

10-22-1926

## City Club of Portland Bulletin vol. 07, no. 04 (1926-10-22)

City Club of Portland (Portland, Or.)

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



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

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

---

### Recommended Citation

City Club of Portland (Portland, Or.), "City Club of Portland Bulletin vol. 07, no. 04 (1926-10-22)" (1926).  
*City Club of Portland*. 78.

[https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_cityclub/78](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityclub/78)

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

"Harmony in  
Diversity"

# PORTLAND CITY CLUB BULLETIN

"Active  
Citizenship"

VOLUME VII

PORTLAND, OREGON, OCTOBER 22, 1926

NUMBER 4

**FRIDAY, OCTOBER 22**

*Hotel Benson, 12:10*

SPEAKER

**THORNTON T. MUNGER**

*Chairman, City Club Committee on General Park Development*

SUBJECT

**"Should Portland Spend Money for Parks At the Present Time?"**

SPEAKER

**DR. CHARLES H. ROGERS**

*Chairman, City Club Committee on Tuberculosis*

SUBJECT

**"Is There a Need for Another Tuberculosis Hospital and Does the Present Bill Rightly Provide For That Need?"**

SPEAKER

**J. P. NEWELL**

*Chairman, City Club Committee on Longview Bridge*

SUBJECT

**"What Should Be Portland's Attitude Toward a Bridge At Longview?"**

SPEAKER

**L. K. HODGES**

*Chairman, City Club Section on Port Development*

SUBJECT

**"Portland's Shipping"**

---

## COMING EVENTS

*October 29—* Final Reports of Committees on Election Measures.

*November 5—* Dinner Meeting. Guest and Speaker, DR. ARNOLD BENNETT HALL, President of the University of Oregon.

# PORTLAND CITY CLUB BULLETIN

Published Weekly By

## THE CITY CLUB

OF PORTLAND

Office of the Club . . . . . 607 Oregon Building  
Telephone Broadway 8079

Subscription Price . . . . . \$1.00 per year

Entered as Second Class Matter, October 29, 1920, at the  
postoffice at Portland, Oregon, under act of March 3, 1879

City Club dues are \$1.00 per month, payable semi-  
annually on May 1st, and November 1st. There is no  
initiation fee.

### CITY CLUB PURPOSE

*"To inform its members and the community in  
public matters and to arouse them to a realization  
of the obligations of citizenship."*

### CITY CLUB BOARD of GOVERNORS

ERNEST C. WILLARD . . . . . President  
J. P. NEWELL . . . . . First Vice-President  
W. H. MARSH . . . . . Second Vice-President  
LEMUEL P. PUTNAM . . . . . Secretary  
HUGH C. GRUWELL . . . . . Treasurer

JAMES A. MCKINNON  
GEORGE N. WOODLEY  
DR. KARL H. MARTZLOFF  
L. T. MERWIN  
C. C. LUDWIG  
THADDEUS W. VENESS

ALDEN B. MILLS . . . . . Executive Secretary

The following amendment to the proposed bill  
embodied in the Compulsory Automobile In-  
surance report was passed at the City Club  
luncheon, October 8. It is to be section three of  
the bill and the other sections are to be re-  
numbered accordingly. The amendment reads:

"3. Upon the conviction of the owner or driver  
of any motor vehicle of an offense against any  
motor vehicle law or ordinance in effect in this  
state for which offense a sentence of imprison-  
ment might be imposed the court may direct  
such convicted person to furnish proof of financial  
responsibility to abide by and satisfy any judg-  
ment obtained against him in any action for  
death or personal injury resulting from the op-  
eration by him of a motor vehicle and upon the  
making of such order the District Attorney shall  
take the necessary steps under this act to secure  
the enforcement of the same."

"The wealth of a city is in its citizen-  
ship."

Give your friends the privilege of  
becoming better citizens thru membership  
in the City Club.

Invite them to join.

### RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE CITY CLUB OF PORTLAND OCTOBER 14, 1926

**BE IT RESOLVED**, That we, the members of  
the Board of Governors of the City Club of  
Portland, in order to clearly set forth our at-  
titude in regard to the approval of committee  
reports, do hereby reaffirm our position. The  
members of the Board of Governors in approving  
a report submitted by a regularly appointed  
committee do not necessarily approve or dis-  
approve the conclusions and recommendations  
of the report. Its approval and submission of a  
report for consideration by the membership—  
unless otherwise stated in the Board's resolution  
approving and submitting it to the Club—shall  
be taken and understood to mean no more than  
that, in the judgment of the Board, the report  
has been prepared in a careful and thorough  
manner, shows no evidence of being prejudiced,  
appears to have considered the facts with reason-  
able completeness, presents the committee's  
argument in a logical manner, and draws con-  
clusions which seem to be substantiated by the  
facts and arguments in the body of the report,  
and is therefore worthy of consideration by  
the Club.

*Members of the City Club are invited to attend  
the production of "Riff-Raff," musical comedy by  
Grace Henry and Morris Hamilton, produced at  
the Heilig theater on the nights of October 29  
and 30 by members of the Portland Junior  
League, directed by Miss Henry. It will be  
staged for the benefit of the Junior League out-  
patient clinic of the Doernbacher Childrens'  
hospital.*

### APPLICATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following applications for member-  
ship have been received and will be voted  
upon at the regular Friday luncheon,  
November 12:

B. V. WRIGHT  
Gilchrist Lumber Company  
924 Bedell Building

W.B. BRIGGS  
Secretary and Trust Officer  
Lumbermens Trust Company

Proposed for membership by E. S.  
Vollins and Thaddeus W. Veness.

## INTERESTING PROGRAM IS PLANNED FOR FRIDAY

A steady growth in attendance and interest has marked the open forum programs on election measures and other committee reports which the City Club has been holding during October. The final meeting of this series will be held next week and all reports on election measures still outstanding will be presented at that time.

This week several very interesting and controversial subjects are slated for discussion including the ticklish problem of Portland's attitude toward a bridge at Longview, the matter of voting \$600,000 of bonds for parks and playgrounds, a report on the proposed Eastern Oregon Tuberculosis Hospital, and a continuation of the discussion on the Portland shipping report. These reports will be presented by Messrs. Newell, Munger, Rogers and Hodges, chairmen of the respective committees or sections.

