on all of the communities in the Portland Metro Region. In response, several organizations and governmental agencies have begun to study and set policies regarding this issue.

Affordable housing advocates and many policy makers believe that it is imperative to make policies now that will ensure that there will always be a certain amount of affordable housing left in all communities in the Portland region. Approaches to this problem have included everything from regionwide policies to smaller, community initiatives. One thing that all of the efforts have in common is the belief that our whole community suffers if we are not able to provide affordable housing for everyone.

At the same time, many policy groups and governmental organizations are beginning to look at the imbalance of jobs and housing growth in the region. Unlike affordable housing, however, few jurisdictions are developing a policy response to this issue. It is difficult for many jurisdictions to know how to respond to this pattern of growth. Instead, the implications of this imbalance are just beginning to be understood.

II: What is happening? Who is involved?

Affordable Housing:

In the Portland Metropolitan region there are many local efforts that address the lack of affordable housing in the region. There are wide range of Community Development Corporations that now provide neighborhoods with affordable rental and home ownership options for low-income households. Local Housing Authorities provide affordable housing through federal funds in the form of public housing,vouchers, and certificates that subsidize market rate rents. Municipal efforts through the cities also address the issue of affordable housing through studies and policy priorities.

Non-profit organizations like the Portland Housing Center, and the Housing Development Center, continually study this issue to obtain an understanding of the effects of the lack of affordable housing on our communities.

The following are examples of innovative and on-going efforts in the region that are responding to the need for affordable housing in the region:

• City of Portland Housing Preservation Ordinance - The City has adopted this policy as a response to the expiration of federal contracts for many subsidized housing units in the City. This policy assures that publicly assisted rental housing affordable to low and moderate income persons and households will be preserved as a long-term resource to the maximum extent practicable. The City of Portland will do this by purchasing the buildings from the owners that want to opt out of the federal contracts that subsidizes its units. The City will then preserve the units in the building as affordable.

• Metro Affordable Housing Technical Advisory Committee - This committee was formed to respond to the affordable housing goals that were adopted in the Regional Framework Plan in December of 1997. Metro at that time committed to addressing affordable housing on a regionwide basis. This committee works on defining and implementing a fair share approach to affordable housing. By June, 1999, this committee will recommend fair share affordable housing targets for each jurisdiction to the Metro Council. By December 1999, the committee will recommend a regional affordable housing strategy plan.

• Coalition for a Livable Future - This is a non-profit advocacy group includes member organizations from throughout the bistate region. Their mission is to protect, restore, and maintain healthy, equitable, and sustainable communities, both human and natural, for the benefit of present and future residents of the greater metropolitan region. They have been a strong advocate for affordable housing in the Portland Metro region. They have an Affordable Housing Action Alert Network to alert the community about on going issues. The Network contacts its members by e-mail to encourage action regarding affordable housing issues of regional importance.

• Clark County Department of Community Services, Land Trust - Clark County has made a commitment to provide affordable housing in their community through the development of a land trust. The purpose of the land trust is to acquire and hold land for the benefit of the community. The land is then accessible for the use of community residents for affordable housing, businesses, and/or agriculture. This project is still in the planning stages and the county is in the process of acquiring funding.

• Portland Housing Center, The Changing Marketplace: Recent Transformations in Home Ownership in Portland, OR, 1990-1995 - This report was developed to document the transformation of affordable home ownership in the City of Portland from 1990 to 1995.

• City Club of Portland, Planning for Urban Growth in the Portland Metropolitan Area, March 29, 1996 - This study examines the urban forms required to accommodate the expected population increase, the desires of residents regarding how to achieve desirable forms of development, and the suitability of existing land use planning policies and systems for encouraging these desired urban forms.

Jobs/Housing Balance:

• Metro 2040 Growth Concept - This concept was adopted by Metro for the long-term growth management of the region including a general approach to approximately where and how much the UGB should be ultimately expanded, what ranges of density are estimated to accommodate projected growth within the boundary and which areas should be protected as open space. The growth concept is designed to accommodate approximately 720,000 additional residents and 350,000 additional jobs. The total population served within this concept is approximately 1.8 million residents within the Metro boundary. Metro plans to begin to address the issue of jobs/housing balance in the near future in relation to the 2040 Plan. This will be addressed as a growth management issue.

•Bi-state Transportation Committee - A new committee that includes members from Washington and Oregon that will address issues of bi-state significance in relationship to transportation needs. This will include a discussion of the job/housing balance in the region and how it relates to transportation. This committee has yet to meet.

• Coalition for a Livable Future, Portland Metropolitics: A Regional Agenda for Community and Stability - CLF commissioned Myron Orfield to do an assessment of the Portland Metro Region that looks at many issues including poverty, land use, jobs, crime, racial segregation, transportation, and schools.

III: FURTHER INFORMATION/HOW GET INVOLVED?

City of Portland
Cathey Briggs
503-823-7700

Metro:

Housing Technical Advisory Committee
Gerry Uba at 797-1737
ubag@metro.dst.or.us
www.metro.dst.or.us

Bi-state Transportation Committee
Chris Deffebach
(503) 797-1921
deffebachc@metro.dst.or.us

Jobs/Housing Balance
Mark Turpel
(503) 797-1734

Coalition for a Livable Future
(503) 223-2889
clf@friends.org
www.friends.org/clf

The City Club of Portland
Paul Leistner
317 SW Alder, Suite 1050
Portland, OR 97204-2531
503-228-7231
pdxcityclub.org

Community Development Network
Tess Jordan
2627 NE MLK Jr Blvd
Portland, OR 97212
503-335-9884

Sabin CDC
Steve Crowell
2517 NE Alberta St.
Portland, OR 97211
503-287-3496 x23

Friends of Clark County
(360) 695-5570
www.teleport.com/~focc

Clark County, Department of Community Services
Marlia Jenkins
1610 C Street
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000
(360) 397-2130
djay@co.clark.wa.us

Portland Housing Center
Peg Malloy
503-282-1397

IV. Conclusions

Without community involvement regarding affordable housing and the jobs/housing balance, our community could be dealing with the impacts of these issues for decades to come. Low-income households are finding it increasingly more difficult to locate housing that is affordable and are often forced to pay more than half of their income for rent. This instability means that many households in our community are living on the edge of survival.

There needs to be a renewed commitment of funds for affordable housing on all levels of government. Municipalities must begin to deal with the growing lack of affordable housing in their regions and develop strategies to provide it. Affordable housing is an issue being addressed by a few municipalities. Every community in the region should take on the responsibility of providing

affordable housing for everyone in their communities and for the growing number of people who are moving into our communities.

It is also important that our community looks at the possible negative impacts of the jobs/housing imbalance in the region. This problem is a difficult one to address, which explains why there has been little effort so far. However difficult, it is vital that communities address this issue and determine how they want to deal with this imbalance in their region.

Ted Knowlton

THE I-5 TRADE CORRIDOR

I. Definition

Interstate 5 is the only continuous interstate highway between Mexico and Canada on the west coast. In the greater Portland region, I-5 intersects with two transcontinental railroads and with deep water shipping on the Columbia River. The trade corridor is bounded on the south by the intersection with I-84 and on the north by the intersection with I-205 (14 miles).

Growth in the Portland region has lead to increasingly unacceptable levels of congestion with regard to both freight and commuter traffic in the I-5 trade corridor. The corridor is congested. Portland/Vancouver is the 14th most congested metropolitan area in the nation. I-5 is the most congested segment of the regional freeway system. Without improvements to the system, the congestion is expected to grow. Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) are expected to grow 40% by 2020. Meanwhile, vehicle delay is expected to grow 300% in the same period with truck delay expected to grow by 375%. In short, if the congestion is not addressed, this regionally and nationally significant trade and commuting corridor may compromise the economic vitality and livability of the region.

II. What is happening? Who is involved?

• I-5 Trade Corridor Study - The Portland/Vancouver I-5 Trade Corridor Study is a planning and design study of the I-5 Corridor sponsored by the Oregon Department of Transportation, Washington Department of Transportation, Metro, the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council, the Ports of Portland and Vancouver, the Cities of Portland and Vancouver, as well as both Tri-Met and C-Tran. This approximately $1 million dollar study is intended to offer multi-modal solutions in the corridor. Phase I of the study, currently underway, is the planning stage. It is being conducted without federal funds, but a grant for an additional $2 million in federal funding was submitted in January (1999). Phase I has two major tasks: a Freight Feasibility and Needs Assessment and completion of a Corridor Development and Management Plan.

