Historic Resources and the Albina Community Plan

Will Harper  
*Portland State University*

Clyde Dixon  
*Portland State University*

Jean M. Hester  
*Portland State University*

Mary Jane Melink  
*Portland State University*

Kimberly S. Moreland  
*Portland State University*

See next page for additional authors

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: [http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/usp_murp](http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/usp_murp)

Part of the Urban Studies Commons, and the Urban Studies and Planning Commons

Recommended Citation

Harper, Will; Dixon, Clyde; Hester, Jean M.; Melink, Mary Jane; Moreland, Kimberly S.; Ren, Jinxiang; Riordan, Dan; Syrnyk, Damian; and Wadley, Dave, "Historic Resources and the Albina Community Plan" (1990). *Master of Urban and Regional Planning Workshop Projects*. Paper 93.

[http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/usp_murp/93](http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/usp_murp/93)

This Report is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Urban and Regional Planning Workshop Projects by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Planner's problem is to find ways of creating, within the urban environment, the sense of belonging. - Leo Marx

The 1990 Comprehensive Planning Workshop team would like to express our sincere gratitude to Dr. Deborah Howe, AICP and Michael S. Harrison, AICP for their time and commitment to our project. It has been an invaluable experience and a great learning adventure.

We also would like to acknowledge the following people for their special contribution to this project:

CLASS MEMBERS

Will Harper, Workshop Coordinator

Clyde Dixon
Jean M. Hester
Mary Jane Melink
Kimberly S. Moreland
Jinxiang Ren
Dan Riordan
Damian Syrnyk
Dave Wadley

Technical Advisory Committee

Dr. Carl Abbott       Dr. Darrell Milner
Art Alexander        Peggy Scolnick
Elise Anfield        Mary Sauter
Sam McKinney         Al Staehli

Interviewees

Elise Anfield        James Hambrick        James Milligan
Kathryn Hall-Bogle   Jane Heisler         Dr. Darrell Milner
Joyce Boles          Al Jamison            Alta Mitchoff
Hanna Dienes         Michael Matteucci     Jane Morrison
Peter Frye           Richard Matthews      Edna Robertson
Lisa Gladstone       Denyse McGriff       Al Staehli
OTHERS

Dr. Carl Abbott, Portland State University
Duncan Brown, Environmental Planner
Jeanne Harrison, City Planner
Mitch Rohse, LCDC Communication Specialist
Nancy Weisser, Cablecast Producer, Portland Cable Access (PCA)
Professor Stephano Zegretti, Portland State University

City of Portland, Oregon, Bureau of Planning
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREFACE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBINA COMMUNITY PLAN</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBINA HISTORY</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBINA TODAY</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORIC PRESERVATION ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oregon Statewide Planning Goals</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1984 Historic Resource Inventory</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Portland Municipal Code</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Historic Preservation in Albina</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984 HISTORIC RESOURCES INVENTORY</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Field Test of Historic Resources</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Historic Resources Findings</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Historic Inventory Recommendations</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENSEMBLES AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN THE</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBINA AREA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ensembles Findings</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Goal 5 ESEE Analysis-NE Tillamook</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ensembles Recommendations</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES AND TOOLS FOR IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implementation Findings</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implementation Recommendations</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCLUSION</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOSSARY</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDICES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A: Historic Preservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B: Historic Resource Field Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C: Ensembles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D: Issues and Tools For Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix E: Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Comprehensive Planning Workshop is the capstone of the Portland State University Masters of Urban Planning program. The projects undertaken by students in the workshop are planning studies that have a practical use long after the school term is over. In the last two years, the workshop term projects were a study of housing in Southeast Portland and a plan for Portland's Homestead neighborhood.

Michael Harrison, AICP, Chief Planner for the Albina Community Plan, proposed that the students in the 1990 Comprehensive Planning Workshop examine historic preservation issues that will impact the revitalization of inner North/Northeast Portland as part of the Albina Community Plan.

Originally, the workshop originally intended to research Albina's history as a background piece to our main research efforts. It quickly became clear to us that there was a rich, fascinating story to be told about Albina, one that we wished to develop into a piece that would be accessible to more people. Therefore we produced two documents, the history as a separate document, designed to stand alone, and this document which presents our findings and recommendations.