The report on Portland's shipping is the final chapter in a series of reports covering Portland as a transportation center. Other chapters in this series include: "The Unification of Railroad Facilities in the City of Portland," published July 4, 1924; "Railroad Development in the Portland Territory," January 2, 1925; and "The Upper Columbia River as a Waterway," May 1, 1925.

## CITY CLUB REPORT IS PRAISED IN EAST

Mr. Henry Swift Ives is vice-president of Casualty Information Clearing House of Chicago, Illinois. He is a deep student of motor vehicle casualty insurance problems, and especially of compulsory automobile insurance. He attends meetings of the Committee of Nine, composed of executives of various large insurance companies to study that subject and furnishes valuable aid to that committee. Nobody is better versed in these matters than he. Mr. Ives received a copy of the recent report of the City Club on Compulsory Automobile Insurance and thereupon wrote MacCormac Snow, Chairman of the committee, in part as follows:

"Fortunately, the report reached me the day before the meeting of the Casualty Insurance Committee of Nine which has been studying this situation for some time, and I may add that at this meeting there was much favorable comment as to the report. In fact, I am personally of the opinion that it is the most thorough investigation of the subject which has been made by any group of citizens and I want to congratulate you most heartily on the ability displayed in its preparation."

## TUBERCULOSIS HOSPITAL REPORT IS PRESENTED

This committee was appointed to consider the so-called Eastern Oregon Tuberculosis Hospital Act passed at the last session of the legislature and referred to the people for action at the November election. It is necessary that the act be referred to the people for the reason that the state constitution provides that no state institution may be established outside of Marion county unless the people approve the action by affirmative vote. The act proposes to authorize the State Board of Control, consisting of the Governor, Secretary of State, and the State Treasurer, to select a site for and erect a tuberculosis hospital at some point east of the Cascade mountains. The act provides that the hospital shall accommodate not less than 200 patients and appropriates \$100,000 for the purchase of land, building construction, and salaries and maintenance for the balance of 1926.

While the death rate from tuberculosis in Oregon is considerably less than that for the United States as a whole, (Oregon 71.0; U. S. 90.6, per 100,000 population), the incidence of this disease is sufficient to warrant the most serious attention of the people of the state. The National Tuberculosis Association estimates that there are now 3700 active cases of this disease in the state. This estimate is reliable for it is based upon the one to seven ratio between deaths and existing cases which the association has found to be a national average. During the year 1925, 538 cases terminated in the death of the patient.

In determining the number of cases which require hospitalization, it should be remembered that it is unnecessary to send every sufferer of this disease to a hospital, as a considerable proportion of early cases can be cared for by following proper home treatment and careful methods of sanitation. The practice of the tuberculosis authorities in ascertaining the number of beds necessary to provide adequate hospitalization is to provide one bed for each annual death as a minimum. During the past five years there have been on the average 596 deaths each year so that 596 beds is to be regarded as a minimum requirement for the proper hospitalization of Oregon's tubercular population.

Investigation, however, quickly shows that the state is very far behind in the matter of hospital facilities. It should be borne in mind that the general hospitals are not open to patients suffering from tuberculosis as it is a communicable disease. Most cities also have stringent regulations with respect to the location of sanatoria which care for tuberculosis patients. There are but two private sanatoria in the state both of which are located near Portland just outside the city limits.

To summarize the present facilities, there are now available 190 beds at the State Tuberculosis Hospital at Salem and 35 beds at the Multnomah County pavilion at Troutdale. In addition to these facilities, there are 84 beds in two private sanatoria adjacent to Portland, of which one-half or 42 beds, on the average, are utilized by residents of the state, the remaining one-half being

used by patients from other states. There are also a number of beds in the Government hospitals at Walla Walla and Boise which are available for Oregon ex-servicemen, 55 Oregon men on the average being cared for in the two institutions. However, the deaths of ex-servicemen outside the state are not counted in the Oregon death record for which reason we have not considered the facilities for treating Oregon ex-servicemen at Walla Walla and Boise. The total hospital facilities for Oregon patients are therefore 267 beds as compared with the minimum requirements of 596 beds. There is thus a deficiency of 329 beds, which means that a large number of active cases of tuberculosis do not have the treatment which their condition demands.

The absence of proper hospital facilities is also quite apparent from the records of the state hospital at Salem. Out of 1355 applications during the past six years, the hospital has admitted only 933, the remaining 422 being denied admission due to lack of space. In other words, only about two out of every three patients who now apply for admission at the state institution are admitted. Even those admitted are forced to wait for a considerable period as there is always a long waiting list which increases during the winter months. On September 14th, 1926, there were 44 patients on the waiting list and last winter the number rose to 68. It is also probably true that the number of potential patients is larger than is shown by the waiting list, for the long waiting period which now averages from two to four months undoubtedly operates to reduce the number of applications for admission.

The effects of delayed treatment are undoubtedly far-reaching and the immediate provision of adequate facilities is essential from both a humanitarian and an economical point of view. One of the essentials to adequate treatment of this disease is the application of prompt therapeutic measures. This is necessary in order that the patient's life may be saved and it is also important from the standpoint of the cost of treatment, for every delay in the treatment of a well-established case results in a marked increase in the total cost of treatment. The present waiting period of from two to four months may, in many cases, mean the difference between life and death to the patient. This is amply indicated by the fact that 351, or roughly one-third, of the 1049 patients admitted in the eight year period ending in 1924, died.

There are, of course, other points involved as well, including the possibility of spreading the disease by permitting logical hospital cases to remain under temporary home care where other members of the family are continually exposed to infection. Due to the long waiting period, also, the psychological time for placing the patient in a sanatorium is often passed and many patients thereafter prefer to remain at home where their chances for recovery are greatly diminished.

In view of these facts, the committee regards it as indisputable that additional hospital facilities for tuberculosis patients are an immediate and grave need and that a proposal to provide 200 additional beds is entirely sound.

