

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies
Publications

Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies

1997

Metropolitan Briefing Book, 1997

Carl Abbott
Portland State University

W. Warren Wagar

Ethan Seltzer
Portland State University

Craig Wollner
Portland State University

Howard Wineberg

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/metropolitanstudies>



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

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Citation Details

Abbott, C., Wagar, W., Seltzer, E., Wollner, C., and Wineberg, H., (1997) Metropolitan Briefing Book, 1997. Presented by the Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies, College of Urban and Public Affairs, Portland State University.

This Technical Report is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies Publications by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

*Metropolitan
Briefing
Book
1997*

PRESENTED BY
THE INSTITUTE OF
PORTLAND METROPOLITAN STUDIES

COLLEGE OF
URBAN AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MULTIPLE OREGONS	3
LEARNING FROM PAST FUTURES	7
PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA CORE VALUES	13
CRITICAL ISSUES LIST 1996	18
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PORTLAND AREA	26

MULTIPLE OREGONS

By Carl Abbott, Professor of Urban Studies and Planning

We all have a sense that there is more than one “Oregon” in the 1990s.

BUT, we’re not quite sure where and how to draw the dividing lines.

Maybe the division is west versus east. Maybe it pits city folks against country people. Maybe it lines up the Willamette Valley against “downstate” or “outstate” counties. Maybe (according to *The Oregonian*) it is really a three-way division between Portland, Portland suburbs, and the rest of the state.

Perhaps, I’d like to suggest, the problem of defining the “two Oregons” is more complex than drawing a simple line on a map. To understand what’s going on as Oregon nears the twenty-first century, we may need to think about two sorts of regional economy and regional identity that are layered on top of each other. The question is not whether a particular community is part of Oregon 1 or Oregon 2, but how it is balanced between older and newer roles in the world economy. In a sense, we need to think of “regions” as being states of mind as much as they are natural environments.

For the first century that Oregon was part of the United States—from 1845 to 1945—Oregon was a land organized around steamboats and railroads. There were steamboats on the Willamette and Columbia, railroads to California, Puget Sound, and the East with spurs up the valleys that laced the mountains and plateaus. Steamboats and railroads created a Pacific Northwest that we can think of as “Columbia”.

Literally, Columbia was the Columbia River Basin, with its ranching, mining, farming, and logging enterprises that sold to markets in California, the eastern United States, and Europe. Metaphorically it is a shorthand for the resource economy of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Columbians herded sheep and ran cattle; they grew fruit and grain; they cut trees and scooped fish from the cool waters.

In the Columbian world, Portland was the prime organizer. It was the regional capital that dominated Spokane, Boise, Pendleton, Walla Walla, Salem, Eugene, Longview. Columbia was a region that was oriented east to west from resource land to markets. Seattle’s role as organizer of the Puget Sound resource economy and then Alaska was a mirror, a second off-center “Columbia.”

The last fifty years have brought a new Northwest layered on the old. We can call this second Northwest “Cascadia.”

Cascadia is a product of automobiles and airlines, not steam engines. It is oriented north and south, from Victoria and Vancouver to Bellingham, Seattle, Tacoma, Olympia, Portland, Salem, and Eugene. It is marked by high volume movement of people, information, and finished products as much as the movement of raw materials. It is organized internally along the I-5 axis and it networks with the global economy.

In the “Cascadian” economy, Seattle is the prime organizer. Other cities of the I-5 corridor (including Portland) play supporting roles. This rise of Seattle depended on several key decisions in the 1950s and 1960s: staging the Century 21 world’s fair, turning the University of Washington into a world-class research institution, and investing in facilities to handle containerized cargo (to get long distance shipments rather than bulk resource commodities).

The Cascadian economy recruits its new workers from California, Korea, and sagging software companies around Boston’s Route 128. Cascadians need the rest of the Northwest for recreation and refreshment as much as they need it for resources and markets. It is a Cascadian impulse to create a North Cascades National Park or a Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. It is the Cascadian impulse that brings exurbanites to Sandpoint, Idaho or Joseph, Oregon to interact tensely with ranchers and loggers. It is the Cascadian impulse that has made Missoula a center for environmental policy-making and a significant point on the national intellectual map.

As these last points suggest, no place in the Northwest is purely Columbian or purely Cascadian. Everywhere they are interlocked in edgy and dynamic balance. There are Cascadians in eastern Oregon and Columbians in Portland. For an illustration of the interweaving of the two “Northwests,” stand in your imagination on the Columbia River dike east of the Portland Airport.

The Columbian economy is all around you. In the distance you can see plumes of smoke from the paper mills at Camas, Washington. Plowing downriver comes a barge tow full of wood chips headed toward Portland harbor. Across the river is a long Burlington Northern train with cars full of wheat for transshipment to world markets out of Portland or Kalama.

But the Cascadian economy is equally present. You can hear the traffic humming across the Glenn Jackson Bridge on I-205. Some of the cars are carrying people from Olympia who find it easier to fly out of PIA than SeaTac. Along the bike path come bevvies of Portland information workers stretching their muscles as well as their minds, for it’s an imaginary weekend that we’re here. Overhead (and overheard) are the rapid-fire landings and takeoffs of airplanes on the lucrative north-south routes served by Alaska, United, Horizon, and Southwest.

This contrast encapsulates the layering of Cascadia onto Columbia. We can see the same layering if we cast a slightly broader gaze. A couple miles downstream from PIA is the site where Swift and Company in 1908 built a huge packing plant to process the cattle of the Columbia basin—a classic “Columbian” enterprise. A few miles upstream is the start of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic

Area of 1986--a product of the ways in which "Cascadians" are revaluing the landscape.

What's been happening along the lower Columbia has been happening elsewhere in the state. Most communities are both Cascadian and Columbian. Some maps can bring the point home.

Start with the counties that preferred John Kitzhaber for governor (Map 1) and the counties where Ron Wyden won or came within one percentage point of Gordon Smith (Map 2). In both cases we see the political influence of Portland and Eugene extending westward to the Pacific Coast and eastward across the Cascades, but detouring around the heart of the Willamette Valley. Then look at a map showing the counties that voted down the OCA's anti-gay rights Measure 9 in 1992 (Map 3). The tolerance zone included not only Kitzhaber and Wyden territory but also Coos County, Jackson County, Sherman County, and Gilliam County.

All of these maps show something quite different from the standard vision of two Oregons split nicely between urban and rural. What they show is the influence of a newer cosmopolitan economy gradually transforming rural as well as urban Oregon.

We can contrast these maps with two others. Map 4 shows the last of frontier Oregon—the counties with fewer than 6 people per square miles, an indicator of wide open spaces by anyone's book. Map 5 shows the counties with a persisting tradition of frontier recklessness where the murder and suicide rate in 1993 was 1.5 times the state average.

The point is twofold. First, there are important regional variations within Oregon. Second, these do not coincide with much of our common understanding of the way the way the state divides.