> FREIGHT FEASIBILITY AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT: This task will examine I-5 from a freight perspective. It will examine arterial streets, rail crossings and transit service in addition to Interstate 5. Elements of the task will include documentation of the economic importance of the Corridor to trade, identification and evaluation of a range of improvement alternatives using modeling and conceptual engineering analysis, and recommendations on a range of improvements for further consideration.
>
> CORRIDOR DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT PLAN: This task will incorporate recommendations for the Freight Feasibility and Needs Assessment into long and short-term management and project-investment strategies. This plan will propose actions to be taken within the next 20 years at specific locations within the 1-5 corridor; many of the suggestions will be intended for adoption into regional and local comprehensive plans. Environmental and engineering considerations will be considered in determining the feasibility of suggested strategies. Public input and agency involvement will also be conducted to know whether strategies are appropriate. Elements of this task include:

--A complete cost/benefit analysis of potential solutions.
--Environmental analysis, including air quality impacts, and identification of potential mitigation strategies.
--Traffic analysis and transportation meeting.
--Identification of neighborhood, social, environmental justice impacts and potential mitigation strategies.
--Identification of potential right-of-way needs
--A land use impact analysis.
--Identification of environmental, social, and economic constraints to the development of the corridor.
--Development of a finance plan.
--Identification of a coordinated development plan or schedule for all planning, design and construction activities.
--Public outreach and involvement.

As noted above, federal funds have been requested for Phase II (as part of the same grant application as Phase I). The purpose of Phase II is essentially to implement the recommendations of Phase I. Improvement alternatives that are deemed implementable within five to ten years will be carried forward. Implementation of the Phase I strategies will involve the physical design of improvements and any necessary NEPA (National Environmental Protection Act) reviews.

• What Is The Timeline?

10/2001 = Completion of the Phase I of the corridor study (with or without federal funds).
10/1999 = Task 1: Freight Feasibility and Needs Assessment.
10/2001 = Task 2: Corridor Development and Management Plan.

10/2004 = Completion of Phase II.

• The Bistate Transportation Planning Committee - Other interesting things are happening besides the I-5 Trade Corridor Study. Recently, SWRTC (SouthWest Washington Regional Transportation Council) has been involved in a discussion with Metro's Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) over the creation of a Bistate Transportation Planning Committee. While there is a good working relationship between the two agencies, there is not clarity nor a bistate consensus that identifies a short and long-range strategy for bistate improvements. The Bistate Transportation Planning Committee would have as their charge to insure that the needed 1 to 6-year transportation investments are identified and funded, and to develop a consensus for a long range set of transportation system improvements and a financing plan to meet bistate transportation needs.

SWRTC will consider adoption of a joint resolution to create the Bistate Committee in April, 1999. JPACT is scheduled to consider adoption of the resolution in May, 1999. If formed, the Bistate Transportation Committee will review all issues of bistate significance for transportation and present recommended actions to SWRTC and JPACT. The intention is that JPACT and the SWRTC Board will take no action on an issue of major bistate significance without first referring the issue to the Bistate Transportation Committee for their consideration and recommendation.

Membership in the committee is to be drawn from agencies serving on the JPACT and SWRTC Boards. Representation in Washington would come from the Washington Department of Transportation, C-TRAN, City of Vancouver, Clark County and the Port of Vancouver. In Oregon,

membership would come from the Oregon Department of Transportation, Tri-Met, one of the Counties of the tri-county region, the City of Portland, Metro and the Port of Portland.

III: FURTHER INFORMATION/HOW GET INVOLVED?

Public involvement and input is programmed as part of Task 2 of Phase 1, development of the Corridor Development and Management Plan. This process is scheduled to begin, roughly, in October of this year (1999). The following are people and agencies to contact to find out more about the project and its schedule.

ODOT:
Kate Deane
Intergovernmental Liaison, Region 1
ODOT
123 NW Flanders, Third Floor
Portland, OR 97209
phone: 503-731-8245
e-mail: kate.h.dean@odot.state.or.us

WDOT:
Mary Legry
Transportation Planning Manager
Washington Department of Transportation
PO Box 1709
Vancouver, WA 98668
phone: 360-905-2014
e-mail: legrym@wsdot.wa.gov

SWRTC: SWRTC carries out regional transportation planning for Southwest Washington including Clark County. It functions as both a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and as a Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO).
Dean Lookingbill
Transportation Director
Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
1351 Officer's Row
Vancouver, WA 98661
phone: 360-737-6067
fax: 360-696-1847

METRO (JPACT):
Chris Deffebach
Metro
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232
phone: 503-797-170

IV. Conclusions

There are a lot of agencies involved in this project and it's well organized. In addition, there are other issues that dovetail with it, such as the Columbia River Channel Deepening project. Issues of transit and rail are also important. A major public involvement effort will begin soon as part of this project. Helping to direct citizens towards this effort will remain an ongoing challenge.

Ted Knowlton

COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL DEEPENING

I. Definition

The Army Corp of Engineers is currently conducting a five-year feasibility study to deepen the Columbia River channel from a depth of 40 to 43 feet. The study area covers 103.5 miles of the Columbia: from the terminus at the Pacific Ocean to the I-5 Interstate Bridge, and 11.6 miles of the Willamette (the area North of the Broadway Bridge).

The Columbia River offers immense economic benefits to the region. It is a strategic trade corridor for the nation. In 1997 it carried approximately 29.7 million metric tons of waterborne cargo valued at $13 billion. The Columbia also plays a vital role in the regional ecosystem. With the recent listings in the Northwest of salmon as a threatened or endangered species, the Columbia is under intense environmental scrutiny. Therefore, any changes to the river, such as channel deepening, must attempt to reconcile the often-contradictory goals of increasing shipping and improving habitat for wildlife -- especially salmon.

The need for Columbia River channel deepening is driven by steady growth in waterborne commerce and the use of larger and more efficient vessels to transport bulk commodities and containerized cargo. These larger ships, known as panamax ships, require deeper channels. Panamax ships currently use Portland area ports, but must leave the ports with less than a full load. Thus, the primary reason why proponents argue that the channel should be deepened is to increase the use of regional ports by making the channel compatible with current shipping technology.

Reasons FOR deepening the Channel:

--Consumer/ Business Expenses: If the channel is not deepened, consumers may pay more for imported goods and businesses will pay higher export costs.

--Regional Economy: The Portland area's trade-based economy may also erode.

--Displaced Transportation Burden: Inaction may place further cargo transportation burdens on other modes such as rail and highway freight.

--Decreased Maintenance Dredging: If the channel is deepened annual maintenance dredging would likely decrease. Annual dredging would decrease from 105 million cubic yards (mcy) to 90 mcy over the next 20 years.

--Lower Transportation Costs: The draft EIS shows an annual transportation benefit of approx. $40 million from the deepening.

--Net Economic Benefits: The draft EIS estimates the total net economic benefit per year at $22.2 million. This figure subtracts the direct monetary cost of the deepening.

Reasons Against Deepening the Channel:

--Impacts On Listed Fish Species: The current draft EIS from the Army Corps was produced prior to the listing in the Northwest of salmon species as either threatened or endangered. Sediment disposal sites and the affects of free-flowing sediment, contaminated sediment and coastal erosion were not adequately reviewed for their impact on the habitat of these listed species.

--Relocation Of Removed Material: 19.7 million cubic yards of material would need to be relocated on upland sites or in deepwater portions of the channel. The exact location of these sites is yet to be determined but could have substantial environmental impacts. In addition, some of the sediment may be contaminated, especially in areas of the Willamette River outside of the federal navigation channel. The Corps believes that such contaminated sediment could be relocated to deep areas within the Willamette and then capped with clean material, but this issue has not been resolved and it requires further study. For example, some of the Willamette sediment may not be biologically suitable for in-water placement.
--Increased Salinity: Dredging a deeper channel would likely lead to an increase in estuarine salinity under low river flow conditions. The impacts of this increased salinity have not been adequately studied.
--Disturbance Of Sediment: A disturbance of contaminated sediments may release toxins into the food chain. White Sturgeon, for example, are particularly susceptible to the so- called bio-accumulation of toxins. White Sturgeon are a shrinking species in the region that rely heavily upon the Columbia River.
--Coastal Erosion: Deepening the Columbia could cause erosion of coastal beaches. Columbia river sediment restores beaches along the coast. If the relocated sediment is disposed of in deep water areas of the river or ocean, much of this sediment will no longer recharge beach areas. In addition to reducing the direct flow of sediment to the coast, the deepening of the channel could produce an estuarine sink which would pull sand into the river mouth from the coastal littoral zone (the area between high-water and low-water mark), further accelerating erosion. If coastal erosion were to occur or increase as a result of channel deepening, there could be negative effects on the tourists, cranberry growers, and wildlife that use the coastal littoral zone.
--Direct Expense: Local sponsors (the seven ports) would have to pay 35% of the estimated $175.5 million-dollar project.