We turn now to consider the logic of locating the proposed hospital east of the Cascade mountains. The chief argument for locating the hospital east of the mountains is that patients from the section are disinclined to go to Salem on account of the long distance from their homes and because they dislike the more damp and cloudy Willamette Valley climate. It is said that for these reasons Eastern Oregon does not utilize its full quota of beds at Salem. In fact, the present state hospital at Salem has been referred to by some as affording only "local" care for tuberculosis patients. In support of this claim, the records of the hospital have been analyzed to show that 72 per cent of the patients treated come from within 100 miles of Salem. Upon investigation, however, the committee discovered that this was an entirely logical situation as the 100 mile zone, consisting of the counties of Benton, Clackamas, Columbia, Linn, Marion, Multnomah, Polk, Tillamook, Washington and Yamhill, contains 68 per cent of the state's population and the beds at the hospital are allotted on a population basis. The present allotment of beds at Salem is equally logical if the newer method of providing hospitalization on a basis of annual deaths is used, as the 100 mile zone contributed 65.5 per cent of the deaths in the state from tuberculosis. The slight discrepancy between the population and death percentages on the one hand and the patients treated on the other hand can be easily explained by the fact that the state hospital allows Multnomah county a slight additional allotment to compensate for the transient cases which enter from the Portland area.

With respect to the extent to which eastern Oregon utilizes its quota of beds at Salem, the figures of the past six years show that the eastern section of the state has been utilizing the equivalent of 27 of the 30 beds to which it is now entitled on a population basis. The committee therefore concluded that the present inadequate facilities at Salem are being used by both eastern and western Oregon on a basis which corresponds substantially to their relative needs. At the same time it believes that the factors of distance and climatic difference do operate to diminish in a slight degree the use of the present facilities by residents of eastern Oregon. The committee came to the conclusion, however, that this aspect of the situation has been emphasized much more than it deserves.

In order to reach a sound conclusion as to the extent to which the hospital requirements are met by the present facilities and particularly to compare the relative service which eastern and western Oregon are now receiving, the following table was prepared:

Section	Min. Bed Req.	PRESENT BED FACILITIES			Total Beds	Present Bed Deficiency	Per Cent of Need Fulfilled by Pre- sent Facilities
		State Hosp. Salem	County Beds	Private Sanit.			
Eastern Oregon.....	79	27	.....	6	33	46	41.8
Western Oregon.....	517	163	35	36	234	283	45.2
State.....	596	190	35	42	267	329	44.8

*Explanation:*

(1) In ascertaining the number of beds available to Eastern Oregon and Western Oregon, respectively, we have applied the percentage of patients treated from each section in the last six years to the present bed capacity of 190.

(2) In determining the number of beds available in private sanatoria to Eastern Oregon and Western Oregon respectively, we have applied the percentage of patients treated from each section during 1925 to the present bed capacity for all Oregon patients of 42, which is 50% of the total capacity.

In preparing this table the minimum bed requirements were based upon the average

In view of the general deficiency of 329 beds and because it would be desirable to treat eastern Oregon patients in their own district, the committee believes that the erection of a hospital in eastern Oregon to take care of its minimum needs would be an entirely sound procedure. The minimum need for the eastern section of the state on a basis of annual deaths is, however, only 79 beds, and if the private sanatoria continue to render the same service to eastern Oregon patients that they now do, the minimum need to be filled by the proposed state hospital would be only 73 beds. If the proposed 200 bed hospital is erected, the relative needs and facilities of the two sections of the state would be as shown in the following table:

Section	Min. Bed Req.	—BED FACILITIES IF State Hospital	200 County Beds	BED HOSPITAL IS Private Sanatoria	ERECTED— Total Beds	Per Cent of Need Fulfilled if 200 Bed Hospital is Erected
Eastern Oregon.....	79	200		6	206	260.7
Western Oregon.....	517	190	35	36	261	50.5
State.....	596	390	35	42	467	78.3

number of annual deaths. The present bed facilities were not computed on the basis of any theoretical scheme of allotment, but upon the extent to which the present facilities are actually being utilized by the two sections of the state. This was done in order that we might take into account any disadvantage which eastern Oregon might be under as a result of the fact that all of the hospital facilities are located in the western section of the state.

The table indicates that the present facilities in the state as a whole now fill only 44.8 per cent of the minimum need and that there is a total bed deficiency of 329. The eastern Oregon situation is slightly worse than for the state as a whole since their requirement is only 41.8 per cent filled, with a deficiency of 46 beds. Western Oregon's need is only 45.2 per cent met and the bed deficiency is 283. It is thus apparent that the present hospital facilities for treating tuberculosis patients roughly serve both sections equally well.

It is contended, however, that eastern Oregon patients should, if possible, be treated in their own section of the state. The committee is in hearty accord with this contention as it is consistent with the policy of tuberculosis specialists throughout the country; namely, to treat patients under climatic conditions as nearly as possible like those in which they plan to live. Eastern Oregon has a scantier rainfall, a lower relative humidity, and a higher percentage of clear days than the western section of the state. There is a wide popular belief that such a climate offers more favorable conditions for the treatment of tuberculosis. Statistics, however, show that the disease is treated about as successfully in one section of the country as another, bearing in mind that the vast majority of patients receive treatment in their own general locality. There is obviously no scientifically accurate method of determining the beneficial effects on tuberculosis patients of the various manifestations of atmospheric phenomena which go to make up climate. Nevertheless, the psychological aspect of the disease alone is highly important, and inasmuch as climate contributes to a favorable environment, it may properly be considered as a definite factor.

This table indicates that the erection of a 200 bed hospital in eastern Oregon, as proposed, would mean that the eastern section of the state would have hospitalization to the extent of 260.7 per cent of its present minimum needs. Western Oregon, on the other hand, even with all the 190 beds now provided at Salem, would have only 50.7 per cent of its minimum requirement fulfilled.