For planning purposes, this analysis makes me especially uncomfortable with the standard approach of setting off everything east of the Cascade divide as a separate administrative region as do many state agencies and planning initiatives.

Instead, planners should think about patterns and connections that build on growing similarities and connections. To look at a county that I'm familiar with, I like the fact that Hood River County's Regional Strategies partner is Clackamas County. I like the fact that the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area forces Hood River County to think in terms of a six-county, two-state planning region. I also like the Regional Strategy alliance that links Lane, Benton, Linn, and Lincoln counties.

Indeed, for a last exercise let's take the twelve regions into which the Oregon Economic Development Department has divided the state for its Regional Strategies Program. Regional Strategies asks each region to define three priority industries. Several of the state's priority industries are clearly part of the older

Columbia economy: agriculture, fisheries, forest products. Several are clearly part of the Cascadian economy: biotechnology, high technology, metals, software. Two others—environmental and tourism—have a foot in each camp. Region by region, only the Washington-Multnomah region places its whole faith in the Cascadian economy. Every other region blends old and new. Tourism and environmental industries balance forest products in Baker and Malheur counties. Software balances forest products in the Jackson-Josephine region and balances agriculture in the Mount Hood region.

Yes, there are two Oregons, but the dividing lines are not as clear as the crest of the Cascades or the canyon of the Deschutes River. Instead, two economies and lifestyles coexist throughout the state. We're already living with each other. The challenge is to make that coexistence peaceful and fruitful.

LEARNING FROM PAST FUTURES

By W. Warren Wagar, Department of History Binghamton University, SUNY

[This article is adapted from Mr. Wagar's presentation at the IMS Annual Leadership Symposium, May 4, 1996, at Portland State University.]

I've been asked to talk to you on the subject of how we can be "smart" about what we expect from the future. What lessons can we draw from the history of forecasting?

I really wish I had been asked to talk to you on the subject of how we can be dumb about the future. This I know something about. For example, when I wrote the first edition of my fictional scenario of world history for the next 200 years, *A Short History of the Future*, I envisaged all kinds of exciting adventures for Yugoslavia, East Germany, and the Soviet Union in the 1990s and the first half of the 21st century. The book reached the stores in the fall of 1989, just in time to witness the unravelling and eventual disappearance of Yugoslavia, East Germany, and the Soviet Union.

And yet every day or so, you hear tell of futures studies, this wonderful new multidisciplinary inquiry into the shape of things to come. Speaker Newt Gingrich is a dues-paying member of the World Future Society in Washington, Alvin and Heidi Toffler—million-copy best-selling futurist authors—advise the Speaker, Vice President Gore writes a book about the future of the global environment, magazines like *Wired* and *Scientific American* devote whole issues to the future, and in the greater Portland area, Metro has developed a 2040 Framework Plan to ensure democratic coordination of the growth of the region during the next 50 years. This summer I will be one of 480 confirmed speakers peddling my wares at the 8th General Assembly of the World Future Society in Washington. I am also one of 427 contributors to the massive two-volume *Encyclopedia of the Future* published this January by Macmillan, with dueling introductions by Alvin Toffler and Daniel Bell.

So what are futures studies? Futures, plural. Studies, plural.

The best short answer is very short. For the most part, futures studies are baloney—an acceptable lunch meat, but not exactly the caviar and truffles you might have been expecting, after all the hype. Most futurists most of the time give us not a glimpse of future shock; they give us generous but only marginally nutritious portions of future schlock.

I say this as a historian. Just check out the track record of futurists over the past 30 years. Starting in the mid-1960s, when the World Future Society was founded, did they foresee the women's movement, the gay rights movement, the fiasco of Vietnam, the end of the postwar boom, the power and popularity of the personal computer, the rise of religious fundamentalism, the decline of the cigarette, the

arrival of a whole new generation of deadly incurable viruses, the erosion of the stratospheric ozone layer, the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe, or the world-wide phenomenon of joblessness and underemployment in the mid-1990s? Not at all.

Of course they did foresee World War III, a second Ice Age, personal robots and helicopters for everybody, drastically shorter work weeks, the paperless office, the replacement of radio and books and movie theaters by television (except for those hardy unkillable perennials, the drive-in theaters), famine throughout the Third World by 1975, the elimination of infectious disease, the loss of all our forests to acid rain, the electric automobile, and the phasing out of fossil fuels by nuclear fission and hydrogen fusion power. Maybe some of that will actually still happen, in some century or other.

Why do futurists perform so miserably? There are plenty of reasons, but let me cite one in particular. It was pointed out by Frank Owen in January, 1996, in his column in the *Village Voice*: and I quote Owen, "The futurists' basic error is to take an existing trend and extrapolate it, as if it were an ascending line on a graph. But society is not a mathematical model, and as any student of cultural history should know, a trend doesn't exist for long without a counter trend appearing to retard its progress." Exactly!

Society is not a mathematical model. Society is an incredibly complicated super-organism, situated in a still vaster organism, the earth's biosphere, and composed—in our century at least—of all the things that all the people of all the world think and say and do, day by day by day, along with the synergy between the doings of human beings and the doings of the biosphere. The future is not just political, or economic, or social, or cultural, or technological, or environmental—the future is all that and more. Just as history is everything that ever did happen, so the future is everything that ever will happen. Just as historians cannot literally reconstruct or re-enact the past from the appallingly fragmentary evidence the past has left for us to find, so futurists cannot predict the future from evidence that does not yet even exist.

Another related problem is our very human propensity to learn a lot from recent history, while forgetting everything we learned from earlier history. My favorite example is provided by World Wars One and Two. World War One grew out of a big international arms race and dozens of fierce eyeball-to-eyeball international crises. The "lesson" of World War One, learned by almost every French and British statesman of the interwar period, was that war preparation breeds war, so appease your enemy, be patient and empathetic, and don't get paranoid if he does something you don't approve of. This gave us World War Two. So the "lesson" of World War Two, learned by every statesman of the postwar era, was that failure to prepare for war breeds war, so don't appease your enemy and get very paranoid and threatening if he does anything you don't approve of. This gave us the multi-trillion dollar Cold War, the wars in Korea, Vietnam, and Afghanistan, and almost led (and might still lead) to World War III.

So the lesson of history is not that we learn nothing from history, but that we learn too much, most of it dead wrong for the circumstances currently at hand. No two historical situations are the same, because society is that incredibly complex super-organism. We never go around exactly the same way twice, and all trends are born to be counter-trended.

I am tempted to end there and leave you dangling, because what I have just said is far and away the most important thing I can tell you about the future. But, in fact, there is some use to futures studies, or I would not be wasting my time and risking my modest reputation indulging in them. Let's go back to the phrase itself. As I said a few minutes ago, it is futures studies. Futures, plural.