II. What Is Happening? Who Is Involved?

The US Army Corps of Engineers is conducting a channel improvement feasibility study for both Columbia and Willamette River channel deepening. The feasibility study began in 1994 and is scheduled for completion in 1999. There are two phases of public comment for the EIS that is included as part of the Corps of Engineers feasibility study. The first phase is closed to additional comment. The final public review comment period is pending.

May, 1999 - Chief of Engineer's Report
June, 1999 - EIS Record of Decision
2000 - Possible Congressional authorization through the Water Resources Development Act.
2001-2003 - Possible construction (channel deepening)

III: FURTHER INFORMATION/HOW GET INVOLVED?

Interested parties should contact the Corps regarding the final public review comment period. Written comments on the Channel Improvement Study can be sent at any time.
Laura Hicks (Project Manager)
USACE, Portland District
PO Box 2946

Portland, OR 97208
phone: 503-808-4786
e-mail: Laura.L.Hicks@usace.army.mil
web: www.nwp.usace.army.mil/pm/projects/crnci/

The study is being sponsored by the ports of: Astoria, Portland, St. Helens, Oregon; and the ports of Kalama, Longview, Vancouver, and Woodland, Washington. The public representative for the seven ports sponsoring the Columbia River Deepening Project is:
Dianne Perry
6208 N. Ensign St.
Portland, OR 97217
phone: 503-285-6343
fax: 503-285-6350
e-mail: crcc@teleport.com

The Port of Portland has their own representative as well.
Alan Willis
700 NE Multnomah St.
P.O. Box 3529
Portland, OR 97208
Phone: 503-731-7050
Fax: 503-731-7080

Other Interested Organizations:

- Ginger Metcalf
  Identity Clark County
  703 Broadway St., Ste. 610
  Vancouver, WA 98660
  phone: (360) 695-4116

- Oregon Environmental Council
  520 SW 6th Avenue, Suite 940
  Portland, OR 97204-1535
  phone: (503) 222-1963
  e-mail: oec@orcouncil.org

- The Lower Columbia River Estuary Program (LCREP) is a participant in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's National Estuary Program. LCREP works to protect and enhance the Lower Columbia River ecosystem.
  Deborah Marriot
  811 SW Sixth Avenue
  Portland, OR 97204
  phone: (503) 229-5247
  e-mail: lcrep@deq.state.or.us

- The Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC) is the technical support and coordinating agency for fishery management policies of the four Columbia River treaty tribes.
  Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission

729 NE Oregon, Suite 200
Portland, OR 97232
Phone: 503.238.0667
Fax: 503.235.4228
e-mail: croj@critfc.org

• National Marine Fisheries Service
Ben Meyer at (503) 230-5425

• Northwest Environmental Advocates
133 SW 2nd Ave, Suite 302
Portland, OR 97204
Email: nwea@igc.apc.org
Phone: 503-295-0490
Fax: 503-295-6634

IV. Conclusions

Many of the agencies and interest groups involved are waiting for the Army Corps to adequately study the costs and benefits of alternatives. For example, one such alternative is Loadmax, which is an advanced river stage and tide forecasting system used to forecast and schedule ship traffic based on river levels. In addition, the next phase of the study, addressing environmental impacts specifically, will be crucial.

Channel deepening is an issue of critical metropolitan significance. It brings into focus the balance between economic growth and environmental quality, though until the Corps finishes its studies the impact of one on the other is not known. Nonetheless, this issue provides the region with an opportunity to directly discuss and take action on basic values related to livability and sustainability in the region. As such, this issue deserves wide visibility and recognition in the months and years ahead.

Jonathan Dent

AIR QUALITY IN THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA

I. Definition

Portland and Vancouver share the same airshed. Sources of pollution on either side of the river affect the air quality on both sides. Similarly, efforts to reduce emissions improve air quality throughout the airshed. Overall, the air quality in the Portland metropolitan area is considered good. The Pacific Northwest is the only region of the country where urban areas consistently meet the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) standards for ozone.

The number of days each year where the Portland metropolitan area fails to meet this standard, however, is increasing. The region will find it increasingly difficult to meet EPA requirements as ozone standards become stricter and as population increases. Stricter EPA standards are also being implemented for regional haze and particulate levels and the impact of these standards are currently being analyzed. While air quality appears to be good at the regional level, there are sections of the metropolitan area, particularly in North, Northeast and Northwest Portland that have significant local concerns.

Activities that degrade air quality can be divided into point sources and non-point sources. Each requires a different approach. Historically, air pollution controls concentrated on point sources such as industrial emissions. These efforts have resulted in improvements in air quality over the past thirty years. Controls on non-point sources such as automobile and wood burning emissions have also been implemented with significant gains. Despite these controls, non-point source pollution has increased as the population has grown. This is particularly true as we own more cars and are driving more for work, errands, and recreation.

This report presents current efforts at evaluating and improving air quality in the metropolitan region and identifies issues that may affect us in the future. Maintaining current air quality conditions will depend upon the region adequately addressing growth concerns, affordable housing, neighborhood infrastructure, and jobs-housing balance throughout the region--in short, the elements that constitute the quality of life we in the Northwest expect. Failure to address adequately these factors will result in decreased air quality, which will in turn affect our health, our quality of life, and our ability to attract future growth to the region.

II: What is happening? Who is involved?

At the governmental level, air quality issues are primarily addressed by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), and the Washington Department of Ecology (DOE) and Southwest Washington Air Pollution Control Authority (SWAPCA). Each of these entities must, at a minimum, act to ensure that the area over which they have jurisdiction meets federal standards for clean air as determined by the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Ground-level ozone is a primary contributor to smog. Approximately 30% of ozone originates from automobile emissions. While the metropolitan area currently meets EPA standards most of the time, there are an increasing number of days each year when we do not. EPA standards for ozone are now being tightened. The impact of the new standards is being examined in Oregon by the DEQ. Their 10-

year predictive model suggests that the region will continue to meet EPA standards if current programs are continued.

The EPA recognizes the Portland-Vancouver area as one airshed for purposes of ground-level ozone levels. Washington and Oregon therefore coordinate their response to ozone levels. Nationally, there are many metropolitan areas that cross state lines which fail to meet ozone standards. The EPA already has an established framework for interstate management. One strategy Oregon and Washington have adopted is to coordinate their declaration of clean air days during periods of high ozone. Such declarations increase public awareness, decrease confusion, and assist media coverage. One goal of the declaration is to decrease automobile use during high ozone times (usually a few days each summer) by increasing use of public transit and eliminating unnecessary trips.

Carbon monoxide levels are not analyzed at the regional airshed level. The major source of carbon monoxide is automobile emissions. High levels tend to be concentrated around congested intersections or densely-populated areas. These considerations are taken into account when DEQ or DOE comments on growth and transportation concerns. In North Portland, the Oregon Environmental Council has voiced concern about air quality and its effect on asthma sufferers.

Fine particulate standards for the EPA are being tightened to include smaller particles. The major sources of fine particulates are large industrial sites and wood burning. Fine particulate levels in the metropolitan area have improved significantly over historic levels and the region should meet the new standards. The new standards have been incorporated into DEQ's annual report. Results of a study on the new level and the metropolitan area will be available this summer and can be obtained by contacting Steve Aalbus at DEQ.

The EPA will soon list the region for non-compliance with regional haze standards. The required response to this listing is not yet known. Regional haze is a product of cumulative emissions and can travel long distances. In response, a Northwest Air Management Group is being created which will include representatives from Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming as well as representatives from Indian tribes and federal land managers from the National Park Service, Forest Service, and Bureau of Land Management.

Overall, DEQ and SWAPCA work closely regarding ozone management and keep informed about the other's activities on other air quality concerns. They each play an advisory role on important topics in the other state. They also each raise air quality issues in other forums such as growth management and transportation hearings. An example of their cooperation is the use of offsets. Offsets allow a company that emits less pollution to sell their right to emit to another company. Overall emission levels in an airshed are still regulated, but the use of offsets provides a way to account for economic considerations in maintaining air quality. It is unclear if offsets could occur across state lines right now, as no attempts have been made. DEQ and DOE are working to provide a framework for interstate offsets.