It may be argued that the proposed hospital would be available for western Oregon patients as well. Nevertheless, the act specifically states that as nearly as possible residents of western Oregon shall be admitted at Salem, and residents of eastern Oregon at the new hospital. Experience seems also to demonstrate that patients dislike to go long distances from their homes, so the extent to which the proposed hospital would be utilized by patients from western Oregon is a matter of conjecture. The construction of a 100 bed hospital would amply care for the present minimum eastern Oregon requirement and allow a considerable factor of safety for future needs. Such a hospital would also be sufficiently large that it might be economically administered. The construction of a hospital of 200 beds, however, would only mean that many eastern Oregon patients who are not in grave need of hospitalization would be receiving it, while western Oregon patients in a much more advanced stage would still be without the more badly needed hospital care. Looking to the future, it seems certain that the population of western Oregon will increase much more rapidly than that of eastern Oregon so that the relative need for hospital service will become more divergent as time goes on. The proposal to so greatly anticipate the hospital needs of the more sparsely settled and slow growing section of the state, therefore, seems clearly unsound.

In conclusion, the committee believes that in view of the present state shortage of 329 beds, additional beds are an immediate necessity. It believes that a 100 bed hospital might properly be built in eastern Oregon, but that the proposal to erect a 200 bed hospital there cannot be justified on the basis of present need nor on the needs of any reasonable future time. It further

(Continued on Page 8)

## BONDS FOR ADDITIONAL PARK PURCHASES ARE FAVORED BY CITY PARK COMMITTEE

A charter amendment will appear on the City ballot November 2 to provide additional funds for the growth of the city park system. Its explanatory title reads as follows:

"An Act to amend the Charter of the City of Portland by inserting therein a new section authorizing the issuance and sale of Six Hundred Thousand Dollars of bonds for acquiring real property for parks and playgrounds, defraying necessary expenditures in aid of the development of an appropriate parks and playgrounds system, and payment of other expenditures in connection therewith."

Your Committee sees two questions to be answered:

*First*—Does Portland need more park area?

*Second*—If more acreage is needed, is this the right time to acquire it and is the proposed measure a satisfactory way of providing it?

### 1. DOES PORTLAND NEED MORE PARK AREA?

There are several ways of arriving at a judgment whether Portland's park area is sufficient for its needs or whether additional acreage ought to be secured now.

#### *Comparison of Park Acreage with Population.*

One way of arriving at the sufficiency of the present park system is to compare Park acreage with population. The number of people for each acre of park within the city limits for all the cities between 200,000 and 500,000 (1925 U. S. Census estimates) for which your committee could get data is presented in the following table:\*

City	People for each area of Park within City
Washington, D. C.	170
Newark	608
Minneapolis	116
New Orleans	330
Cincinnati	146
Kansas City	111
Seattle	200
Jersey City	536
PORTLAND**	212
Toledo	216
Denver	167
Columbus	584
Louisville	178
St. Paul	128
Oakland	421
Omaha	75
Birmingham	423

\*"Parks in the Larger Cities of the U. S." by Caroline L. B. Segrist, Municipal Reference Library Notes XII, 13, p. 53.

Of these seventeen cities, 9 have in proportion to population a larger acreage of park than Portland and 7 a smaller.

\*\*Based on an area for Portland of 1326 acres, which, however, includes the 205 acres of the West Hills Golf Course, actually outside the city limits.

On the basis of present population the total area of parks looks fair, but only fair. For a rapid growing city the present area would soon become inadequate. For a population of 500,000 the present area of parks inside Portland's city limits would give 1 acre to each 377 people.

The Bennett plan states that the "desirable ratio is about 100 persons to each acre." Portland's boulevard or parkway mileage is small, only 3 miles, in fact the least of any city in its class according to our information; Seattle has 32 miles.

#### *Acreage in Parks in Proportion to Total Area in City.*

Of the area within Portland's city limits, three per cent is in parks today. This is low in comparison with many cities that stand well. There are several that have twice as much of their area devoted to parks. Of course, Portland's area is large for its population, but this is a sign of youth. Even so, the park area should be kept up to an adequate proportion of the total area, regardless of present population in anticipation of an ultimate growth of population to fit the area.

#### *Advice of Experts.*

The Olmsted Bros. Plan of 1903, a very notable piece of work, recommends for the Portland Park system several large parks which have not been acquired and which form a very integral part of their plan. In other particulars the Olmsted Plan has been followed with excellent results.

The Greater Portland Plan of 1912, (Bennett Plan) recommends 7791 acres for Portland's Park System within an eight mile radius in the expectation that the ultimate population will be 2,000,000.

The City Planning Commission issued in 1919 "A Ten-year Program for Meeting Portland's Needs for Playgrounds, Parks and Boulevards." That urged the immediate purchase of some tracts and the "tying up" of others that they might not be lost to public ownership if the city was able to buy them later. That was 7 years ago and the decade is  $\frac{3}{4}$  over, but only a beginning has been made on this program, because there have been no bond issues for Park expansion provided since 1919.

In the report of Chas. H. Cheney, city planning expert, to the City Planning Commission in 1921, he classifies Portland's needs as follows: (a) Playgrounds for children under 12, (b) Neighborhood playfields for older boys, girls and adults, (c) Local squares for breathing spaces and civic centers, (d) Picnic parks and bathing beaches, (e) Connecting boulevards and parkways, (f) Wild parks, (g) Auto tourist camps. He said "The greatest need existing today is to provide playgrounds for children under 12, who, as is well recognized, will seldom go more than a quarter of a mile from home to use a playground."

The City Planning Commission last month passed unanimously a resolution urging a bond issue for park expansion, from which we quote as follows:



(1) "The City of Portland would be justified, in the interests of wise planning and future development, in authorizing a bond issue of \$1,000,000 at this time, for extension of park and playground property, as recommended by the various community clubs;

"(2) Having due regard, however, to the general financial situation of the City and the funds required for other important municipal projects, the Planning Commission believes that the amount of such issue should be limited to a sum which will provide for the more urgent and immediate needs of the City, and will assure the fullest economy to the taxpayers, in connection with parks and playground development;

"(3) In the judgment of the City Planning Commission, the minimum amount necessary for such purposes, in the light of the foregoing considerations, is the sum of \$600,000. \* \* \*

"The press and the various civic organizations of the city are urged to unite in an effort to arouse the voters of Portland to the support of such a measure, if submitted at this election, in order that Portland may not fall behind in necessary parks and playground facilities; and that the taxpayers may be saved from future losses or unnecessary burdens, by reason of failure to acquire the necessary properties, before the latter have been materially affected by subdivision, building improvements, and rapidly increasing land values.