Why do we put "futures" in the plural? Because there will be more than one? Absolutely not! There will be only one future, just as there was only one past. Viewed by an omniscient being, past and future would be the same thing. The only difference between them is the position of the observer in the temporal flicker of "now." If it's May, 1996, the future is June and the past is April. If it's May, 1896, the future is June, 1896, and the past is April.

No, it is perfectly correct to speak of the future, in the singular. But that is not what futurists study. We cannot study it, because it has not happened yet, and it has supplied us with no primary sources. The term "futures" is short for "alternative plausible futures," i.e., future states of affairs that we can plausibly imagine, given the best available (but always fallible) knowledge of the way things are and have been in the past.

This is a long way from prediction, but I submit that it is better than not thinking ahead at all. Let me give you one more horrendous example of what it means not to think ahead. In the early 1960s, the American economy was booming. There was an abundance of college students and a shortage of qualified professors. The lesson learned from this was the need to increase graduate school enrollments to meet the multiplying need for college professors. Established graduate schools doubled and re-doubled their enrollments. Many states, like California and New York, decided to transform some or all of their state colleges into state universities with big graduate programs. In my state of New York, Governor Rockefeller created, with the stroke of a pen, four state university centers where before there had been none. Each of these four was charged to develop a massive graduate school with dozens of Ph.D. granting departments. My own university, the former Harpur College, became the State University of New York at Binghamton. In no time an enrollment of 2,000 had become an enrollment of 12,000, including 3,000 graduate students all pursuing master's and doctor's degrees. Over the past 25 years, my department alone has awarded more than 130 doctorates in history.

Now enter the 1990s. Budgets for higher public education shrink. The demand for Ph.D.'s shrivels, not because there is no social demand, but because there is not much economic demand given budgetary constraints. The graduate programs of the State University of New York, in 1996, stand on the threshold of obliteration. Over built campuses top-heavy with expensive senior faculty hired

in the 1960s and 1970s may soon have to be put up for sale, and their aging faculty put out to pasture. Even if the economy were booming, there would not be anything like enough college teaching jobs for all the hundreds of thousands of young men and women sucked into the mindlessly proliferating graduate schools of the 1960s and 70s. What ever gave us the idea there would be enough? The fact is, we did not look ahead. We just grew, like weeds in an untended garden, until we all started to choke.

So, yes, you have to try to think ahead. But this is a lot harder than it sounds.

I have two salient pieces of advice for look-aheaders. First, look at all the possibilities you can think of. And second, look at them in a global context. Let me explain. One of the main reasons why futures studies so often flop is that the futurist adopts the mind-set of the social or natural scientist rather than the mind-set of the historian. In other words, he or she builds vastly simplified models of the real world, with most factors assumed to be constant or controlled, while one or a few others are allowed to vary. For example, you project the needs for fresh water of a given region. You project current rates of demographic, agricultural, and industrial growth, and you find that at these rates of growth, you will need X gallons of fresh water by the year 2040. You plan accordingly. Fine.

But what if changes in technology make it necessary to have a lot more (or a lot less) fresh water to grow crops or process ores or whatever? What if social unrest and racial conflict in adjacent regions lead to a doubling of the rate of population growth, through immigration from those adjacent regions, and you need a lot more fresh water? A good historian looks at society as a whole, not just as a model of political or social or economic behavior.

Remember, the real future will consist of everything that people think and say and do; and everything they think and say and do will exert an impact on everything else they think and say and do. No one can take literally everything into account, or avoid building models. But take a lesson from the historian. Strive for models that are as holistic, as all-encompassing, as possible. Who would have thought in 1910 that Henry Ford's Model T (and all its ilk) would eventually destroy downtown businesses and facilitate middle-class flight to the suburbs? But in the end, it did. One major invention, with plenty of help from the oil barons and the tire manufacturers, changed the whole landscape of North America—although, for various reasons, cultural as well as geographical, it made much less difference to the landscape of Continental Europe or Japan. But when I say "everything," I mean everything everywhere, and this brings me to my second word of advice. We live today, and have lived for many generations, in what my colleague at Binghamton University, Immanuel Wallerstein, calls a "world-system," a system of production for sale in a global market, together with a highly integrated complex of interacting but sovereign nation-states and a global technoculture that is virtually identical throughout the world. This technoculture has, among many other things, created what the late Pierre Teilhard de Chardin called a "noösphere," an envelope of thought and consciousness stretched out around the planet like the skin of an onion, in which

communications satellites, computer and telephone networks, and print and audiovisual media put every part of the world in more or less instantaneous communication with every other.

All this means that city and regional planning—as such—are obsolete. You cannot imagine the industrial future of Portland without also imagining the industrial future of Malaysia or Nigeria. You cannot foresee the economic demand for Oregon agricultural products without considering demographic and economic trends in China. At present rates of demographic and economic growth in China, by the year 2020 China will be importing enormous quantities of grain, driving world grain prices sky-high and prompting North American farmers to increase production by leaps and bounds.

Now I'm not saying this will happen. The bubble of the Chinese economic boom may burst. Or a calamitous civil war may take China temporarily out of the world economy. But one thing is sure. If China does continue to grow and prosper, a lot of North American farming communities are going to benefit big time. Meanwhile, manufacturing jobs now plentiful in Oregon may be exported by capitalists searching for cheaper labor to China, or, for that matter, to India and Russia. In 2020, some North Americans might be trading in their business suits or their factory uniforms for farmers' overalls.

Or imagine much bigger changes. Ponder the impact of global warming by 2040, if the worst-case scenarios of the doom-crying climatologists are right. Or a worldwide populist revolution against capitalism in response to the growing concentration of wealth in the hands of a small Bill Gatesian elite, while billions of people are unemployed, underemployed, underpaid, or worked to death, the victims of downsizing, planet-wide outsourcing, automation, the whole nine yards. By 2040, capitalism may have reached the point reached in 1989 by communism in Eastern Europe, for entirely different reasons, but with the same effect. A new book by the distinguished capitalist economist Lester Thurow (*The Future of Capitalism*) comes to similar conclusions.

Or what if—to use a phrase coined by Benjamin Barber—jihad gets the better of McWorld? By “McWorld” Barber means the globalizing trends symbolized by the planet-wide triumph of McDonald's hamburgers. By “jihad” he means not just Islamic holy war but all the separatist, centrifugal forces at work in today's world to resist these globalizing trends, to pit race against race, nation against nation, tribe against tribe, creed against creed. Jihad tore Yugoslavia to shreds, just at the point when it looked as if it were going to become a prosperous part of the European Community. Jihad is ripping much of Africa apart, as we speak. Jihad could shatter India. Terrorist groups armed with nuclear weapons could make mincemeat out of our hopes for a stable New World Order. Jihad could wreck our own cities in North America, as Asians, Latinos, Blacks, and Whites struggle for power. Too much jihad, and guess what? At the very least, costs for security and defense will skyrocket, countries like the U.S. will have to go on a permanent war footing, and the domestic arms industry will have a field day. Call it the jihad dividend!