While air quality may be considered good at the regional level, there are areas of the metropolitan region that have significant local concerns. North, Northeast, and Northwest Portland are particularly concerned about industrial point-sources emissions. Neighbors West/Northwest, a neighborhood association, obtained an EPA grant to study air quality and identified over 70 toxic compounds including benzene, a known carcinogen.

The organization sponsored a joint investigation of air quality in the neighborhood with DEQ. Results of this study will be available soon through Gregg Lande at DEQ. Neighbors West/Northwest has also produced a 24-minute documentary entitled "What Is in our Air?" which explores industrial pollution in urban areas with particular attention to the interface between industrial and residential areas. Copies of this tape may be ordered by contacting Sharon Genasci. House Bill 3293 deals with this issue as well and is being addressed by the current legislature.

Many of the compounds identified in North and Northwest Portland may be traced to the transferring of gasoline to barges so that it can be shipped to the Tri-Cities. The state of Washington is currently deciding if it will approve construction of an oil pipeline from Puget Sound to the Tri-Cities. If approved, the pipeline would obviate the necessity of barging gas up the Columbia River. This is a controversial proposal since the proposed route of the underground pipeline crosses three state parks and many wetlands and streams, including important salmon habitat. While Washington will ultimately make the decision on the pipeline, it is clear that building the pipeline would improve air quality throughout the metropolitan area, and would reduce toxic compounds in the Northern neighborhoods in Portland. Furthermore, it would reduce tanker and barge traffic along the Columbia River thus reducing the chance of accidental spills and lowering emissions from these sources.

Oregon DEQ has expressed these concerns and supported the idea of the pipeline in the draft Environmental Impact Statement being conducted for the pipeline. John Williams, representing labor unions of Portland workers exposed during barge operations, has voiced concerns of the Portland metropolitan area to the larger Washington state community. He has contacted the Washington State Parks Commission and Washington environmental organizations in an attempt to expand the analysis of the pipeline to include its impact on the Columbia River and its communities. Background information on this complicated issue can be found in several articles by Paul Koberstein of the Cascadia Times.

Several programs are addressing air quality concerns in the metropolitan area in new ways. Since much of the air pollution in the metropolitan area is from non-point sources, reducing them relies to a great extent on reducing our dependence on automobiles and grasping with questions of growth. As these connections are explored, two concerns become apparent: 1) traditional regulatory approaches are poorly suited to cope with cumulative affects from countless sources, and 2) changing lifestyle choices depends upon changing attitudes through information and education.

The Oregon Environmental Council (OEC) is conducting a study on the feasibility of instituting "location efficient mortgages" (LEMs) in the Portland metropolitan area. Initially developed in Chicago, LEMs recognize that housing located near public transit, retail facilities, and jobs reduce the need for automobiles within a household. A monetary value can be determined as to the potential savings a household enjoys by being efficiently located. This value is then included when calculating mortgage terms, allowing families to buy houses they might otherwise not be able to afford. By allowing additional families to purchase houses in central neighborhoods, LEMs have the potential to reduce sprawl caused by housing price differentials between central and peripheral sections of the metropolitan area and will reduce several factors behind the increase in annual vehicle miles travelled. OEC is in the process of determining what locations in the Portland metropolitan area could benefit from LEM. Clark County is not included in their analysis.

The Center for Science Education at Portland State University is addressing air quality concerns through the Horizons program. The Horizons program involves middle and high schools from throughout the bi-state metropolitan area. It provides extensive teacher training, establishes

monitoring stations, and allows students to collect data. Besides exposing students to air quality concerns, this data is being used to develop an urban airshed model which will be used to inform future policy discussions. Population growth is a key factor in the model.

A growing but unknown factor in air quality are emissions from 2-stroke marine engines. These engines are unregulated and their numbers and size have increased dramatically over the past 20 years. 2-stroke engines are also a major contributor to water pollution. Technology exists to significantly reduce marine engine emissions through the use of 4-stroke engines. These engines are more expensive and have not been as popular as 2-stroke engines. Skippers for Clean Oregon Waters (SCOW) brought this issue before the Environmental Quality Commission at their March, 1999, meeting. The issue most likely will need to be brought before the state legislature, however, for any real progress to be made.

III: Contact Information

Further information on programs, reports, and actions detailed above may be obtained by contacting the following individuals and organizations.

Cascadia Times, Paul Koberstein, (503) 223-9036
Department of Environmental Quality, Steve Aalbus, (503) 229-6798
Department of Environmental Quality, Gregg Lande, (503) 229-6411
Department of Environmental Quality, Annette Liebe, (503) 229-6919
Genasci, Sharon, (503) 229-0525
Horizons Project, Portland State University, Linda George, (503) 725-3861
Neighbors West/Northwest, (503) 223-3331
Oregon Environmental Council, Chris Hagerbaumer, (503) 221-1963 x102
Skippers for Clean Oregon Waters, Dan Pence, (503) 774-4207
Southwest (WA) Air Pollution Control Authority, Jennifer Brown, (360) 574-3058 x27
Williams, John, (503) 626-5736

Useful web sites:

Cascadia Times: http://cascadia.times.org/archives
Horizons project: www.horizons.pdx.edu
Oregon Environmental Council: www.orcouncil.org

IV: Conclusions

Air quality issues in the Portland metropolitan area have low visibility to the public. While government agencies in both states are working to meet EPA standards and to voice air quality concerns about transportation and growth issues, the interconnected nature of the region's geography and economy in relation to air quality is not broadly discussed. The region would benefit from a broader discussion of the effects of growth.

Currently, this discussion often polarizes the community along environmental-economic lines. Perceptions about air quality are changing, however, as the traditional dichotomy between clean air and jobs and a growing economy breaks down. The case of the Fort James paper mill in Camas provides an illustrative example. Responding to pressure from stricter EPA standards, Fort James is

implementing a $45 million project to reduce air and water emissions. Besides reducing the amount of chlorine the plant releases to the Columbia River, the project will reduce the release of odor-causing compounds by 85%.

Communities across the river, particularly Troutdale, stand to benefit greatly from these efforts. But it is Camas itself that will benefit the most. While Fort James remains one of the largest employers in Clark County, numerous high-tech firms have already moved to Camas. More are expected once the odor decreases. Quality of life is a central factor in the ability of high-tech firms to recruit employees and helps determine where these firms locate. By attracting new companies to Clark County, the project should ultimately improve the jobs balance in the metropolitan area and reduce the emissions from automobile travel (at least on a per capita basis).

Air quality issues cannot be dealt with in isolation or solely through stricter standards or tighter regulation. The long-term quality of the region's airshed will rely upon reducing the impact of each resident and industry. This is particularly important as the region's population continues to increase. The cumulative effects can only effectively be dealt with by considering the region as a whole: growth, housing, transportation, and economic issues. Failure to do so will likely result in increased regulations, lower quality of life for the residents already here, and more difficulties in attracting new industries to the region to maintain a vital economic base.

Jonathan Dent

SALMON AND THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT IN THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA

I: Definition

Salmon and steelhead are woven through the cultural, natural, and economic fabric of the Northwest. Current salmonid populations are a fraction of historic levels and continue to decline. While this trend has long been observed and is of concern to many in the region, the extent of decline gained wider exposure in 1995 when coho salmon along the Oregon coast were proposed to be classified as threatened under the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

The coastal coho listing was the first of several salmonid ESA listings. In March of 1998 lower Columbia River steelhead were listed as threatened. This listing is significant because it marks the first time a large urban area has been significantly affected by the Endangered Species Act. This was followed in March, 1999, with the listing of eight salmonid populations in Oregon and Washington as threatened and one, the upper Columbia chinook, as endangered. At that time as well, a decision on the Snake River fall chinook was deferred for up to six months.

Five of these populations either spawn in or travel through the Portland metropolitan area: upper Willamette steelhead, mid-Columbia steelhead, lower Columbia chinook, upper Willamette chinook, and Columbia River chum. ESA listings pose several unique demands. Any activity detrimental to salmon will need to be specifically covered under an incidental take permit from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) as provided in section 4(d) of the ESA. The 4(d) rules are expected to be announced this summer. This process and its effects are discussed in greater detail in the appendix.