#### *Rate of Growth of Park System in Recent Years*

Exclusive of the three golf courses, all of which have been acquired in the last few years, the acreage of parks within the city is today about 1085 acres. Of this, about 236 acres have been added since 1919, 22 acres by gift and the rest by purchase from the bond issue of 1919 and the special tax levy for school playgrounds. This is a growth about commensurate with the growth in population, but apparently it must stop now until special appropriations or donations are forthcoming.

#### *External Evidence of Need of Parks*

The quantities of children that play ball, hop scotch, etc., in the streets, is eloquent evidence that there are not enough neighborhood playgrounds, for any child prefers a well-appointed, spacious playground if it is close by.

Many children now play in vacant lots through the tolerance of the owners. These blocks of vacant lots cannot continue to function as playgrounds, as the city fills up; it is obvious as these lots become built upon, the public must provide some other place for the children, otherwise they must take to the street.

During the season the crowded conditions of the Plaza Blocks and the Park Blocks give some inkling of what the need for down town "breathing places" will be when there are two or three times as many to use them and correspondingly more down town congestion.

The crowds that walk in Washington Park, Mt. Tabor, Laurelhurst, and Peninsula Park throughout the year and that fill the golf courses and tennis courts to capacity tend to indicate that Portland is not prepared to furnish recreation to a greatly expanded population, either of adults or children.

Of the several approaches to the city, only one is through an attractive parked boulevard. One

of the greatest assets of a city is boulevard approaches and circuits and they can be easily had in Portland now.

This city is a port, at the confluence of two great rivers, but is without any public water-side park where aquatic sports or scenes can be enjoyed, except the narrow strip near Riverview, recently donated. Year by year the opportunities to acquire acreage for such a park are slipping away.

From each of the above approaches to the question, "Does Portland Need More Park Area?" your committee reaches the conclusion "Yes." We believe that the program of park acquisition is not keeping sufficiently ahead of the growth of population, and that definite steps to secure more park acreage is indicated by the facts.

## **2. IS THIS THE RIGHT TIME TO ACQUIRE ADDITIONAL ACREAGE AND IS THE PROPOSED MEASURE A SATISFACTORY WAY OF PROVIDING IT?**

### *Present Opportunities to Acquire Park Acreage*

Unplatted portions of the city are fast being developed. The longer the delay, the more difficult it will be to acquire playground sites, additions to present parks, and new parks. Plans are being made to plat and construct streets over a certain area often talked of as an addition to one of the present parks. Another ideal site is possibly being lost this year by industrial development. Small vacant areas about town, now available as playground sites will soon be built upon. No time in the future will be as good as the present for acquiring park sites.

### *Is Taking Land Off the Taxroll An Objection?*

An objection often raised to creating parks is that the area involved is taken off of the tax rolls. Improvement of a park area will often increase the value of the abutting property to an extent nearly to offset the loss. In the case of playgrounds, the increase in value will be spread over an area of about one-half mile radius, and the increase may exceed the loss.

### *Is the Bond Issue the Best Method for Park Acquisition?*

Objection may be made, that we already have too many bond issues and are at least approaching the point where the taxable wealth of the city can support no more. In this connection an examination of statistics collected by the National Municipal Review, as of January 1, 1926, discloses that out of 56 cities having a population of from 100,000 to 300,000 Portland had at that time the 13th highest per capita non-selfsupporting indebtedness, amounting to \$90.90 per capita. Per capita debts of other cities in this class ran from a minimum of \$31.11 to a maximum of \$134.05. All these figures were based on U. S. Census estimates of population and included school and port indebtedness, but not county. When it is considered that outside of the far western and southern states the activities of counties are very limited, it will be seen that Portland would rank still higher if county debts were considered.

These figures, however, while they doubtless do not reflect the situation accurately, do show that Portland is heavily bonded as compared with other cities of its class, though how nearly we have approached the limit is conjectural.



In spite of Portland's heavy indebtedness, we believe that its park system must be expanded along with the expansion of population that appears likely, and we also believe that an actual economy can be effected by purchases of property at this time, which will justify the proposed bond issue.

A park, unlike a building or street pavement, does not become obsolete or wear out. It is useful for generations and it is therefore just and financially sound that the cost of acquiring park property be spread over a considerable period by means of long term bonds, although this method of financing is probably not equally sound as a means of raising money for improving parks.

*Is the Shortage of Money for Maintenance an Argument Against This Measure?*

The argument has been advanced that already the city administration is embarrassed to maintain and operate the parks it has. The Committee feels that the need now is not to develop intensively more park acreage but to acquire land, while it may be, and let it lie fallow until the time is ripe for improvements, if there is a shortage of tax money for maintenance. Furthermore in answer to this argument, Portland is not appropriating very freely for the maintenance of her parks. She devotes to park purposes 3.9 cents of the tax dollar. Other cities which are noted for their park systems are spending more than this—Chicago 5.4 cents, Detroit 4.6 cents, St. Louis 4.1 cents, Boston 5.6 cents, San Francisco 4.0 cents, Buffalo 4.4 cents, and Washington, Denver, Toledo, Oakland, all over 5 cents.

*How Will the Money Be Spent?*

As already mentioned, various city planning experts have recommended park programs which have been followed to some extent but are far from completed. The Superintendent of Parks, Mr. Keyser, has told your committee of his program for the expenditure of these funds, if voted by the people. Briefly, he advocates following up the Olmsted Plan in a general way with further large field and woodland parks, additions to present parks and completing the system of small neighborhood playgrounds.

*Why Is the Public Not More Insistent for More Parks?*

Your Committee senses that the public has of late been somewhat silent toward the development of municipal parks, other than golf courses. This is probably largely due to the enormous exodus of people from the city for their recreation. The beaches, Mt. Hood and the Columbia River waterfalls, suddenly made within easy reach, have absorbed attention. This lack of clamor for city parks is not a permanent condition and should not be allowed to blind voters to the need for providing adequate close-in parks and playgrounds.