Coming back to May, 1996, and the here and now, what does my advice mean to you? Should you throw up your hands, emit a loud groan, and stop forecasting and planning? Obviously not. But to quote Ethan Seltzer, we have to be “smart” about our futurizing. We must consider all the possibilities, have lots of contingency and back-up plans, and play with many alternative scenarios. We must hang loose and be ready for huge surprises, pleasant or unpleasant. We must think holistically, and build the global context into all our models. We won’t get it just right. We might even make stupendous mistakes. But at least we won’t make the worst mistake of all: we will never underestimate the future.

PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA CORE VALUES

March 18, 1996

By Ethan Seltzer Director, Institute for Portland Metropolitan Studies

Introduction...

We are a trend setter region in some ways, a follower in others. We are known for our high quality of life, beautiful landscape, location on the Pacific Rim, high quality workforce, and innovative approaches to managing growth and public policy generally. It is now clear that maintaining these attributes of our metropolitan area in the years ahead will form the core of the challenge before us. Even more, these attributes are truly the riches of our region, and our use and stewardship of these resources, carried out wisely or otherwise, will create the legacy we leave for our children. Creating a shared base of knowledge regarding what we collectively have at stake, its vulnerabilities and opportunities, stands at the threshold of our plans for the next century.

As we begin this work, there are three central assumptions that shape our thinking:

- 1) People matter, not just as workforce but also as active community members. Whether the issue is productivity within a firm, competitiveness within an industry, or success of a region, the challenge seems to be to knit people and networks together in a manner that harnesses the learning abilities and creativity of all. In addition to a vital economy, we all have a stake in strong communities, healthy societies, and a vibrant local culture because they help to supply the connections that make productive relationships vital.
- 2) Prosperity must be assessed on a regional basis, rather than a jurisdictional basis. Two elements seem to be important levers or drivers of metropolitan prosperity: the competitive advantage that a region enjoys relative to other regions engaged in similar activities; and, the unique aspects of the region that no other region shares which enable regions to get ahead by being different". The operational boundary is the region, and this blend of stewardship and development is the strategy.
- 3) Place provides continuity and focus. The landscape and ecology of a region offers opportunities for differentiation from other places, resources useful to the economy, the basis for building strong communities and local culture, and a tangible window into the major issues confronting communities now and in

the future. Note that place and landscape refer to both cultural/historical aspects of a community as well as its natural/environmental qualities.

Successful regions, then, will be those best able to merge people, prosperity, and place into an interlinked strategy for stewardship and development. Metropolitan areas focusing on one or two elements while excluding others run the risk of optimizing for one set of essential attributes while diminishing another. Ultimately, truly sustainable regions will be those that meet the needs of present residents while increasing the range of choices that future residents will have to meet theirs.

Core Values...

For the past year, the Institute has been exploring the core values of the metropolitan area. Our values describe what matters", what we as both individuals and as members of communities use to guide our actions and order our choices. Values are aids to navigation, providing a context for making choices and linking means to ends. Our interest in values is twofold:

- First, unlike issues, values don't change as often or as much. Therefore, to the extent that values are widely held, they can serve as important catalysts for long-term community action.
- Second, since values help to create priorities, understanding how values work at a metropolitan level provides insights for understanding metropolitan sense of place and the sources for community identity.

Therefore, our look at metropolitan area core values offers a vehicle for understanding what communities hold in common, and a way to unite what otherwise might be seen as disparate community interests. If we can identify a list of core values, and assess whether our behavior actually reflects those values, then we can begin to talk about whether the quality of community life we say we want will actually be realized in the next century. If we aren't walking our talk" as a metropolitan region, then it will be up to metropolitan area residents and community leaders to consider new choices and actions in the years ahead. Our task has been to assemble the information that can inform that kind of discussion.

We began with a careful reassessment of the Oregon Values and Beliefs Study, completed in 1993 by the Oregon Business Council and the Oregon Progress Board. Although those results have been widely reported, we worked with the developer of that study, Adam Davis, to revisit the results for the five Oregon counties in the metropolitan area. In particular, we drew in previously unreported responses to open-ended questions. For those unfamiliar with the Oregon Values and Beliefs Study, it was a very detailed and extensive surveying effort to uncover core values and beliefs of Oregonians from all corners of the state. Over 1300 individuals were scientifically selected and participated in over two hours of surveys, interviews, and focus groups.

The results for the metropolitan area mirrored those for the state as a whole. The four metropolitan area core values derived from this work were, in order of priority:

- 1) Participation in Family—family is important, and spending time with family is highly valued. Note that in this case family” refers to both the household members and the extended family of the respondent. It’s that home base that can be counted on, and which has expectations of and for its members. Given more time, Oregonians would spend more time with this group. Concern for the welfare of children and of parents and the elderly is associated with this value.
- 2) Independence of Self—being able to live a life of your own devising, and having the sense that you can make changes in your life is of great importance to Oregonians. Note that this is not about disengagement, but about engagement in a socio-political environment where individuals feel effective. Further, this is an expression of the expectation that our region is a place where individuals can make a difference, and small groups can come together to identify and solve community problems.
- 3) Career and Job Opportunity—we desire good work, jobs that both put food on the table and offer some promise of satisfaction. Underlying this is a desire for access to opportunity, requiring both the ability to share in the economic prosperity coming to the region and having access to the tools for economic participation. A key finding here, however, is that Oregonians are not willing to embrace economic growth at any cost. There is a great desire to see economic growth occur in a manner that leverages things for other closely held values.
- 4) Concern for the Environment—this should be a clean, green, beautiful, uncrowded, and unhassled place. Air should be clean, water should be plentiful and swimmable, and wilderness should still be accessible in a reasonable amount of time. The number one quality that folks associate with the state and region is its beauty, and their number one fear is that we may become too crowded and “just like other places,” especially those places in states to the north and south.

These values were arrived at by surveying individuals and then aggregating the results. Our next step was to look for value statements that reflected community concerns. The strategy that we used was to collect goal, value, and/or vision statements from all of the cities and counties in the six-county metropolitan region, and to review them for common themes. The assumption here is that the legislatively adopted statements of jurisdictions would reflect broader collective rather than individual concerns. The common themes that we discovered, in no particular order, are:

- a) Safety—people want safe communities where they can live a life free from the fear of crime, or unreasonable concern for personal safety for themselves or loved ones.
- b) Community Identity / Sense of Place—communities want to have distinct identities. They do not want to simply blend in with their neighbors to the point where their boundaries become invisible and both residents and nonresidents have no clue as to when they've gone from one community to another.
- c) Vital Economy, Civic, and Social Life—communities want to be known as dynamic places, populated by involved people. These are places that are alive and characterized by effective relationships, mutual caring, and opportunity.
- d) A Life Close to Nature—communities seek to interweave the natural with the built, to maintain the traditional Pacific Northwest link to the landscape and its resources even in our most populated places.