The Portland metropolitan area's response to the ESA listings will help to determine the future of both salmonids and the ESA itself. The ESA has been under increasing attack for, among other concerns, its economic impact on rural communities. Last year's steelhead listing brought the ESA to urban America. Portland, and now Seattle as well, will be closely scrutinized by both proponents and opponents of the ESA.

Salmonids pose several unique challenges to recovery efforts. Salmon depend on cold, clear water with natural gravel beds for spawning. They are affected by dams which create barriers to upstream travel and cause mortality as fish attempt to pass by in either direction. Dams, in turn, create the cheap, non-polluting energy that powers our population and industry and form an important transportation corridor to the Northwest interior.

Maintaining cool water temperatures requires maintaining forested buffers along creeks, not just in mountain forests but along agricultural and urban sections of rivers as well. Such buffers also help to reduce erosion which clogs gravel spawning beds and suffocates salmon eggs. Salmon are weakened further by water pollution and low oxygen levels that are caused by non-point pollution sources such as agricultural and urban runoff. Finally, thousands of miles of prime spawning habitat are blocked by road culverts that were not designed to pass fish. Saving salmon will require addressing all these factors as well as the population growth that increases the demand on our resources.

It is easy to support salmon. Salmon are powerful symbols of the northwest; salmon are part of what define our region. Not surprisingly, there is overwhelming support for protecting and restoring salmon runs. It is also apparent that the ESA listings have the potential to delay and restrict the region's economic development. A primary concern is that significant money will be spent and development potential lost to meet ESA requirements without seeing an increase in the health of fish populations. While support for restoration efforts is currently high, this support could erode if fish populations fail to recover as costs mount.

Maintaining support for salmon recovery will require addressing the question of equity between different sectors of the region. These concerns are compounded by the need to achieve results with the money spent on restoration projects. For example, spending almost one billion dollars for the City of Portland alone on eliminating the combined sewer overflows (CSOs) into the Willamette River has begun to be questioned. Eliminating CSOs has other benefits besides salmon recovery, but it has been suggested that salmon would benefit more if that money were spent on other projects.

The emotional debate surrounding this decision is revealing. Many in favor of reducing the scope of the CSO project justify their position by observing that Willamette River water is already polluted when it reaches Portland. At the same time, many upriver residents of the Willamette, primarily agricultural and forest product industrial users, resent their activities being regulated and the costs imposed on them to meet water quality standards when urban areas are not subject to the same standards. Northwest salmon are the first significant urban listings under the ESA. How our region responds to these listings will help to determine the future strength of the ESA itself, as well as the validity of the "green" identity of the region.

II: What is happening? Who is involved?

The March, 1999, listings of salmonids has long been expected. Most, if not all, government agencies and many key industries have been preparing their response over the past year or more. A quick survey of these efforts shows repeated references to a few key elements:

> **Integrated Response.** Restoration needs should be prioritized and coordinated such that efforts are neither repeated nor overlooked. In particular, governments need to realize that salmon needs cannot be contained within jurisdictional or political boundaries.
>
> **Locally Responsive.** Restoration efforts should take into account the needs and desires of the local population as much as possible both to achieve buy-in and because local residents are most familiar with their conditions and needs.
>
> **Science Based.** Science can help us to identify and prioritize the limiting factors to salmonid health. Decisions should be based on scientific evidence, but science alone cannot make decisions for us as ultimately our actions are based on the value we as a society place on salmon.

In this examination of the region's response to the ESA listings, special emphasis will be placed on efforts that view salmon as a regional resource and that involve partnerships across organizational and geographic boundaries. Responses to the listings can further be divided into two broad categories: those that focus on effects in the field such as specific restoration projects or reduction of particular harmful practices, and those that address instead the governance questions of how society should be

structured to manage the resource most effectively. The line between these two is necessarily blurred as efforts in restructuring are undertaken to achieve improvements in the field.

The City of Portland responded to the 1998 steelhead listing by forming an ESA program. This program was motivated by several goals. First, the impact of city operations on salmon needed to be determined. To this end, each department is in the process of analyzing how their current operations affect salmon. A second aspect of the city's approach is to coordinate their response and allocate costs fairly to the different city bureaus.

Internal coordination has been fostered by the creation of a steering committee with representatives from each of the seven city bureaus. The steering committee, in turn, is part of a larger governance structure that includes Commissioner of Public Works Erik Sten, Bob Durston from Commissioner Sten's office, and Mary Abrams, the ESA program coordinator for the city. As the steering committee identifies issues and explores solutions it will communicate those findings to city staff and to the City Council. Initial findings are expected to be presented to the Council in June, 1999.

The City of Portland has also been involved with external coordination efforts. It has met regularly over the past year with NMFS to determine how city operations can be covered under the 4(d) process. City staff also meet regularly with Metro and the Governor's Office to work on securing federal funding for restoration projects. This is part of a larger effort including the Governors' offices of the four Pacific states. City ESA staff meets less frequently with other jurisdictions throughout the metropolitan area. Because of the technical nature of the city's response, it has not yet actively involved the public, though it has met with community stakeholder groups such as watershed councils, environmental groups, and industry organizations.

The city recognizes the need for public education and public outreach, and is attempting to expand these elements. In at least two cases, the city has reached across the Columbia River to include Washington in its response. Last summer's "At the Waters Edge" forum on the potential impact of ESA listings included representatives from Clark County, and the city has kept abreast of developments in the Puget Sound metropolitan area. Again, these are the first significant urban listings under the ESA, and the greater Portland and greater Seattle areas can help each other in working through this complex process.

Metro's response to ESA as primarily been integrated into existing programs. David Moskowitz has recently been hired as a full-time coordinator for the response to the ESA listings. By its nature, Metro actively involves jurisdictions throughout the metropolitan area. In addition, the Metro Policy Advisory Committee also includes representatives from state agencies and the business community. Metro occupies an important position for coordinating the regional response to the ESA listings. Metro’s Regional Framework Plan and 2040 growth concept are intimately connected to salmon needs and Metro hopes to convince NMFS that these plans can be the vehicle for restoration efforts.

Title 3 of the Regional Framework Plan deals specifically with water quality issues and new riparian development. Metro is currently undertaking stream assessments which will form the basis for a recovery plan. A grant from the state Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) enabled Metro to hire a consultant to evaluate riparian conditions in response to the requirements of the ESA. Other evidence of regional coordination by Metro includes their contact with local watershed councils, business councils, and the governor's Willamette Plan.

both states. A few of the more actively involved organizations include Oregon Trout, Native Fish Society, Oregon Environmental Council, and Defenders of Wildlife.

The academic community in Oregon has helped to facilitate the region's response to the ESA listings. The Mark O. Hatfield School of Government at Portland State University has helped to bring together representatives from Oregon's industry, environmental, scientific, religious, government and academic communities to form the Stewardship Plan Committee. It is currently preparing a State of the Environment report that will be the basis for developing an integrated strategy designed to achieve environmental, economic, and social sustainability. It is exploring new governance structures that coordinate efforts across sector lines and that do not rely overly on regulations. Its recommendations will be presented to the state legislature in 2001.

The Executive Leadership Institute at Portland State University also sponsored a forum last summer on the implications of ESA listings for local governments. This three-part forum brought municipal and special district leaders together to learn more about the ESA process and recommended options for action. Concerns specific to local governments in Washington state were included as well. Similar workshops may be offered again this summer.

The current process of relicensing Portland General Electric's (PGE) hydro projects on the Bull Run and Sandy Rivers provides a good example of organizations working together to address an issue on a system-wide basis. This process began in response to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) regulations regarding recertifying privately-owned dams. It has since been expanded to include ESA considerations.

Since salmon are affected by higher water temperature and lower flows resulting in part from the City of Portland's water supply system, the city became involved with PGE. As the primary land manager in the upper basin, Mt. Hood National Forest has an interest in ensuring salmon viability; at the same time land use practices in the upper basin have degraded fish habitat and road culverts block salmon access to historic habitat. The relicensing process has evolved to examine all aspects affecting salmonid health throughout the system. The process hopes to produce a Memorandum of Understanding between PGE, the City of Portland, NMFS, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Mt. Hood National Forest that will both meet ESA requirements and allow for relicensing of the project.

III: FURTHER INFORMATION/HOW GET INVOLVED?

Included here is contact information for all organizations listed above. Also included is information for many local watershed councils, as they provide an easy way to get actively involved in issues affecting your local watershed. Metro will be holding several workshops and open houses early in May to address salmon issues in the context of the Goal 5 Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection process. Call (503) 797-1871 for dates and agendas.