**CONCLUSIONS**

In conclusion, your Committee feels that it is wisdom to vote the bond issue for parks now and urges citizens to vote "Yes" on the last measure on the ballot No. 506, for these reasons:

(1) Portland needs more parks in anticipation of its growth.

(2) Many desirable areas must be gotten now, if ever, and certainly it is economy in the long run to buy such property while it is unimproved or vacant.

## INCOME TAX REPORT IS WARMLY DEBATED

Four reports were presented for the approval of the Club at the meeting last Friday. Unlike the action of the meeting before, all the reports were adopted except the shipping report on which action was postponed until this week. Considerable discussion was aroused by the report of the committee on the income tax, but when a vote was finally taken the report was accepted nearly two to one by the Club. This report was presented very ably by C. W. Platt, chairman of the committee.

Other reports presented and adopted were the report on the Eastern Oregon Normal School, presented by Edward L. Clark, and the report on local bridge bonds which David L. Stearns read and explained. L. K. Hodges spoke briefly on the shipping report, but as the report was not yet in the hands of the members final action was postponed.

## HOSPITAL REPORT

(Continued from Page 5)

believes that the erection of a hospital of such size would mean an illogical allocation of bed facilities in the light of the present relative needs of the two sections of the state. The committee is loathe to disapprove any measure which would help to fill the present grave need for additional hospitalization, but it cannot see its way clear to approve the proposed measure to erect a 200 bed hospital in eastern Oregon although it would favor the construction of a hospital of 100 beds there.

Respectfully,

DR. CHARLES H. ROGERS, *Chairman*  
CLYDE C. FOLEY

(3) A bond issue is a most appropriate means of acquiring park property and Portland is easily able to absorb this amount of indebtedness.

In recommending that the Club endorse the bond issue to augment the park system, your committee urges that Portland's present citizens show the same vision, faith in the future and public spirit that the people of 1871 did when this frontier town with a population of only 8293 purchased for \$32,624, against opposition and ridicule, the 40 acres that now constitute Portland's most prized park, Washington Park.

This committee of the City Club is now studying the specific needs of our city for park additions—whether it be for more neighborhood children playgrounds, for an aquatic park, for downtown "breathing spots," for an arboretum, parkways, boulevards or scenic drives, municipal golf courses, ball diamonds and other field sports or natural woodland parks. When that study is completed it will give the City Club an opportunity to be of service in advising how the Park system should best be expanded.

ORMOND R. BEAN  
EARL A. MARSHALL  
G. H. OBERTEUFFER  
ARTHUR D. PLATT  
WILLARD F. ROUSE

THORNTON T. MUNGER, *Chairman*

October 18, 1926.

SUPPLEMENT TO

PORTLAND CITY CLUB  
BULLETIN

"Harmony in  
Diversity"

"Active  
Citizenship"

VOLUME VII

PORTLAND, OREGON, OCTOBER 22, 1926

NUMBER 4

BRIDGES  
Over the  
COLUMBIA and WILLAMETTE RIVERS

Reports by Two Committees of the  
City Planning and Port Development Sections  
of the  
CITY CLUB OF PORTLAND

BRIDGES OVER LOCAL  
HARBOR ARE OPPOSED

To the Board of Governors:

We of your committee for the study of the three bridge and approach measures on the present ballot have held several meetings, including one on October 13th, 1926, to which were invited the proponents of the bridges as represented by the Peninsula Bridge Association, Guaranty Building. We divided the question into its four aspects: financial, legal, traffic, and navigation, and assigned these respectively to Messrs. Risley, Lee, Holford, and Dennis for special study. However, because each of these aspects presents some phase of each question relative to the bridge, a somewhat different form of presentation is followed in this report.

After these special studies, and after hearing and questioning of the advocates of the bridges, we have to recommend against the adoption of the measures for the Interstate-Fremont and the St. Johns bridges for the following reasons:

1. We find at the present time a county bond limitation which leaves, after removal of the funds for construction of the two bridges and Broadway ramps, less than \$500,000 for future appropriation as may be necessary for projects of a more essential nature but not now prominently in the public eye.

2. There is not now a compelling need for these bridges, even though they are perhaps eminently desirable.

PORTLAND MUST MODIFY  
STAND TOWARD LONGVIEW

The City Club,  
Portland, Oregon.  
Gentlemen:

The gravity of the situation which confronts Portland because of the proposal to build a bridge of insufficient clearance between us and the sea has not been fully realized by the people of this city. Protection of the navigable channel against obstruction of this character has been left to those bodies, official and civic, which customarily watch over the welfare of the port, but divided counsels among them cause danger that our interests may be compromised. At the same time their natural anxiety lest the movement of ships to and from our harbor be hampered has been misconstrued and misrepresented until Portland is now regarded as having taken a wholly selfish position, considering only her own welfare, and disregarding the rights of lesser communities. If this view prevails among those in authority at Washington, our protests and arguments will not receive due consideration. In order that the rights of Portland may be safeguarded, it is imperative that in presenting our case full consideration be given also to the rights of other Columbia river ports and that our claims be based on the right of the people of the entire Columbia river basin to an unobstructed

(Continued from Page 2)

(Continued on Page 4)

# PORTLAND CITY CLUB BULLETIN

Published Weekly By

## THE CITY CLUB

OF PORTLAND

Office of the Club . . . . . 607 Oregon Building  
Telephone Broadway 8079

Subscription Price . . . . . \$1.00 per year

Entered as Second Class Matter, October 29, 1920, at the  
postoffice at Portland, Oregon, under act of March 3, 1879

City Club dues are \$1.00 per month, payable semi-  
annually on May 1st, and November 1st. There is no  
initiation fee.