Each of these community themes has a close correspondence to the individual values outlined above. Desires for safety and distinct community identities relates to the notion of independence of self. A life close to nature connects directly to concern for the environment. Safety and family go hand in hand. Community vitality relates both to the notion of career and job opportunity as well as to the kind of relationships accompanying strong family ties.

To review these findings we convened a series of small group meetings throughout the metropolitan area during the fall of 1996. Most of the people we talked with were active in their communities, and agreed that these lists were, for the most part, representative of their aspirations. However, they pointed out a number of things that were missing. There is no explicit mention of community, a surprising result to active community members because of the fact that they struggle with a seeming decline of community life as an important issue. There is no real discussion of diversity, and the need to incorporate diverse points of view, despite the fact that the world is becoming a more diverse place, both globally and locally.

There was tremendous concern about growth, and a great desire to slow the pace of change. To many, preserving quality of life was an immediate problem, not one to be left to a future outcome of a long-term planning process. With that came frequent descriptions of communities that no longer knew themselves as well as they used to. On the other hand, there was an almost universal sense among these activists that their problems weren't intractable, and that a few folks could get together and make a difference. This suggests that community is alive and well, but that the geography over which people feel effective is shrinking.

Conclusions...

What can we conclude from this analysis? Putting these individual and community values together suggests that residents of this metropolitan area are seeking three things:

- Good Work—employment that offers satisfaction, a way to put food on the table, and the potential for advancement;
- Good Communities—communities within which residents feel they can live a life of their own devising, and whose members feel effective and able to identify problems and work cooperatively to create solutions; and
- Good Landscapes—a clean, green, accessible, and uncrowded region.

The next phase of our work will investigate the ways in which we can claim, in this region, to be known for these things. If, as we are increasingly beginning to believe, these kinds of values can be used to characterize this place, then our challenge as a region will be to consider them as a strategic foundation for economic and community development. Again, these themes or values offer a framework for making strategic choices, and for assessing options available to us. Putting these qualities to work in a sustainable manner may likely be the essence of the task ahead.

CRITICAL ISSUES LIST 1996

By Craig Wollner, Research Fellow, Institute of Metropolitan Studies

BACKGROUND AND METHODS FOR THE 1996 LIST

Since 1993, the Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies (IMS) has been analyzing the Portland region's most pressing issues in order to create a responsive program of research and service and to understand the Portland area's real needs. This Critical Metropolitan Issues List is a popular and sensitive barometer of regional concerns. For IMS, it helps to map the directions in which staff efforts should go in order to fulfill the Institute's mandate. For the region's elected leaders, other government officials, and citizen-activists, the list is a useful tool in identifying key issues and developing strategies to deal with the most urgent needs of the community.

In the past, the Critical Issues List was compiled by a variety of methods including research and analysis of the findings of public opinion surveys, review of strategic plans from a variety of public and private entities, needs assessments, vision statements, and other materials. In 1996, however, IMS decided to follow its own carefully planned and executed program of survey research to produce a portrait of the concerns of citizens and leaders as they view the area in the present and the near future.

The research strategy unfolded in three stages. First, a series of focus groups with elected and appointed officials and community activists was led by Professor David Morgan of PSU's College of Urban and Public Affairs. The discussions in the focus groups were designed to elicit a sense of the themes or issues which those who are immersed in the day-to-day problems in the area found most compelling. Next, a telephone survey was developed by researchers Claire Strawn and Kay Woodford incorporating the list of issues identified by the focus groups. The survey ultimately included 401 respondents aged 18 and over, drawn from adult households in the six county area. The margin of error was plus/minus 5 percent with a confidence level of 95 percent.

The final research stage involved a return-mail survey of 1,900 individuals selected from the IMS mailing list. These individuals are community activists, elected and professional officials from every kind of local and regional government, scholars of urban affairs, and others whose professional focus is on the region. These opinion leaders were asked to rate the significance of the same issues used in the telephone survey of the general public. The mail-back element of the research achieved a response of 511, for a rate of approximately 27 percent, high for such a technique.

The use of separate surveys of households and opinion leaders, based on the same issues list, provided the opportunity to compare separate perceptions of the critical issues facing the metropolitan region.

THE QUESTIONS

Issues gleaned from the focus groups were framed as questions in both the phone and mail surveys. Respondents were asked to rate the importance of each issue, with 1 being not important and 10 very important. Ten issues were identified:

- A quality educational system with stable funding
- Reducing crime to increase community safety
- An adequate supply of affordable housing to meet a range of needs
- Creating a productive economy that provides family wage jobs
- Protecting and maintaining the quality of the environment and natural resources
- Managing the growth of the region to maintain quality of life
- An efficient transportation system that includes alternative means of travel
- A fair system of state and local taxes
- Providing a range of social services to meet basic human needs such as health care, child care, and homelessness
- Maintaining the basic system of bridges, roads, water supplies and the like

RESULTS OF THE SURVEYS

Both the telephone survey of households and the mail-back survey of opinion leaders asked respondents to rate ten issues on a scale of 1 - 10, with 10 being very important for the region. The comparative rankings were:

Rank	Householders	Opinion Leaders
1	Education	Education
2	Crime	Growth
3	Taxes	Environment
4	Environment	Jobs
5	Growth	Transportation
6	Jobs	Infrastructure
7	Social Services	Social Services
8	Infrastructure	Housing
9	Housing	Taxes
10	Transportation	Crime

In addition to the ratings, respondents were asked to identify the one issue facing the six-county metropolitan region that should be considered more important on the public agenda. The top three issues for each group are listed below.

Issue Rank	Householders	Percent	Opinion Leaders	Percent
1	Education	31.3	Education	30.9
2	Environment	10.6	Managing Growth	13.2
3	Managing Growth	10.4	Economy/Jobs	9.8

ANALYZING THE RESULTS OF THE 1996 CRITICAL ISSUES SURVEYS

The results of the Critical Metropolitan Issues research for 1996 are highly instructive, for several reasons. Among the most intriguing is the fact that on the subject of the region's most important issue there is strong congruence between perceptions elicited from the fraction of the regional general public contacted in the telephone survey and the responses of those opinion leaders who returned mail-back surveys.

The strong agreement among all elements surveyed that urgent attention must be paid to an excellent educational system with stable funding makes a powerful statement. At every opportunity in each of the surveys—in the basic ranking exercise as well as in response to the question of which issue deserves greater attention—respondents overwhelmingly named education as the primary issue with which the metropolitan region must deal. A number of comments accompanying answers strongly suggested that many respondents in the general public and among opinion leaders regard education as the key to the successful resolution of all other issues mentioned. That is, educational excellence, they feel, leads to better jobs, a stronger economy, lower crime rates, and even a fairer system of taxation, as one respondent suggested.