Locally Organized Watershed Councils:

Clackamas River Basin Council, Eric Carlson, (503) 650-1256
Columbia Slough Watershed Council, Jay Mower, (503) 281-1132
Johnson Creek Watershed Council, Bob Roth, (503) 239-3932
Sandy Basin Watershed Council, Debbie McCoy, (503) 630-2382
Tryon Creek Watershed Council, Dawn Uchiyama, (503) 823-5596
Tualatin Watershed Council, Elizabeth Moundalexis, (503) 648-3174 x116
Yamhill Watershed Council, Melissa Leoni, (503) 472-6403

Government Sponsored Organizations

Fish Recovery Board, Jeff Breckle (509) 427-5211
Lower Columbia River Estuary Program, (503) 229-5247
Governor's Watershed Enhancement Board, (503) 378-3589
Willamette River Initiative, (503) 986-0034

Government Agencies:

City of Portland, Commissioner Sten's Office, Bob Durston, (503) 823-3589
City of Portland, ESA Coordinator, Mary Abrams, (503) 823-7032
Metro, ESA coordinator, David Moskowitz, (503) 797-1579
National Marine Fisheries Service, Rob Jones, (503) 230-5429
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Jim Martin, (503) 872-5270 x5452
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, (360) 696-6211
Washington Governor's Salmon Recovery Office, Sandi Snell, (360) 902-2229

Other Organizations:

Association for Portland Progress, Rob McGrath, (503) 224-8684
Defenders of Wildlife, Sara Vickerman, (503) 697-3222
Executive Leadership Institute, Jennifer Chambers, (503) 725-5153
Friends of Clark County, (360) 695-5570
Identity Clark County, Ginger Metcalf, (360) 695-4116
Native Fish Society, Bill Baake, (503) 977-0287
Oregon Business Council, Duncan Wyse, (503) 220-0691
Oregon Stewardship Plan Committee, Bob Doppelt, (541) 744-7072
Oregon Stewardship Plan Committee, Craig Shinn, (503) 725-8220
Oregon Trout, Geoff Pampush, (503) 222-9091
Responsible Growth Forum, Addison Jacobs, (360) 571-9174

Web Sites:

Oregon Environmental Council: www.orcouncil.org
Oregon Plan: www.oregon-plan.org/index.html
Sake of Salmon: www.4sos.org/homepage
Save our Wild Salmon: www.wildsalmon.org
Washington Salmon Recovery Office: www.wa.gov/esa
Willamette River Initiative: www.econ.state.or.us/wvlf

IV: Conclusions

The full impact of the ESA listings on the Portland metropolitan region is still unclear. The listings have the potential to affect nearly all human activities in the region: how we wash our cars and driveways, how we care for our homes and yards, how much we pay for basic services such as water, sewer, and electricity, how much we pay for consumer goods. Traditional regulatory efforts are not likely to be an effective method for changing behavior at this level. Furthermore, considering the scope of activities affected, debates surrounding restoration efforts are bound to prove emotional, emotion which could challenge the current broad consensus that restoring salmon is the right thing to do.

Equity issues, project costs, perceptions of regulatory efficacy, and visible signs of improvement all will determine if that consensus can be sustained. There is a growing realization that salmon cannot be restored under the current crisis-driven regulatory framework. Agencies and organizations are increasingly working together to address salmon needs systematically and are researching and compiling the actions needed to further restoration efforts. While science can inform our decisions, restoring salmon ultimately rests on value judgments. There is a history of a lack of trust between the (loosely-defined) preservation and development communities. The future of the consensus on salmon restoration, and therefore the future of salmon in the region, will depend largely on sharing information on what restoration strategies work best, and the presence of a neutral forum for an open discussion in the community.

V: APPENDIX. THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

Protection under the Endangered Species Act represents a significant departure from earlier attempts at salmon recovery. Earlier efforts were often either limited geographically or only dealt with a particular aspect of the conditions affecting salmon. Because these efforts concentrated on areas with good potential salmon habitat, this has meant that urban practices have been largely ignored. Under the Endangered Species Act, any activity that harms an endangered salmonid or degrades its habitat throughout its range is restricted. Considering the scope of salmonid habitat requirements listed above, most human activities could come under scrutiny. Most of these actions will not be prohibited, but under section 4(d) of the ESA, any activity that harms endangered fish or their habitat requires an incidental take permit.

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is not expected to announce the 4(d) rules until this summer (1999). NMFS is currently involved in discussions with the affected states and Indian tribes to determine which current practices will be covered and which will need to be modified or restricted. It is the responsibility of each municipality, government agency and industry to evaluate their impact on salmonids and to prepare a plan for long-term recovery if they wish to be covered under the 4(d) rules. Most individual citizens will not need to be concerned with the 4(d) process directly as their actions will be covered by aggregate limits analyzed by local municipalities and special districts and negotiated with NMFS. Citizens who follow municipal codes for building and development will likely not be penalized under ESA even if their actions harm salmonids.

Indirectly, of course, the provisions for what constitutes "allowable take" of endangered salmonids under the 4(d) rule will affect every citizen of the metropolitan area. Costs for a wide variety of services and goods will be affected by ESA listing and the 4(d) rules. Water, sewer, and perhaps electrical rates will likely increase as municipalities and electrical companies change their practices to comply with ESA requirements. Changes in industrial practices will affect prices of a wide range of consumer goods. Development of land, particularly near riparian areas and wetlands, will be restricted which will have an impact on new housing costs and availability. In the metropolitan area, however, such practices are already regulated, for instance under Metro's Title 3 of the Urban Growth Management Plan. ESA considerations are being integrated into this existing plan.

BUILDING THE REGIONAL COMMUNITY

A region is really no one's neighborhood. In most cases, even residents of the same street occupy different regional territories. They work, shop, recreate, and socialize in a territory of their own devising. Nonetheless, we know from the census and from surveys that 99% of the working residents of the six-county metropolitan area go to work within this metropolitan region. Despite the fact that we may live our lives within differing subunits of the metropolitan area, we do share an interest in the whole, consciously or not.

Simply stated, though we may not identify with the whole metropolitan area as "home", we share a common fate with the other 1.8 million residents that happen to live here as well. Consequently, building a sense of regional community, of regional sense of place, is an essential aspect of creating effective responses to issues of bistate, metropolitan significance. Community building on a regional scale is a never-ending challenge, and never easy.

To begin to investigate how community gets built in the region, we took a look at several different aspects of how the metropolitan area gets represented to the people who live here. We asked whether the landscape provides important clues, and how that might be reflected in things like popular guide books and hunting and fishing licenses. We took a look at the media, both electronic and print. Finally, we started to take a look at the structure for neighborhood involvement, both as a means for understanding where points of contact "close to home" might be located as well as to identify the means for connecting with folks where they live.

What follows is our first cut at some of the aspects important to community building on a regional scale. This will be an ongoing focus for the Institute. We will share additional results as they are generated through our ongoing publications and web site.

HOW WE USE THE NATURAL LANDSCAPE:

State Parks: The different tax structures of the two states have prevented a conflict from occurring over non-residents using state park facilities. Washington parks do not charge for day use and charge the same amount for camping regardless of residency. Oregon often charges for day use but does not differentiate between residents and non-residents either for single use fees or annual passes. The two states operate a joint reservation line for campground reservations, but maintain different information lines.

There is historical precedent for differential treatment of residents and non-residents in the state park systems. In 1978, Oregon began charging non-residents more for camping. The Oregon chambers of commerce were generally opposed to this move. In response, Washington state instituted a surcharge for Oregon residents (residents of all other states were treated the same as Washington residents). In 1988, the Oregon legislature repealed the differential fee structure.

Hiking: The United States Forest Service began charging for parking at trailheads in the past few years. Since Oregon and Washington are in the same region, the rules are generally identical. Parking

permits cost $3 per day per vehicle or an annual pass may be purchased for $25. The annual pass is good at all Forest Service trailheads in Oregon and Washington.

While federal land managers largely recognize the regional unity of the Portland metropolitan area within each agency, fees, regulations, and information are still fragmented between the different federal agencies (Forest Service, BLM, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service). This is particularly true of fee and permit requirements. As more fees are established for traditionally free activities, these agencies are beginning to recognize citizen frustration towards agency fragmentation and have begun to discuss the possibility of creating a federal pass system. If such a pass were either national or regional in scope, it would simplify matters for the region's residents. If the pass were to cover all federal lands in a single state, it would fail to recognize the regional unity of the area.