It is our feeling that preserving the past and using that past to anchor and enhance revitalization of inner North/Northeast Portland is of critical importance to the future of the city of Portland.
The historic resources within each community illustrate and establish an area's legacy, and community members are increasingly interested in preserving that sense of history. In response, public officials are working with citizens to develop programs designed to identify and preserve historic resources. Concerns about the effects and need for economic growth within neighborhoods has resulted in efforts to coordinate the historic preservation programs with the planning process. This approach is being used in the City of Portland's Albina Community Plan to enable the simultaneous conservation of historic resources and the economic revitalization of the community.

The Portland State University Comprehensive Planning Workshop study, *Historic Resources and the Albina Community*, was designed to review the issues and problems endemic to preservation of historically significant places and buildings in the Albina Community Plan study area. The study area as defined by the plan conforms loosely to the boundaries of the original city of Albina located in inner North/Northeast Portland. (map 1)

Specific objectives to be addressed by the study include:

- Reviewing and updating the Albina portion of Portland's 1984 Historic Resources Inventory,
- Identifying properties in the inventory that are at risk due to development pressures,
- Exploring the possibility of the establishment of historic and/or multiple resource districts, and the development of a local implementation mechanism to protect historic resources with particular attention given to the preservation of significant ensembles.

The goal of our research and analysis is to encourage the dynamic revitalization of Albina while preserving the area's historic character and serving the economic, physical and social needs of the community.
Historic preservation is a broad topic. The limitations of one term of coursework required selectiveness in deciding what areas to research. To this end our study produced the following:

- A final report of our findings and recommendations. This document analyzes the completeness of the 1984 Historic Resource Inventory, examines the use of ensembles as a preservation tool, and identifies additional tools for historic preservation.

- A history document of Albina from its origins as an incorporated city in the 19th century to the era of urban renewal and model cities in the 1960's and 1970's.

- Historic walking/driving tours of the community.

- A presentation of our findings and recommendations for cablecasting on Portland's local cable access stations.

In addition, some class members will be working on a project collecting historic photos from the community and developing an exhibit of Albina's history. This project will extend beyond the completion to this study and the PSU winter 1990 term.

To aid in the identification of key issues and resources, a citizens technical advisory committee was formed. The committee is made up of area residents and historic preservation professionals. Members include:

- Dr. Carl Abbott, Chair, Department of Urban Studies and Planning, Portland State University

- Art Alexander, Assistant to City Commissioner Mike Lindberg and resident of Albina

- Elise Anfield, Assistant to City Commissioner Mike Lindberg and resident of Albina

- Sam McKinney, Oregon Historical Society

- Dr. Darrell Milner, Chair, Black Studies Program, Portland State University
Mary Sauter, Albina resident and owner of the historic Palmer House

Peggy Scolnick, Albina resident and member of the 1984 Historical Resources Inventory Staff

Al Staehli, Architecture Historian, Consultant to 1984 Historical Resources Inventory

Additional information was collected by interviewing historians, individuals from the community, and planning professionals.

Findings in the various sections of this document are indicated by a ✓, recommendations by a ◆.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The PSU Comprehensive Workshop Historic Preservation study was designed to review the issues and problems endemic to preservation of historically significant places and buildings in the Albina Community Plan study area. The Workshop is an important planning experience course in the PSU Masters of Urban Planning program. 9 students participated in the 11 week workshop, and worked together to prepare the planning study for the Albina Community Plan director, Mr. Michael Harrison, AICP, City of Portland Senior Planner.

The Albina Community Plan (ACP) is a comprehensive district plan being developed by the City of Portland Bureau of Planning and the citizens of inner North/Northeast Portland. The expected completion date is the spring of 1992. The ACP addresses revitalization in the context of land use, economic development, housing, transportation, public safety, neighborhood planning, urban renewal, family services and historic preservation.

The goal of the Workshop's research and analysis is to encourage the dynamic revitalization of Albina while preserving the area's historic character and serving the economic, physical and social needs of the community.

The study of the historic preservation issues as they impact the Albina Community Plan Area examines the following:

**Historic Resources Inventory**

In 1984, The City of Portland conducted a city-wide inventory of properties of historical and architectural significance. One of the objectives of the PSU study is to review and test the validity of the Albina portion of the Historic Resources Inventory. We conducted a field test of inventory completeness which covered about 250 blocks within King, Vernon, and Sabin neighborhoods.
Findings

Resource nomination is to some extent subjective. Some sites may have been overlooked in the initial windshield survey. Neighborhoods with a low level of participation in the inventory process may have additional historical sites which were not inventoried.