Repeatedly, mail-back respondents designated education on the part of the questionnaire requesting a statement on the item on the list which "should be more important than it is currently, regardless of the score you gave it above..."

Some simply said “education,” or “#1” (its position on the list). Others said “a quality educational system,” in the most frequent formulation, is imperative. “This,” one respondent observed, “needs to be addressed and very quickly. The legislature has put it off for far too long!” Another shibboleth often linked with quality in the educational system was “stable funding.” It was also said to be, by itself, critical. “Stable funding for our educational system is the most critical issue if Oregon expects to continue its prosperity,” stated a respondent, speaking for many others. Another person, perhaps summing up the general frustration of opinion leaders on the issue, wrote, “education/funding has become a political football. Public education deserves better. Cutting taxes for a few is not the answer.”

It is difficult to discern if people meant by education simply K-12, but it is perhaps significant that of those focusing on education, only a few specifically included higher education in the call for more attention.

Having noted the overall strength of the identification of education as the primary regional issue in both surveys, it is well to consider the context in which it occurs. Thus, if examined against the backdrop of the passage of Measure #47 in the November 1996 general election, the insistence of respondents on the significance of education is puzzling. This measure, passed by voters statewide in November, initially cuts the property tax by 10 percent and limits its growth thereafter to 3 percent per year. Although the measure specifically directs the state legislature to make cuts so as to spare schools as much as possible, the impact on school finance promises to be significant, as opponents pointed out in the electoral campaign. The measure might have been expected, therefore, to run into serious resistance among voters in the five Oregon counties in the metropolitan region. Yet election results show that even though the vote was close in all counties, only Multnomah defeated #47. What, then, are we to make of the laser-like focus on education in each survey?

In the case of the issue occupying the second position in the telephone survey, congruence with opinion leaders disappears. Crime ranked second in the telephone survey, whereas in both elements of the mail-back survey (rankings and the “what deserves more attention?” question), it was at the bottom of the list. Indeed, none of the returned mail-back surveys commented directly on the issue of crime.

Two comments about the relative rankings of crime seem appropriate, although neither can be said to resolve the gap between the two surveys. First, crime has fallen over the last two years in the region. In 1995, in addition, Portland experienced the lowest crime rate in six years. Crimes most likely to affect average residents, car theft and burglary, were down dramatically in the first half of 1995. Car thefts showed a drop of 34 percent, while burglaries fell by 18 percent. The overall decline in the rate of serious crime is consistent with national trends which have shown a decrease over the last four years.

Second, Oregon voters passed two strong anti-crime measures in the 1994 elections—one putting in place a so-called three strikes law mandating long

sentences for a third felony conviction, and another authorizing the construction of nineteen new prisons. These new laws indicate that the public remains insecure about their safety.

It is apparent that there has been a significant failure of communication on crime between the public and their leaders and that both elements must come to some mutual understanding of the true dimensions of the region's criminal activity before meaningful action on the issue can occur.

For the respondents to the mail-back survey, growth is the second leading issue while the attitude of the general public, as reflected in the phone survey, is that this is an issue of middling importance, ranking in a tie for fourth with concern for the environment. Interestingly, on this issue, the public may be marginally more attuned to the realities than the planners and other community leaders who populate the IMS mailing list. Recent population estimates show that regional growth has slowed somewhat from the torrid pace of the first three years of the 1990s. However, recent forecasts predict that the four urban counties of the region—Clackamas, Clark, Multnomah, and Washington—will experience growth of somewhere between 20,000 to 31,000 persons per year for the next five to fifteen years. Even at the lower figure, such an increase would significantly stress the region's infrastructure and environment. Those attuned to policy, the mail-back survey implies, are deeply concerned about the ripple effect through the regional life that this would have. They clearly want to do something about growth. The question is whether or not the public is listening.

The third issue brought up in the telephone survey was taxes. Again, there was a considerable variation in the perception of the mail-back respondents on this issue. They ranked taxes in the ninth position. The 1996 vote on Measure #47 suggests that a little more than half of the regional public continues to regard the tax structure as deeply unfair. As noted, they are willing to sacrifice the quality of some services, like education, for what they perceive as a fairer tax system. "Tax base—how we fund schools," an interviewer noted about one phone respondent's observations. "The whole state taxation system needs an overhaul." It no doubt says something about the public's perception of the complacency of public officials or about their distrust of efforts to reform the tax system initiated by politicians that the gulf is so wide on this issue in the IMS surveys.

As noted, taxes ranked near the bottom (ninth) for the opinion leaders. Few commented on it, but of those who did, some seemed to echo the sentiments of the members of the public who thought it was extremely important. "A fair system of state and local taxes would provide the funding for all of the other [issues]," a mail-back respondent wrote. Another said "more than 50 percent of every person's income goes to taxes; local, regional, state, and national." Still, the almost total lack of focus among mail-back respondents on this issue, seems remarkable, especially given its strength among the public.

There was a tie for the fourth ranking issue in the telephone survey. The environment and growth were listed as equally important by the general regional public contacted for the survey. The perception of equal gravity of the

two issues was closely mirrored by mail-back respondents who nevertheless ranked growth as the second leading issue with a mean score of 8.1 and environment at third with a mean score of 8.08. It is also obvious that in both surveys, the respondents saw the two issues as closely linked. Comments volunteered about these issues were among the most vivid of those offered on any other subjects. These deeply held attitudes are perhaps summed up by the comments of a mail-back respondent who wrote “overwhelming growth is causing dangerous amounts of traffic problems, air pollution, and a reduced quality of life.” Another stated “growth scenario is killing Oregon—any pretense of management is a farce—our leadership is no better than the high priests of Easter Island—we are killing ourselves.” Similarly, a phone respondent worried that “we are not providing for growth, we are creating growth; not sustainable growth, but a raping [of] the natural resources.”

The fifth most important issue in the phone survey was jobs, which ranked slightly higher, at fourth, among mail-back respondents. The middling rank of this issue in both surveys suggests the high level on which the metropolitan level economy has been operating during the last two years. With unemployment running at 3.8 percent in the summer and declining to 3.7 percent in September, it would have been difficult for respondents to argue that employment was a problem. Still, the presence of the topic on the list in the face of what amounts to a labor shortage, indicates the ongoing concern of the public and policy makers with this leading indicator of social well being.

This underlying unease about jobs in both surveys was expressed as a call for the generation of “family wage jobs,” or similar language. “Creating well-paid jobs is the most important [item],” one mail-back respondent said. “Without this [dealing with the other critical issues] is not possible.” Others echoed that view, characterizing family wage jobs, as one person did, as “crucial to everything falling into place.” Such comments apparently respond to the well documented secular decline of high-wage manufacturing jobs in the local, state, and national economies and the rapid rise of lower paying service sector jobs. In 1993, for example, the region’s real average income per worker was the same as it was in 1983—\$26,000. Put another way, Tektronix, which ten years ago employed 24,000 workers, today employs 7,000. Those separated from the company and still in the work force have by now been reabsorbed into the economy, but most likely in the service sector, at significantly lower rates of pay.