Winter Sports: Both states operate a permit system to use winter recreation facilities. Residents can purchase a Sno-Park permit. Annual permits purchased from California, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington are good in all 4 states. The states operates this program and each state charges a different amount for the permit. Since many Washington residents were purchasing their annual passes in Oregon because of the cheaper price, Washington has since required vehicles with Washington plates to possess Washington passes at their sites. This helps to ensure that the state of Washington receives the proper amount of money for this reciprocal program. The fact that this was necessary reveals how closely connected the recreation community is to the facilities and programs of each state.

Fishing/Hunting: The largest difference between the treatment of residents and non-residents for outdoor recreation opportunities is in the hunting and fishing license requirements. In almost all cases, non-residents are charged more than residents. The difference can be significant. In some cases, residents receive preferential treatment for limited permits.

Washington State Fishing Licenses:

	Resident	Non-Resident
Adult, Freshwater	$20	$40
Adult, Saltwater	$18	$36
Adult, Combo	$36	$72
Youth, Combo	$5	$5
Adult, 2 Day pass	$6	$6

Washington State Hunting Licenses:

	Resident	Non-Resident
Hunting	$15	$150
Trapping	$36	$180
Deer Tag	$18	$60
Elk Tag	$24	$120
Bear Tag	$15	$150
Turkey Tag	$18	$60
Goat Tag	$60	$180
Sheep Tag	$90	$360
Cougar Tag	$5	$50
Moose	$180	$360

Conservation license (free with hunting lic.)	$10	$10

Oregon State Fishing Licenses:

	Resident	Non-Resident
Fishing	$20.50	$48.00
1 day	$8.25	same
2 day	$15.50	same
3 day	$22.75	same
7 day	$34.25	same

Oregon State Hunting Licenses:

	Resident	Non-Resident
hunting	$15	$53
bighorn sheep tag	$91	$976
black bear tag	$11	$151
cougar tag	$11	$226
deer tag	$11	$176
elk tag	$26	$291
pronghorn tag	$26	$201
rocky mt. goat	$91	N/A
waterfowl/upland bird	$6/each	$26/each
turkey tag	$11	$41

In addition to the price differentials, Oregon residents receive preferential treatment for restricted tags. The Rocky Mountain goat controlled hunt is available to residents only. Only three tags are available state-wide, and there were over 3400 applicants last year. Between 5-10% of Bighorn sheep permits are allowed to be issued to non-residents; the rest are reserved for residents. In 1998, 4 tags went to non-residents (941 applicants) and 58 went to residents. No more than 3% of black bear tags can go to non-residents. Washington state does not differentiate between residents and non-residents for access to tags.

A few factors help mitigate the cost to non-residents. One is the possibility of buying day passes instead on the season pass. For non-residents who only fish a few days in the other state, this is a good option for those who wish to save money. Washington also provides a youth pass for non-residents at the same rate as residents. Finally, for birders, boaters, and picnickers who use state facilities, the $10 conservation license (free with any fishing or hunting license) is the same for residents and non-residents.

Overall, the license structure does not recognize the regional unity of the metropolitan area (or the rest of the two states). This has not stopped residents from utilizing resources in both states, but it does increase their cost and undermines any sense of regional unity. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife statistics for 1998 show that 3,502 Clark County residents bought Oregon fishing licenses and 1,841 bought hunting licenses. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife statistics for 1998 show that 488 Oregon residents from the 5 metropolitan counties bought hunting licenses and that 9,860 bought fishing licenses.

Regional unity could be increased if Washington and Oregon were to establish reciprocity agreements. This could take several forms:

- Each state could recognize the other state's licenses as valid (for Oregon and Washington residents only). This is unlikely to occur.

- Each state could allow residents of the other to purchase a license at resident rates. This option may be the best one.

- The states could grant residents of border counties in the other state the right to purchase resident licenses. Because this would involve each state treating a few of its own residents differently, this is unlikely to occur. A case could be made, however, that these residents often work and pay taxes in the other state and so are entitled to favored access.

Despite the numbers of individuals who purchase non-resident permits, there has been little pressure on the states to grant reciprocity. Rich Berry from Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife noted that it would take state legislative action to change the current fee structure. He also thought that there probably was not a large cross over of people between states, although he did recognize that some people have favorite fishing spots in the other state and take advantage of the day passes to use them.

In the case of salmon and steelhead fishing, at least, a case could be made that since much of the money for hatcheries and restoration efforts is federal, that the states should not differentiate between residents and non-residents for access to these fish. At the same time, it should be recognized that anything that increases pressures on these endangered fish should be avoided.

The lost revenue to agency budgets needs also to be considered. For fishing licenses alone, granting reciprocity only to the 6 Portland metropolitan counties could cost Washington state between $197,200 (freshwater license only) and $354,960 (combination license). For Oregon, predicted lost revenue is about $96,305. These figures do not attempt to predict how many non-residents would switch from purchasing daily passes to annual passes at the lower rates.

Guidebooks: REI and Powell's Travel store were asked which hiking guidebooks sold the best. At REI, the best seller by an overwhelming margin was William Sullivan's 100 Hikes in Northwest Oregon. This book also covers 22 hikes in southwest Washington. The next 4 bestsellers all covered Oregon alone and all have at least some hikes that are near the metropolitan area. Similar results were found at Powell's Travel.

Maps: Wildflower Productions recently published a CD-ROM that has topographic maps for much of the Oregon Cascades; the Washington Cascades as far north as Mt. St. Helens, Mt. Adams, and the Indian Heaven Wilderness Area; and the Portland and Vancouver urban areas (in order to increase its value to the business community). This product may be an excellent tool for furthering a regional identity.

Maps are available at several locations. Nature of the Northwest, located in the Oregon Building in northeast Portland, carries many Green Trails recreation topographic maps for Oregon and a few for popular areas in southern Washington. REI has a higher volume and is closer to Washington. It carries a wider selection of Green Trails and United States Geologic Survey maps for both states.

Other Info: Nature of the Northwest provides information on state parks, national parks, and hunting and fishing information for both states. The Oregon State Parks information desk in Portland has some information on Washington State Parks as well. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife does not provide copies of Washington's regulation booklets. The Washington Fish and Wildlife office in Vancouver does carry copies of the Oregon regulations.

Organizations: The Mazamas outdoor club is based in Portland but has a strong membership in both states. Of approximately 3,000 members (from all over the U.S.) , about 300 are from Clark County in Washington. It offers about 300 climbs annually, with about half of them in Washington state. It offers between 500 and 600 hikes annually, with about 20% in Washington. There are no distinctions between Oregon and Washington residents in terms of dues or membership.

Partners in Flight has a joint Oregon and Washington Chapter. Partners in Flight is an international organization that monitors the populations of neo-tropical songbirds. Because they migrate, it is important to look at these birds at a regional level. In recognition of this, federal matching funds increase with bi-state chapters from 3:1 to 9:1. Nonetheless, most other states maintain individual chapters. For more information on this program and its activities, contact Claire Puchy at Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife.

CONTACTS:

Gifford Pinchot National Forest	(360) 891-5000
Mazamas	(503) 227-2345
Mt. Hood National Forest	(503) 668-1700
Nature of the Northwest	(503) 731-4444
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	(503) 872-5260
Oregon State Parks--Information	(800) 551-6949
--Reservations	(800) 452-5687
Powell's Travel Books	(503) 228-1108
REI	(503) 283-1300
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	(360) 696-6211
Washington State Parks--Information	(800) 233-0321
--Reservations	(800) 452-5687

THE LEWIS AND CLARK BICENTENNIAL:

The bicentennial of the Lewis and Clark expedition in 2004-06 will offer a unique opportunity to reinforce regional unity. The historic importance of the expedition to the region and the familiarity and romanticism of the story will produce many efforts to celebrate and recognize the anniversary. Many cities and agencies along the route are already planning their activities.

A few groups are already considering the anniversary at the regional level. The Lewis and Clark 2005, Inc. is a group of local citizens drawn from both sides of the Columbia who are planning the celebrations with the Washington and Oregon historical societies. One product it will produce is a brochure of activities throughout the region so that citizens and visitors will know all the activities. Many activities will center on the Fort Vancouver Historical Site and will be supported by the

interpretive experience of the National Park Service. The state park systems are also busy planning their activities.