The field test identified 31 individual, unranked historic sites that may have been identified in the HRI but were disregarded in the ranking because of a lack of supporting documentation. Many of the structures in the test area, that would not qualify for a ranking in the inventory, may have historic characteristics that contribute to the quality of the area.

Recommendations

The inventory needs to be reviewed and updated periodically. Over time, additional information that is brought out can improve a building's ranking and with a change in appreciation, potential resources can gain historical significance. Updating and reviewing the inventory should be promoted as an on-going process, driven by community interest and monitored by the City of Portland. Areas within Albina that had low levels of participation in the 1984 inventory and a low density of identified resources should be reviewed and surveyed for historic resources.

Ensembles and Historic Preservation

Ensembles are a seldom used but innovative approach to small scale historic preservation. An ensemble is a group of significant buildings, places, and objects that reflects the people and events that make up the history and identity of the neighborhood or city. Ensembles allow protection of small groups of historically significant properties, which individually may go unrecognized. Our ensemble study included research of historic districts and landmark areas in Portland and other Oregon cities and a field survey of eighteen of the thirty-two ensembles in the 1984 HRI. The 18 ensembles are all outside of the proposed conservation districts in Albina.
Findings

Individual sites within the studied ensembles share architectural styles or features, and all but one was constructed in a common time period (1-5 years). Property owners are often unaware that their residence is part of an ensemble.

2% (7 out of 235) of the studied ensemble structures are considered deteriorated. Like many residential properties in the Albina Plan area, residential ensembles declined 17% in assessed land and improvement value in the last 3 years. Commercial property values showed no change for this period. This stall and decline of property values of ensembles may reflect problems of low investment, an oversupply of commercial property, poor housing quality, or the increased vulnerability of historic resources to neglect.

The City of Portland does not have a policy regulating infill development in the context of historic districts and their bordering areas. Ensembles as a group are currently unprotected as historic resources, and do not require historic and design review.

Recommendations

Ensembles should be recognized in the HRI as equivalent to ranked individual properties. A category of Rank I ensembles which have significance to the city or region should be identified and evaluated through the existing HRI process, just as individually ranked sites are.

An ensemble designation program should be based on a simple and open grass-roots process. This approach should include a variety of incentives and education programs.
Historic Preservation Issues and Tools for Implementation

Historic preservation is an important and complex issue which is difficult to define, prioritize, and implement. Public officials must attempt to fit historic preservation into an already crowded public agenda. Issues such as unemployment, housing safety, drug abuse, school dropout rates, and community livability are frequently viewed by the community as more important. Often no relationship is seen between these issues. It may be difficult for a family which is struggling financially to see the importance of attending a neighborhood meeting on historic resources.

Findings

Historic preservation case law supports historic preservation as a legitimate activity of local government. Historic preservation can be pursued in conjunction with economic development. Gentrification and displacement of households are possible side effects of historic preservation activities. Strong citizen participation is the key to a successful historic preservation effort.

Recommendations

Historic preservation needs to be included as a component of the planning process to enable communities to conserve, renew, and reuse cultural resources. To accomplish this a study needs to be completed to determine the city's level of compliance with State Goal 5 and the HRI should be adopted by the Portland Planning Commission as an official document for use in the decision-making processes of historic preservation planning.

Further study needs to be done to determine the social and economic impact of historical designation on individual sites and surrounding properties. An ongoing assessment of the social impacts of historic preservation needs to be made to prevent displacement of households, gentrification, and reduction of affordable housing. Albina's economic revitalization strategies need to be developed and coordinated with historic preservation efforts. The City of Portland, the Oregon Historical Society and the Historic Preservation League of Oregon should coordinate their efforts in the development of a neighborhood-based historic preservation association for the Albina area.
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The Albina Community Plan is a comprehensive district plan being developed (scheduled for completion in the spring of 1992) by the City of Portland Bureau of Planning and the citizens of inner North/Northeast Portland. The Albina Community plan will address revitalization in the context of all the issues that define and shape a community. These include land use, economic development, housing, transportation, public safety, neighborhood planning, urban renewal, family services, and historic preservation. The results of our study will be incorporated into the Albina Community Plan.