If this analysis correctly reflects the attitudes of survey respondents, then it is probably fair to say that the topic of real interest seems not so much to be jobs, but pay. In any case, the surveys tell us that jobs and the economy remain a sensitive issue across the board in the Portland metropolitan region.

The sixth ranked issue in the phone survey was social services. By comparison, it was seventh among mail-back respondents. The ambivalence of the public toward the provision of social services is captured in a revealing, if oblique, comment from a phone respondent. Preserved in the interviewer’s notes, it reads, “bums on streets—they are a problem, but he is also concerned about their needs.”

Although it ranked lower for them, however, those who received the mail questionnaire chose to articulate their feelings and ideas much more frequently than the phone respondents about social services. Like other issues on which respondents focused, those commenting on social services tended to see it as a nexus. Thus, one wrote, “meeting basic human needs would take care of several of the issues. “[Social services are] the ‘hub’ of the wheel from which 1-10 [the numbered issues] are connected,” said another. Yet another was more specific, noting, “all the issues are very important [but]...providing a basic safety net is a must. Lack of this net falls heavily on children, undercuts the basic morality of society...contributes to (or causes) crime, undercuts the economy because future citizens are not skilled. It is not a ‘liberal’ idea to care, it is smart. Portland is not a ‘third world’ city.” Finally, one person observed that the state of social services was a problem deserving much more attention than it is currently receiving. But this respondent, looking beyond appearances and perhaps putting a finger on the relatively low ranking of this issue, also wrote, “with \$\$\$ so short, the other fires are burning hotter & require more attention.”

The seventh issue on the phone list is infrastructure. Ranking sixth among mail-back respondents or opinion leaders, infrastructure elicited copious written response from them. Again, this was a topic which, while achieving only middling rank, was nevertheless often perceived by respondents as being connected to other issues on the list. Concurrence between growth and infrastructure improvement, said one survey. Somewhat in that vein, one person wrote, “planners still don’t ‘get it’ re: *greeninfrastructure* [italics added]; there needs to be more emphasis on ‘institutionalizing’ the incorporation of greeninfrastructure in all phases/elements of urban design.” Others simply stated very succinctly their priority: “maintaining and enhancing the basic systems of bridges, roads, sewers, water supplies, and the like,” was a typical response of this kind. The most emphatic statement championing the maintenance of the regional physical plant was this one: “the infrastructure—when it is gone, all is lost!”

The eighth ranked issue in both the phone and mail-back surveys was housing. Although the Portland area has recently been assessed as one of the “hottest” housing markets in the nation, with the prices of most kinds of housing stock rising steeply in many parts of the region, both the general public and opinion leaders appear not to be of one mind on this issue, although a significant number of the mail-back respondents said the one issue requiring more emphasis in the region was affordable housing.

Owing to the fourth place tie between environment and growth in the phone survey, transportation was the ninth ranking and last issue among telephone respondents. Conversely, it was rated fifth by those in the mail-back survey. The unimpressive positioning of this issue by phone respondents subsequently may have been neatly framed by the voters’ lack of enthusiasm for the North-South light rail line in the November election. This outcome may mean that until the public is convinced that alternative means of travel, to phrase the key aspect of the statement as it appeared in the surveys, should loom as large in their plans

for movement around the area as the automobile, they will not be particularly interested in the problem.

However, local public officials and opinion leaders believed that resolving transportation problems relating to roads is a pivotal, if not urgent, problem for the future vitality and livability of the region and, in that sense, as being linked to growth and environmental concerns. One respondent said it would be important to build “an efficient transportation system that helps to achieve land use/growth management goals.” A second called for “an efficient transportation system that helps to achieve land use/growth management goals.” A third envisioned a system that emphasized “blending transportation alternatives, affordable housing, and growth management through mixed use planning and development.” And another identified “an efficient transportation system where ODOT [Oregon Department of Transportation] works closely with the cities involved before critical planning is set in stone,” as pivotal. “Metro road system—need major arterials to move traffic on some form of a grid,” said another. “Bicycle travel should be safer and encouraged,” another stated.

CONCLUSIONS

The comparisons above indicate that the metropolitan region general public and the opinion leaders in the area are in agreement about a number of issues which any objective analysis would conclude are, indeed, important to the life of a region. These include education, where there is a surprisingly strong consensus among and between both elements about the need for the most urgent action. Housing was another area in which there was fundamental agreement, although in this case, the issue was not perceived as among the most compelling listed. Jobs and economic development achieved relatively equal importance among both elements surveyed, but, again, they garnered only a middling rank overall. The biggest gaps were in the areas of crime (extremely important to the general public) and growth and the environment (of particular significance to opinion leaders). Another was transportation. Opinion leaders were emphatic about the significance of this issue, but the phone respondents were unmoved by it. On many key issues, respondents in both polls tended to see the issues as intimately interlinked; i. e., do something about one and you might make inroads on most others.

If these results suggest anything about the conduct of policy making in the region, it may be that the two partners—leaders and public—have an understanding on some of the most important issues, but must listen to each other on some of the less immediate problems the region faces.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PORTLAND AREA

By Howard Wineberg, Assistant Director, Center for Population Census and Research

In this report, demographic data are presented for Oregon and the Portland-Vancouver Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area (PMSA) which is comprised of six counties: Clackamas, Columbia, Multnomah, Washington, Yamhill, and Clark. All of these counties are in Oregon with the exception of Clark County which is in the State of Washington. Figure 1 shows the location of the PMSA.

Oregon's July 1, 1995 population of 3,132,000 is spread out over 96,003 square miles yielding a density of 33 persons per square mile (Table 1). The PMSA had 1,710,400 residents in 1995 with a density of 340 persons per square mile which is 10 times greater than that of Oregon. However, there is substantial variation in the density among the counties in the PMSA. Multnomah County has 1,440 persons per square mile whereas Columbia County has only 60 persons per square mile.

Oregon's 1995 population of 3,132,000 represents about 1.2% of the United States' population of 262,755,000. Oregon's population increased 289,679 people (10.2%) in the 63 months since the last U.S. Decennial Census (April 1, 1990). This rate of increase is almost double that of the United States (5.6%) during this time. For eight consecutive years, Oregon has grown at a much faster rate than the national average.

The PMSA has increased from 1,515,452 people in 1990 to 1,710,400 people in 1995. This increase of 194,948 people represents a growth of 12.9% which is faster than that of Oregon (10.2%). Washington County gained the most people since 1990 (58,400) and Clark County had the faster growth rate (22.2%). Two counties have grown at a slower pace than the state average since 1990: Columbia's population increased by 5.7% and Multnomah's by 7.3%.

Population projections for the PMSA show that the annual growth rate for the next 15 years is similar to the annual growth rate experienced in the PMSA from 1993-95, somewhat slower than earlier in the decade. Oregon is projected to increase its population by about 43,000 per year for the next 15 years yielding a population of about 3,775,000 by the year 2010.