Of particular note is the idea of recognizing the evolution of themes surrounding the Lewis and Clark expedition. The first century is often called the "Century of Exploration." The second may be characterized as one of discovery and growth. This growth as been uneven and has continued historic inequalities. As we begin the third century, a theme of unity could be our goal. This could be a time of healing past wounds and separations. We could strive to reconnect people to people and people to the land. Supporting and advancing this theme could produce a heightened awareness of the interconnected nature of the region. Tom Walsh is planning on using this theme to organize the Portland area's response. In his thoughts, the celebration should be 5% backwards, 95% forwards in its perspective.

CONTACTS:

Don Barney, Barney & Worth (503) 222-0146
Ted Kay, Oregon Historical Society (503) 306-5222

RESOURCES FOR NEIGHBORHOOD INVOLVEMENT:

GENERAL - The Multnomah County Library hosts a great web site (www.cascadelink.org) for information about citizen involvement opportunities throughout the metropolitan area.

OREGON - Cities

Beaverton Neighborhood Public Involvement Office - 503-526-2243
They have 13 Neighborhood Organizations.
Contact: Megan Callahan

Gresham
Great web site:www.ci.gresham.or.us/departments/ocm/neighborhoods
Coordinator: Kay Foetisch - 503-618-2537
14 Neighborhood Associations

Hillsboro
Citizen Involvement Coordinator - 503-681-6239
web site: www.ci.hillsboro.or.us

Lake Oswego
They have 17 neighborhood associations, and 3 CPOs sponsored by Clackamas County, but participate with Lake Oswego. LONAC is not affiliated with the city, but is composed of representatives from neighborhood organizations that get together to talk about common interests in the community.
Contact: Lance Bailey 503-697-7421
Great web site: www.ci.oswego.or.us/plan/na.htm

Milwaukie - Active neighborhood organizations.
7 neighborhood districts

2 industrial zones that will become districts
They have advisory capacity only
503-786-7539

Oregon City- Contact: Mary Palmer
12 neighborhood associations
Citizen involvement committee by appointment of mayor to advise on city issues
503-657-0891

Portland
503-823-4519
Has Five District Neighborhood Coalitions that the City of Portland, through the Office of Neighborhood Involvement, contracts with to provide services to the City's 94 neighborhood associations. The Office of Neighborhood Involvement runs 7 programs:
Neighborhood Involvement - neighborhood associations
City Information and Referral
Crime Prevention
Community Outreach Coordination
Refugee/Immigrant Coordination
Metropolitan Human Rights Center
Neighborhood Mediation Center
Web site: www.portland.or.us/oni.index.html

Sandy
Contact: Scott Lazenby, 503-668-6927

Tigard - Has four Citizen Involvement Teams that are geographically based. They are presently meeting together.
Web site: www.ci.tigard.or.us/cityhall/cit.htm
Contact: Liz Newton, 503-639-4171 x308

West Linn - Has 9 neighborhood associations.
Contact: John Atkins
503-657-0331

OREGON - Counties:

Clackamas County - Has 32 Community Participation Organizations, funded through the Public Affairs Department.
Purpose: To bring together persons who share a common concern for the community's interest and environment.
Contact: Dawn Thompson, 503-655-8520
Web site: www.co.clackamas.or.us

Multnomah County - Through the Citizen Involvement Committee, there are 7 community groups that are formed from the unincorporated parts of Multnomah County.
Address: 2115 SE Morrison #206
Portland, 97214

Email: carol.l.org@co.multnomah.or.us
503-248-3450
web site: www.multnomah.lib.or.us/cic/

Washington County
Great web site at: www.co.washington.or.us/citizens/cpo.htm
Contacts: Linda Gray or Terri Ewing, CPO coordinators, 503-725-2117

WASHINGTON

Clark County
Great web site: www.co.clark.wa.us/general/neighbor/neighbr7.htm
35 Neighborhood Associations
360-397-6012, x.5

Vancouver
Web site: www.ci.vancouver.wa.us/neighborhoods/index.html
49 neighborhood associations that are self governing
phone - 360-397-8222

COMMUNITY ORGANIZING:

Environmental Justice Action Group: Ana Agular 503-283-6397

Faith based: Portland Organizing Project, Dick Harmon, 503-235-6233

Rural issues: Rural Organizing Project, 503-397-5453

MEDIA:

Print -

There is no one single way to cover the region through print media. Nonetheless, the single most widely read print source in the region is the Oregonian. It has a weekday circulation of 430,000 including 22,000 in Clark County. The Oregonian does not uniquely address Clark County with marketing or news editions, but it does maintain a Clark County bureau.

The Oregonian alone will not reach every household in the region. The Columbian is particularly important in Clark County. The Columbian has a weekday circulation of over 105,000. It plans to increase its number of editions per week from five to six. The Columbian believes that this move will help it attract more customers and to begin to compete on a level with the Oregonian. Currently 67% of Clark County residents rely on the Columbian the most for advertising information, while 20% of these residents rely upon the Oregonian.

The Oregonian, Columbian and city/neighborhood newspapers such as the Hillsboro Argus and Lake Oswego Review are traditional news sources. Other small print sources serve niche markets

that transcend geographic boundaries. These sources, when used in conjunction with the Oregonian, Columbian, etc., help ensure that the broad regional public is being reached by print media. These sources range from Willamette Week, which places almost 3,000 papers in Vancouver each week, to Just Out, a paper that serves the gay community, to the Skanner, which serves the African American community. These are just a few of the myriad examples that aim at various ethnicities and subcultures within our region.

Business oriented print sources could be used to more selectively target business leaders. Examples are The Business Journal and The Daily Journal of Commerce. The Business Journal, for example, has a market that is typified by college educated professionals in their 40s. However, the Business Journal and most of the other business oriented papers/ magazines do not have a noteworthy presence in Clark County, either in terms or readership or news coverage. In short, most of the business sources are Oregon-centric.

Beth Ann Clevenger (221-2374), with KVO, and Eric Friedenwald-Fishman, with Metropolitan Events (223-3299), stressed the importance of a broad approach in attempting to cover the region through media. In other words, more types of media than print media are necessary. The use of existing grassroots networks to reach people was suggested. Interesting ideas also came in the form of reaching people through pre-movie slide shows in movie theaters. According to Fishman, 2/3 of the adults in the greater metro area see at least one movie a week. They are largely a captive audience before the movie begins and slides could be used to educate, inform, and invite people to participate in important issues.

To use print media effectively, earned media should supplement advertisements. “Earned media” are stories about important issues or involved organizations, such as IMS, that are not paid for as advertisements but instead are traditional news articles. Such media coverage is important because it holds more authority and weight to a reader than an advertisement does. It also tends to be more widely read than advertisements, which are often glossed over by a reader.

Electronic -

• Based on information gathered from local television and radio stations, it appears that virtually all of them view their role as “community builders”, at least in terms of targeting audiences throughout the region and organizing and sponsoring community-wide events. In all cases, the stations indicated that their target audiences encompass households on both sides of the river.

• It is interesting to note that each station is specifically focused on particular demographics, thus precluding them from acting as unilateral “community builders” to help give identity to *all* groups living in the region. The electronic media picture is more like a mosaic, with each station picking up it’s “target tiles.” For example, KNRK fm reaches an “alternative” younger audience throughout the region, and as such serves to help provide a regional identity and to “unite” young “alternative music” fans from all corners of the region.

• Since individuals and households tend to have preferences and station loyalties, it could be argued that no single television or radio station can possibly unite and serve the interests of the entire region. The intense commercial competition among stations creates an environment in which the viewer is continually bombarded with subtle and not-so-subtle “image messages” in an effort to try to win him or her over to a particular station, or at least the group or image it purports to represent.

For example, each station organizes its advertising and marketing campaigns armed with specifically targeted demographic data, and the focus of their p.r. and advertising efforts are primarily to resonate to that audience, and to "win them over" to their station. In most cases it seems that this is done through savvy marketing and promotional tools. It would seem that a large number of media consumers are concerned with finding a station that suits their tastes and interests, and, in this way, stations offer a medium for viewers and listeners to "unite" and perhaps be a part of a larger, regional community.

• Local media definitely offers resources for the sharing of community and regional information, in the form of TV and radio announcements, comprehensive new web sites, viewer information telephone hotlines, and sponsorship of a wide variety of community activities. In this way, local media serves to bring together citizens of the region in a wide variety of activities and events, including cultural, educational, special events, charitable and community-service oriented events.