A series of studies and plans have been done in Albina in the past and large amounts of money spent on urban renewal, model cities, and highway projects. These programs have dramatically impacted the dynamics of the community. No comprehensive planning was done to predict and mitigate the impacts of these programs. There is now a renewed focus on the resources and problems of Albina and how best to revitalize this area.

The Albina Community Plan acknowledges the importance of the area's history with its name. Resurrecting Albina as a name for the study area reclaims the history of the area for its citizens. Hopefully, one of the outcomes of the plan will be the recognition by all of Portland that there are many positive aspects to this long maligned community.
ALBINA HISTORY

The history of Albina and its development has importance and meaning to the current effort to plan for the area’s future. Part of the planning and citizen involvement process needs to reclaim the history and the artifacts that represent it.

Portland’s 1984 Historical Resources Inventory documents seven possible districts, scores of ensembles and nearly 300 individual structures and sites that may be worthy of preservation. These sites document the progression of architectural styles and tastes in Portland’s development from the 1880’s through the first half of the 20th century. What has already been lost or left to deteriorate in Albina tells a story as well. Much of the original commercial area of Albina was destroyed by the decline of inner city street car service and a the general flight of population to the suburbs after WWII. The physical destruction of these now “blighted” areas was worsened by the building of the Coliseum and the Emanuel Hospital Urban Renewal Projects.

In any analysis of the physical remnants of Albina, it is important to understand the area’s history. For this reason, we have created a companion piece to this report, The History of the Albina Plan Area. The history document portion of this study details the development of the area from its origins as an independent city to the present group of 13 neighborhoods in an area equivalent to the third largest city in Oregon.
The population of Albina has always been ethnically diverse. Irish, Germans, Russians, Scandinavians, Polish, and African-Americans have all established vital communities in the area. Today new groups such as Southeast Asians and East Indians are finding a home in the area. The advantages of an integrated ethnically diverse neighborhood are valued by many citizens of Portland.

The Albina community is now home to over 75,000 of Portland's citizens. The area contains a major resource in land, people, history, and community spirit.

Many people who live and work outside of the community are unaware of the positive resources encompassed by the plan area. There are two aspects to this "image" problem. First are the realities reflected in high rates of vacant and derelict buildings, high crime rates, gang activities, and a lack of economic development and opportunity. These are long term problems that all Portlanders need to address, regardless of which part of the city they currently reside in.

The second aspect is the perception of Albina as an undesirable place to live and raise a family. A new and more positive perspective can be gained by exploring the thirteen neighborhoods of Albina and seeing the variety of environments and people who live there. The unresolved racism that often underlies the negative perception of Albina needs to be acknowledged and honestly dealt with. The black community has so far provided much of the leadership and energy behind revitalization actions in Albina. The emergence of that leadership as well as that of residents through their neighborhood associations is an ongoing process. This grass roots leadership and citizen activism has a history that needs to be recognized and celebrated.

It is important to acknowledge the negative as well as the positive impacts of historic preservation. Gentrification, a process in which more affluent households relocate to older neighborhoods, displacing the original occupants, can be the result of preservation efforts. Upgrading and preserving an area without losing the people and their history is a difficult problem.
The Oregon Statewide Planning Goals, City of Portland Historic Resources Inventory, and the City of Portland Municipal Zoning Code foster the historic preservation environment of Portland and the Albina community.

Oregon Statewide Planning Goals

Oregon's statewide planning goals, as established in 1974, require cities and counties to develop comprehensive plans. Each plan must address and be consistent with each of the nineteen statewide planning goals.

State Goal 5 specifically addresses historic areas: "Programs shall be provided that will insure open space; protect scenic and historic areas and natural resources for future generations, and promote healthy and visually attractive environments in harmony with the natural character of the landscape. The location, quality and quantity of historic areas, sites, structures and objects shall be inventoried and where there are no conflicting uses for such resources these shall be managed so as to preserve their original character" (Appendix, A1).

1984 Historic Resources Inventory

It is within the framework of state goal 5 that the City of Portland conducted a historic resources inventory. The inventory identified over 5000 properties that were researched, photographed and ranked according to relative importance. The completed inventory has been accepted by Portland's Historical Landmarks Commission. (A complete discussion of the inventory follows on page 21).
Portland's Municipal Code

The City of Portland historic preservation program is implemented through Title 33 of the Municipal Code. Title 33 of the current code allows for designation of both historic and conservation districts. The Portland Historical Landmarks Commission reviews all proposals for designation and makes a recommendation to the city council for action. It is important to note that designation is not a recommendation for federal National Register of Historic Places action.