### CITY CLUB PURPOSE

*"To inform its members and the community in  
public matters and to arouse them to a realization  
of the obligations of citizenship."*

### CITY CLUB BOARD OF GOVERNORS

ERNEST C. WILLARD . . . . . President  
J. P. NEWELL . . . . . First Vice-President  
W. H. MARSH . . . . . Second Vice-President  
LEMUEL P. PUTNAM . . . . . Secretary  
HUGH C. GRUWELL . . . . . Treasurer

JAMES A. MCKINNON  
GEORGE N. WOODLEY  
DR. KARL H. MARTZLOFF  
L. T. MERWIN  
C. C. LUDWIG  
THADDEUS W. VENESS

ALDEN B. MILLS . . . . . Executive Secretary

### STATEMENT BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

The approval of a committee report by the Board of Governors signifies that in their opinion the report has been prepared in such a manner as to merit consideration by the Club, but does not necessarily mean that the Board concurs in the conclusions and recommendations.

### LOCAL BRIDGES OPPOSED

(Continued from Page 1)

3. The committee feels that, in view of experience locally and in other cities, the six years allotted for construction is too long by at least fifty percent. We feel that insufficient study has yet been given to this matter and that in view of the very large sum of money necessary for the construction of these two structures, considerable caution should be exercised in authorizing this construction.

And now for the main discussion.

1. We find that, according to data supplied by Mr. C. C. Ludwig, secretary of the Tax Supervising and Conservation Commission, upon authorization of this construction, somewhat less than \$500,000 will be available for such other construction as may become essential in the near future. Among such measures may be mentioned the entire replacement of the Morrison bridge, at a cost exceeding in all probability the cost of the erection of the Burnside bridge. Other projects are the improvement of the Broadway, Railroad, and Hawthorne bridges, the moving of the draw span of the Hawthorne bridge to correspond with the present channel, improvements which are likely to be of the utmost necessity.

The suggestion is made by Mr. Ludwig that, because of the practice of including in each city bond issue a clause exempting it from the legal limit of bonded indebtedness, these various improvements might be made by the city. He points out that Broadway, Morrison and Hawthorne bridges were originally constructed by the city and that their replacements might and probably would be undertaken by the same agency.

We find, however, that in the Oregon Laws of 1919 (Olsen's Oregon Laws, pps. 1570-1573) it is provided that bridges over the Willamette river in the city of Portland "are hereby declared and defined to be permanent ROADS and shall include approaches and viaducts leading thereto." The act further authorizes Multnomah county to borrow money to construct and reconstruct such bridges and details the method by which this borrowing shall be done. The final paragraph reads as follows: "Upon the completion of any bridge which shall be constructed pursuant to and by virtue of the provisions of this act, the title thereto and the full control thereof shall be and become vested in said Multnomah county, such power of control to be exercised on behalf of said county by said board of county commissioners."

In all probability, therefore, it will be impossible for the city to build these various

multiplied 30 times before China is raised to the American scale of living. We wonder at the growth of our coast exports. What is today is a mere trickle compared to the flood that will be tomorrow. The channels through which this commerce will flow are not yet fixed, but every facility will be needed, for our Western shore lacks sufficient harbors.

The geographical position of Portland at the head of ship navigation on the only river that pierces the Cascade and Sierra Nevada mountain system gives it the only water grade for railroads between the intermountain country and the Pacific ocean and warrants its citizens in having an ambition to raise this port to the first rank, enjoying shipping facilities equal in quality to those of the greatest ports in the world. This ambition has inspired the people of Portland to expend more than \$9,000,000 on improvement of the channel to the sea in co-operation with the government, to contribute \$475,000 toward the cost of the north jetty and to spend more than \$10,000,000 on public docks, constructed and equipped in the most modern manner.

With a realization of what the future may hold for this city, we shall not lightly regard any obstruction to its commerce. Restriction on the size of ships that could safely come to the port would restrict the growth of the port, consequently the greater prosperity which its people reasonably hope to enjoy. For these reasons the question of the Longview bridge is worthy of consideration by the City Club and should be clearly understood by every citizen.

The proposal is that Congress authorize a private corporation to build a toll bridge across the Columbia at Longview, connecting the highway systems of Oregon and Washington. Congress granted a franchise, in February, 1925, subject to the approval of the plans by the highway commissions of the two states. The Oregon Legislature enacted a law directing the Oregon Highway Commission to be governed by the advice of the Port of Portland Commission as to clearance for ships passing under the bridge. The bridge company submitted plans for a channel span 157 feet high at low water and 750 feet wide between centers of piers, but the full vertical clearance was to be given for a width of only 375 feet. Following a hearing of their application held jointly by the Oregon Highway Commission and the Port of Portland, the Port declared that it would not approve a bridge less than 175 feet above low water, with a horizontal clearance of 600 feet and a width between piers of 750 feet. The franchise expired February 21, 1926, before formal action had been taken by the Highway Commission.

The bridge company, charging a deliberate attempt to kill their enterprise by delay, caused introduction of a new bill in Congress which gave no authority to the two highway commissions but made the plans for the bridge subject to approval by the Board of Engineers of the War Department.

The Chamber of Commerce then became active in the matter and asked for a report from its special bridge committee, of which Mr. Frank L. Shull is chairman. That committee reported in favor of a suspension bridge with a vertical clearance of 225 feet at low water, without naming any horizontal clearance. Sharp difference of opinion arose in the Chamber and no agreement had been reached when Mr. Shull

and Mr. Warren both went to Washington to present their views to the committees of Senate and House.

In the meantime the bridge company, supported by the political influence behind Longview, had made such an impression on Congress that all efforts to have authority to approve plans again vested in the two highway commissions were defeated in committee. Although the Senate committee on commerce has prepared a standard bill for all bridges connecting two states which required approval of plans by the highway commissions of the states concerned, the majority refused to report such a bill for the Columbia River bridge. The committee's bill requires approval by the secretaries of war, agriculture and commerce, acting jointly, but the committee rejected amendments offered by Senator McNary, at the request of the Portland Chamber, requiring that the three secretaries pass on the necessity of the bridge and on its feasibility from the standpoint of cost.

The business community of Portland finally became so aroused and conflict of opinion became so sharp that the Chamber of Commerce entrusted the matter to a special committee on port development having 130 members. The executive committee of this committee employed Mr. C. E. Grunsky of San Francisco to make a survey and recommendations. Mr. Grunsky has been for years an advocate of an international agreement on the clearance of bridges across navigable channels, expecting thereby to prevent the construction hereafter of ships of greater height and to induce owners of existing ships to cut down masts and funnels exceeding the standard height. In conformity with this theory, Mr. Grunsky has recommended for Longview a minimum vertical clearance at low water of "at least 170 feet at the piers and somewhat more at the center." The span should be not less than 850 feet, he says.