Oregon has gained about 205,800 people since April 1, 1990 owing to net migration (people moving to Oregon minus people leaving Oregon) and 83,900 people owing to natural increase (births minus deaths). Net migration has accounted for about 135,400 new people in the Portland Area with natural increase accounting for an additional 59,600 people.

The vast majority of the net migrants to Oregon and the PMSA are under age 65. For Oregon, about 9 out of every 10 net migrants are under age 65 whereas for the PMSA the figure is 19 out of 20. Washington County gained the most elderly and the most people under age 65 (+36,233 and +4,066). Multnomah was the only county that had a net out-migration of elderly since about 3,000 more elderly have moved from Multnomah than moved to Multnomah in the 1990's. Figure 2 shows Oregon's net migration from 1981 to 1995. It is evident from this graph that migration can vary from year to year. For example, Oregon experienced a net migration of -30,250 people from 1985 to 1986 whereas between 1986 and 1987 there was a net migration of +13,600 people. The substantial net out-migration occurring in 1982, 1983, and 1986 is reflective of the recession in Oregon in the early 1980's. Conversely, in each year from 1988 to 1995, Oregon had net in-migration of more than 30,000 people.

The substantial migration into and out of Oregon since 1985 may have changed the composition of Oregon's population. It is estimated that about 950,000 people or 30% of all Oregon residents in 1995 did not live in Oregon ten years earlier.

Oregon's population is not evenly distributed. Although half of Oregon's 36 counties are east of the Cascade Range, these counties contain only 406,800 people or 13% of the state's population in 1995 (Figure 3). The 1995 population of the Portland Area (excluding Clark County) is 1,419,400 which represents about 45% of Oregon's population; in 1990 it was also 45%. The projected population in 2010 shows little change in the population distribution in Oregon with the Portland Area (excluding Clark County) projected to have about 1,720,300 people or 46% of the state's population. The area east of the Cascade Range is projected to contain 13% of the state's population in 2010, the same percentage as that in 1995 and in 1990.

Approximately 430,000 Oregonians are ages 65 and older (Table 2); this represents 13.7% of Oregon's population, a figure that is higher than the national average of 12.7%. The PMSA has a much smaller proportion of elderly with only 11.5% of its population ages 65 and older.

In every county in the PMSA, the percentage of the population ages 65 and older is below the state average. In particular, only 1 in 10 of the residents in Washington and Clark Counties are ages 65 and older.

Oregon is one of the least racially and ethnically diverse states in the nation. Table 3 shows the 1993 population by race and Hispanic Origin for Oregon and the PMSA. Approximately 94% of Oregon's population and 92% of the PMSA's population is white. Hispanics represent the largest minority group at about 5% of Oregon's population (147,300) and 4% of the PMSA's population (67,500). The minority population, although relatively small, has increased over time. In particular, the Hispanic population has increased by 31% between 1990 and 1993 (from 112,708 to 147,300) and the Asian and Pacific Islander population has grown by 23% during this time (from 70,239 to 86,100).

The most racially diverse county in the PMSA is Multnomah with 6.1% of its population black and 5.5% classified as Asian and Pacific Islander. Multnomah County has more residents of every minority group than any other PMSA county. Blacks, in particular, tend to reside in this county as about 75% of Oregon's total black population (37,800 out of 51,250) live in Multnomah County.

The county with the highest proportion of Hispanics is Yamhill with an Hispanic population representing 7.6% of its total population. Further, there are more than twice as many Hispanics in Yamhill County than all the other minorities combined (5,404 versus 2,438).

Table 4 shows the percent of out-of-wedlock births for Oregon and the Portland Area for 1985, 1990, and 1994. It is quite clear that for both Oregon and the PMSA the percent of out-of-wedlock births has increased over time. In 1985, about 19% of the births in Oregon and the PMSA were out-of-wedlock. By 1994, about 29% of Oregon's births and 26% of the births in the PMSA were to unmarried women.

The highest percentage of out-of-wedlock births in 1994 is in Multnomah County (34%); Washington County has the lowest percentage (19%) of births to single women.

That many children are born to unmarried women in the PMSA has implications in that many children in a single parent household live in poverty. The problem of children's poverty is an issue that will need to be addressed since about 50% of the children under age 5 living in single mother households in the PMSA are below the poverty level.

Table 5 shows that the birth rate for women ages 15-19 is substantially higher in 1994 than in 1985 for Oregon and the PMSA. Approximately 2,600 children were born to women ages 15-19 in the PMSA in 1994. Children born to teenagers are at a particularly high risk of living in poverty. Similar to the findings in Table 4, the highest birth rate is found in Multnomah County. Clackamas County has the lowest birth rate for women aged 15-19 and its rate is less than one-half that of Multnomah County (32 per 1,000 vs. 66 per 1,000).

The commuting pattern among counties in the PMSA reveals part of the complex relationship that exists among the various counties in the Portland Area (Table 6). Those workers living in Multnomah County are much less likely to commute outside the county than those living elsewhere in the PMSA.

Approximately 81% of workers living in Multnomah County work in Multnomah County. At the other end of the spectrum, only 47% of workers living in Clackamas County work in Clackamas County.

In the bottom part of Table 6 we find that Multnomah draws the most commuters of any county. Nearly 40% of the jobs in Multnomah County are held by those who live outside the county. Clark County is the least likely to attract

commuters as less than 15% of Clark County's jobs are held by Oregon commuters.

For Oregon and the Portland Area, unemployment rates declined yearly from 1984 to 1990 before increasing for two years (Figure 4). Since 1992, the unemployment rate has again declined reaching very low levels in 1995 (about 3.8% for the PMSA and about 4.8% for Oregon). The rate in the PMSA is lower than that for Oregon in each year since 1984.

The number of people employed in the high tech industry from 1988 to 1995 is shown in Figure 5. This figure clearly shows that the high tech industry has enjoyed tremendous growth in Oregon and the PMSA in a short time. The number of high tech employees in Oregon has increased from about 37,600 to about 54,100 (a 44% increase) between 1988 and 1995. In the PMSA, the number has grown from about 33,800 to 46,700 (a 38% increase) during this time. Approximately 6 out of 7 people employed in the high tech industry in Oregon in 1995 work in the Portland Area.

Figure 6 shows the per capita income for Oregon and the PMSA from 1984 to 1994. The pattern is similar for both areas as there has been a steady increase in per capita income over time. Per capita income is consistently higher for the PMSA than for Oregon. In 1994 the per capita income for the PMSA was \$22,900 compared to \$20,500 for Oregon; per capita income for the United States was \$21,700 in 1994.

Thus, Oregon has a lower per capita income than that nationally while the PMSA has a slightly higher per capita income. Further, the differential in per capita income between the PMSA and Oregon has increased over time.