Relevant sections of Chapter 33 dealing with historic preservation were compared with preservation ordinances adopted by Oregon City, Lake Oswego, Eugene and Forest Grove. Comparison to these particular communities was done for a variety of reasons including: the ease of information collection, availability of information, and the quality of their historic preservation programs.

The City of Portland is currently rewriting Title 33 of the Municipal Code. It is uncertain how this will affect historic preservation efforts in the city and the Albina community.

Upon review of Chapter 33, it is evident that weaknesses exist in the code:

The sections of the code dealing with historic preservation are not found in one place. Four different sections of the code are related to historic preservation. (Appendix, A2 - A14).

Chapter 33.120 does not provide a complete list or definition of terms. Precise definitions are important so that preservationists, developers and interested persons know exactly what can and can't be done.

Chapter 33 does not recognize the concept of ensembles. Therefore the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission does not review demolition of structures in proposed ensembles.

Exterior remodelling is reviewed only for landmarks (33.120.080). Exterior remodelling is not reviewed for significant resources such as ensembles.
Incentives for historic preservation are not addressed. The City of Albany has a $20,000 revolving loan program for exterior remodelling and repair. The loan is provided at 2 percent interest. The City of Eugene offers a revolving loan fund for repair, maintenance, rehabilitation or restoration of a historic landmark. Chapter 33 does not include such incentives.

Chapter 33 also does not include specific penalties and fines for non-compliance of section 120 (Historic Districts, Buildings and Sites.)

A major strength of Chapter 33 is that it gives standing to "any person [to] apply for historical landmark designation of any building, site and/or interior." (33.120.050 (a)). Other jurisdictions typically require property owner, resident, historic landmarks commission or city council participation in the nomination process. For example, the City of Eugene requires a petition signed by twenty city residents for landmark nomination.

Historic Preservation in Albina

Presently six potential Historic Conservation Districts are identified in the Albina Study area. Five were identified in a 1978 planning study and one was identified during the Central City Plan process in 1988. An additional 32 sites in the Albina community are identified as "undesignated ensembles." These are potential ensembles, identified in the Historic Resources Inventory. To date, however, none of these districts or ensembles have been formally adopted by the city council.
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In 1980, the City initiated a city-wide inventory of properties which are of historical and architectural significance. Work on the project took nearly four years and resulted in a body of information on over 5000 individual properties, each ranked according to its relative importance. Ranks were defined as follows:

**Rank I** - Individually the most important properties in the city, distinguished by outstanding qualities of architecture, historical values, and relationships to the environment. Highest priority for landmark designation; eligible for National Register.

**Rank II** - Properties which are of individual importance by virtue of architectural, historical and environmental criteria. Secondary priority for landmark designation; eligible for National Register.

**Rank III** - Buildings which provide the settings for more important buildings and which add richness and character to the neighborhood; properties associated with persons and events of secondary importance or which illustrate particular stages in the development of the city. These properties may be eligible for the National Register as part of a district.

Properties which did not achieve at least a Rank III remain in a computer file. Some objects of importance were too numerous and scattered to be included in the inventory, i.e. horse hitching rings, cobblestones, streetcar tracks, and street names and dates in curbs and sidewalks.

The number of ranked properties in Albina includes: Landmarks - 17; Rank I - 4; Rank II - 67; and Rank III - 285. (Appendix, B1)

Of the Albina Plan area properties reviewed in the HRI, approximately 201 did not achieve Rank III. Six potential Historic Conservation Districts and 32 ensembles were identified in the Historic Resources Inventory.
Field Test of Historic Resources Inventory

One of the objectives of the Albina Community Plan is to review and update the Historic Resources Inventory. Members of the Comprehensive Planning Workshop reviewed the inventory, its methodology and its completeness. A field test of inventory completeness was conducted for about 250 blocks within the King, Vernon and Sabin neighborhoods (Appendix, B2-B3). Our selection of King, Vernon and Sabin neighborhoods was based on three factors:

1. A dot density mapping of ranked historic resources, which indicated that King, Sabin and Vernon areas contained a lower density of ranked resources than other neighborhoods in the Albina area.