This brings the story up to date. It is not the purpose of your committee to enter into a discussion of clearances, channel width, location of a bridge, or any technical features. These are matters to be decided by men qualified for such duties, after hearing of all interested parties, and thorough investigation of conditions. Our aim is to direct your attention to the seriousness of the situation and the need for prompt and united action.

Congress will meet in a few weeks, the demand for a bridge will be pressed and the proponents are confident of success. Portland's motives are questioned. If we persist in our present course of opposition and criticism, solely, our protests are likely to meet with little consideration. Doubtless the government engineers will prevent the construction of a bridge which would interfere with any ships now coming to this port or in the same class as those now coming. But we want more than that. Without fast passenger and mail ships we cannot take rank as a first-class port. Our desire for such service finds no sympathy in the Shipping Board or in the Commerce Committees of House and Senate. If we are to keep the way open for the realization of our ambition, we must change our tactics.

Furthermore, we cannot rest content under the imputation that we are governed by selfish motives only. Such has not been Portland's record in the past nor is it her sentiment now. The prosperity of Astoria, Longview, Rainer,

St. Helens, Vancouver, is our prosperity. We want to see Astoria made a port of call for every steamer line along our coast. We want to see passenger vessels discharging their passengers there if they do not care to bring them further, but we do not want them discharged at a lower river port because man has made it impossible to bring them further. We want to see the products of Western Washington going to sea from Longview's docks rather than by way of Puget Sound.

The location selected for the bridge may not be the best but if Longview is willing to pay for a bridge of proper clearance at that location rather than another, it is not for us to object. And why should we object? A bridge at Longview is not detrimental to us, if it is properly built. San Francisco would gladly bridge the Golden Gate, if it were possible. New York would reap untold benefits from a bridge from Battery Park to the Jersey shore if such a structure could be made to clear the harbor. We are fortunate that Nature has made it possible to complete the circuit of transportation around this port and yet leave the way open for ships.

A connection across the Lower Columbia between the highway systems of Oregon and Washington will be a necessity at some time. The counties bordering the river have a right to more direct communication with each other than is possible by ferry. Construction of the Roosevelt highway along the Oregon coast will bring much additional traffic from California and Western Oregon to Puget Sound and other parts of Washington, and an alternative route to that through Portland and Vancouver will give an added stimulus. Experience proves that provision of an alternative route diminishes the traffic over the existing route only temporarily. Tourists going north by one route will return by the other and in a few years the aggregate will so increase that each route will have more than the one had originally.

Not only do we have a common interest with the lower river ports in the benefits to be derived from a bridge, but they should be as solicitous as we to preserve the full possibilities of the harbor. Even the ports below Longview should not feel secure, merely because ships going to them would not have to pass the proposed span. In the future bridges will be proposed still further down stream and the clearances of the bridge at Longview will be taken as the standard.

These considerations lead your committee to urge that Portland, instead of opposing a bridge, join in the move to build one. We do not believe that a bridge is required for either present or immediate prospective future traffic. From the standpoint of the public interest its construction may very well be postponed for a decade or more. But it may be that the actual increase in property values, (not speculative but real values) through improved transportation will justify Longview and Rainier in building a bridge which will meet the minimum requirements. Whether that be true or not, the people of those communities believe it to be true. They will continue to press for a franchise, and if we do nothing but oppose, they will receive it. Rather than risk restriction of our commerce as a result of such a policy, it would be better for us to join in the enterprise, premature though

it be, and in return for our financial support secure the adoption of plans satisfactory to us.

The importance of the bridge as a connection between the highways of the two states makes it desirable that it be built and owned by the communities directly benefited. The largest share of the cost would be borne by Multnomah County, which means Portland. By contributing half the cost of the bridge, Portland would act in the same spirit as when it assumed the cost, together with the Government, of improving the channel through the whole distance from its upper limits to the sea, and asked no port on the lower river to contribute, though all use the channel thus made.

By taking the lead in recommending this plan Portland would free itself of the charge of selfish obstruction and would seize the initiative, which properly belongs to it as the principal Columbia river port. Its claims would command respect in Congress, such as has not been accorded its representatives when they appeared as opponents of an enterprise promoted by another port. In order to carry through this policy, it would be advisable to enlist the support of all the counties on both sides of the river from Multnomah and Clark down to the mouth for identical bills to be passed by the respective legislatures including them in a bridge district and appointing a joint commission having authority to obtain a franchise from Congress, to issue bonds, to select a site and build a bridge and to collect tolls until the debt was extinguished through operation of a sinking fund. If this plan were taken up in earnest, Congress could doubtless be induced to defer action on the pending bill and ultimately to substitute for it a new bill granting the bridge district authority to build.

The bridge commission would then be free to treat as minimum clearances those named by the Board of Engineers and to build a channel span of such higher, wider clearances as would safeguard any ship from obstruction. We ought not to consent to the erection of a bridge which would not permit the passage to our docks of the largest ships which float upon the Pacific ocean, or are likely to in the next hundred years. We can no more foresee the development of shipping during the coming century than could one living in 1826 have foreseen the progress made since his time.

Nor can we afford to test our power to dictate to ship-builders and owners as to dimensions of future ships. We must compete with neighboring ports where bridges are impossible. If we permit even a suspicion of restriction to go abroad we may lose more than we gain by the construction of the bridge.

Portland's share of the cost would be in the nature of insurance for its free passage to the sea for all time. The return on that investment would consist in uninterrupted growth of the port, of the business of all its merchants, manufacturers, banks and others in all occupations and in the steady increase in the value of its property. That return cannot be estimated, but all who have faith in the future of the port will agree that it will be ample.

Respectfully submitted,

LYMAN GRISWOLD  
RANALD M. HOPKINS  
E. C. MEARS  
J. P. NEWELL, *Chairman*