2. Discussions with neighborhood association members and survey workers involved in the Historic Resources Inventory brought out concerns that this area contained unranked, but potentially significant resources.

3. City Planners and HRI staff were concerned that neighborhoods with a low level of citizen participation in the 1984 inventory process received incomplete historic resource coverage.

Field Test Findings:

-The field test identified 31 individual unranked historic resource sites that had not been included in the historic resource inventory. This may indicate that other areas within the Albina area, which had low levels of citizen participation during the 1985 inventory, may contain unranked resources also. (Appendix, B4)

-The 31 individual potential sites may have been identified in the original inventory process. These may have been disregarded because of lack of supporting documentation.

-Twenty-five ranked I, II, and III historic resources were identified in the test area.

-Many structures in the test area that would not qualify for a ranking in the inventory have historic characteristics that contribute to the quality of the entire area. Examples of historic
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characteristics are leaded glass windows, decorative rafters, pre-cast concrete columns, and murals.

* Elements such as stone walls and natural landscape features were not listed in the resource inventory.

To test our findings we solicited the expertise of an architectural historian (Mr. Al Staehli) who participated in a field check of the 31 sites. His comments were:

* King, Vernon and Sabin contain several potential ensembles.

* Several of the 31 sites may not merit ranking on their own but as an ensemble may have historical significance.

* Individual sites that may not be characterized as ensembles may merit ranking after they are researched in more depth to determine their historical significance.

* Resource nomination is to some extent subjective. Some sites may have been overlooked in the initial windshield survey.

✔✔✔ Historic Inventory Recommendations:

✔ The inventory needs to be reviewed and updated periodically. Additional information can improve a building's rank, while over time, potential resources gain historical significance.

✔ Updating and reviewing the historic inventory should be promoted as an ongoing process driven by community interest and monitored by the City of Portland. Monitoring can determine when a full scale review and update should be conducted by the City as mandated by State Goal 5.

✔ Ensembles should receive status in the current municipal code. This status will protect ensembles from demolition and encourage rehabilitation.
Nomination of building interiors should be promoted by encouraging citizens to nominate resources for inventory consideration.

A listing of unranked landscape attributes such as stone walls, trees, murals, and topography should be created.
ENSEMBLES AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN THE ALBINA PLAN AREA.

Ensembles are a seldom used, innovative approach to small scale historic preservation. The selected properties edition of the 1984 Portland Historic Resources Inventory map includes thirty-two "undesignated ensembles" in the Albina Plan area. The City of Portland Municipal Zoning Code does not recognize ensembles as historic resource properties, nor does it provide a definition.

Studies and discussions with the advisory committee supported the idea that ensembles could be a useful and valuable way to address preservation issues in the Albina Plan area. Our ensemble study included:

1. Research of historic districts and landmark areas in Portland and other Oregon cities.

2. A field survey of eighteen of the thirty-two potential ensembles listed in the 1984 Historic Resources Inventory for the Albina Plan Study Area. These were all located outside of the proposed conservation districts in Albina (Appendix, C1).

An ensemble is a group of significant buildings, places, and objects that reflects the people and events that make up the history and identity of the neighborhood or city. Ensembles allow protection of small groups of historically significant properties which individually may go unrecognized.

Our definition of historic ensembles is broad and flexible in order to maintain a small scale (less than historic district level) and neighborhood (grass roots) oriented approach to historic resource protection. This will be one way a small group of people could take action to preserve their own homes and commercial properties. Currently no method exists in the City of Portland for preservation of small neighborhood areas. The average size of a potential historic conservation district in Albina is 125 acres which includes many citizens and properties in the designation process. Ensembles are typically only a few lots or blocks in size.
Ensemble character and attributes

- Architectural style: Queen Anne Vernacular
- Construction date: 1890
- Historic location: near Woodlawn
- Neighborhood context: later single family homes
- Era of city history: streetcar
- Roof details
- Builder or architect
- Original tenants history
- Architectural history
- Porches
- Rooflines
- Repeating facade profiles
- Window shapes
- Setback from sidewalk
As a group, an ensemble will in some way:

1. Reflect an architectural style and quality of physical design and construction that contributes to neighborhood uniqueness and diversity or;

2. Is an important link to the identity of the community and past social traditions (shopping, commuting or living environment) or;

3. Has community historical significance based on events and development in the past.

Ensemble designation should be a process easily initiated by the residents and property owners themselves. Citizen participation is encouraged by the steps necessary in the historic preservation process such as the research that establishes the historic and design ties of the property to the neighborhood, and nomination of ensembles by neighbors. The illustrations on the following page give some examples of the continuity of attributes and history that make up a potential Albina ensemble.

Ensembles can encourage the spirit of historic preservation in the Albina community by enabling a smaller scale, grass roots appreciation and process. An ensemble designation allows the community to preserve and value the small groups of historically significant parts of the urban environment which can be lost quietly and incrementally. These smaller parts are historic and urban design elements which together can help establish neighborhood identity and pride.

◆◆◆ Ensemble Findings

◆ Individual properties within the studied ensembles share architectural style or features, and all but one were constructed in a common time period (one to five years). Comprised of unique building materials and methods such as the stone-like cast concrete porches and columns or the fish scale wood siding, the proposed ensembles represent significant periods in the history of Albina's physical and social development. There are railroad cottages, streetcar commercial buildings, worker's bungalows, and other interesting groups of ordinary or unique individual structures.
Discussions with several ensemble residents revealed that they were unaware of the proposed ensemble designation for their home or property. Lack of awareness by owners of properties in an ensemble may lead to alterations or development which may damage the integrity of the ensemble grouping. Style, material and building additions are typical alterations which weaken or destroy the historic value of an ensemble or reduce the number of sites included.

The upkeep and restoration efforts of the owners and residents of individual historic or architecturally interesting property is evident. In Albina, a number of ensembles have a restored and ranked historic resource as a centerpiece for other contributing properties (e.g. the NE. 8th Avenue case study with the Queen Anne Vernacular joined by lesser but similar small houses).

Structures in the proposed Albina ensembles are generally in good exterior condition. Of the 235 structures studied, 155 (66%), are considered standard structures in the exterior housing element of the condition of structures survey performed on each ensemble property. (Appendix, C6). Weaknesses typically occur in roofing condition, windows, doors, porches and stairs. Nineteen of the 28 dwellings in the Tillamook St. ensemble case study exhibit roof and exterior wall problems that are repairable by the average homeowner. Exterior surface problems generally require paint and minor siding patch work.

Only 7 of the 235 (2%) studied ensemble structures are considered deteriorated in the condition survey. The most critical defects of the deteriorated structures are broken windows, boarded up windows and doors, and dilapidated roofing and siding. It is important to note, however, that the condition survey did not evaluate interior housing elements. Electrical, plumbing and other problems not visible from the street were not included in the survey results.
Like many residential properties in the Albina Plan area, the residential ensembles studied (except the Tillamook case study) have declined 17% in assessed land and improvement value, according to Multnomah County Tax records for 1987-90. The commercial ensembles did not decline, but neither have they increased in assessed value as most commercial properties in the Portland area have for the same period.

This stall and decline may reflect problems of low investment, an oversupply of certain commercial property sizes, poor housing qualities, and the increased vulnerability of historic resources to neglect. The stall and decline of commercial property value may also result from commercial obsolescence. Retailers such as Fred Meyer and G.I. Joe's typically require lot sizes of 30,000 square feet or more. Commercial development at Hayden Meadows is an example of the current retail trends found in the Albina area.

There is a trend in recent real estate transactions of loss sales, foreclosures, and abandonments in the Albina plan area by individual and small investor property owners (Gladstone, 1990). At the same time, a dozen larger scale investment interests are involved in a majority of purchases of both residential and small commercial properties in the Albina area. Some of the recently sold properties are ranked historic sites or are part of proposed historic districts and ensembles.

Vacant and double lots are present in or adjacent to a majority of the ensembles studied. Both the presence of vacant lots in ensembles and investment interests that have the ability to assemble a large number of individual parcels creates a concern for compatible infill or redevelopment in the Albina community.
The City of Portland does not have an infill policy for historic resource contexts such as districts and their bordering areas. Ensembles are currently unprotected as historic resources, and do not require historic and design review. No guidelines exist for their alteration, maintenance, and demolition. For example, the Tillamook case study is a single family cluster of homes located in a R-1 zone which permits one to four story multi-family apartment complexes. As identified further in the ESEE exhibit, without preservation guidelines the ensemble is vulnerable to redevelopment as multi-family apartments. If a new development or structure was incompatibly sited and designed, it would threaten to alter or damage the historic and neighborhood values that exist, as well as damage the integrity of the ensembles.

In three of the residential ensembles studied, increased development density is allowed. Conversion of single-family structures to multi-family can take place in these ensembles when increased development pressures occur. Removal of historic attributes as a result of conversion can destroy the historic quality of an ensemble. The historic integrity of the Tillamook St ensemble (Case study #1, Appendix, C8) was altered when one house was converted to a duplex. This resulted in the removal or hiding of the structure's historic attributes. This duplex is now incompatible with other homes on the block because of a paved front yard parking lot and facade alterations. One other home on NE Tillamook St. was converted to a duplex quite successfully. Multi-family conversion can occur without reducing the historic quality of the neighborhood.

The total land area within the 18 studied ensembles in the Albina plan area is 36.65 acres. This land area represents less than one percent of the overall land area in the Albina Study area.

Recent studies show that groups most vulnerable to displacement include one person, female headed, and low income households. (So, Getzels, p.354). The elderly and persons with less education are also vulnerable to displacement. Historic preservation efforts in the Albina community must be sensitive to the needs of these groups.
Issues of the displacement of residents from affordable housing due to redevelopment and gentrification are difficult to untangle and generalize across the Albina plan area. An ensemble designation and review process would permit residents to have a voice when property markets, land use decisions, and development programs initiate changes which affect them.

Oregon Administrative Rules Chapter 660, Division 16, section 005 requires local governments to identify conflicts with inventoried significant Goal 5 resource sites. An analysis of the economic, social, environmental, and energy consequences (ESEE) must be performed for identified significant resources in the planning process. We performed an ESEE Analysis on the NE Tillamook Street Ensemble. The ESEE enabled us to examine the larger impacts and issues surrounding the use of ensembles as a historic resource, including the social consequences of not protecting the resource.
TILLAMOOK STREET ENSEMBLE / SNAPSHOTS
Goal 5 ESEE Analysis - NE Tillamook St. Ensemble

(The Tillamook ensemble ESEE is included in the following section as an example and an analysis of the impacts and linkages between ensembles and historic preservation to community and land use planning considerations)

Economic Consequences of Conflicting Uses

The NE Tillamook St ensemble consists of 26 single-family houses on lots which average 5000 square feet. Several large apartment complexes surround the ensemble along NE 7th and NE Sacramento and the ensemble is currently zoned R1, medium density multi-family residential, by the City of Portland. Two structures have been converted from single-family use to duplexes. The ensemble is also adjacent to the Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. M3 Light Industrial Zone and the NE 7th R2.5 Residential Zone.

The potential for redevelopment of the 139,200 square foot ensemble exists. In this R1 zone, 137+ units could be developed at 43 units per acre (1 unit per 1013 square feet). Uses allowed in the R-1 zone include row houses and multi-story apartments with a maximum height of 45 feet. Currently 28 structures exist (1 per 5000 square feet) containing a total of 30 units and all are less than three stories tall. The difference in the number of units and the type of dwellings existing creates a conflict between the smaller scale ensemble character and a potential market demand for larger multi-story development. Development pressures may also increase in this area if the northern light rail alignment follows King Boulevard.

Prohibiting incompatible R1 uses would allow the current single-family residential development pattern to remain. Underutilization of the site would continue since allowing higher density apartment complexes will erode the historical significance of the resource. Multi-family conversion subject to design review is a way to both mitigate underutilization and accommodate preservation.

The economic consequences of protecting the NE Tillamook St. ensemble include the impact of reducing potential housing stock, reduction of development potential and prohibiting incompatible uses. Other economic consequences include the potential economic loss associated with losing higher density development, property owners
expense for labor and material beyond ordinary cost for historically accurate or design compatible housing improvements, public service efficiency lost without higher density development, and a potential reduction in opportunities for affordable housing.

Social Consequences of Conflicting Uses

The Tillamook ensemble provides the area with educational opportunities which allow historical and cultural links to the past. This ensemble displays examples of past development techniques and housing styles which can be enjoyed by current residents and future generations. The ensemble provides a link between the community and past historical patterns. The ensemble was constructed over a period of 25 years (1890-1915) and reflects both the social and economic character of the area at that time. Conflicting uses could erode this historical link. Although much of the architecture of the ensemble is similar to other developments found in the area, the identity of the ensemble is maintained. NE Tillamook St. differs from other blocks in the area as it has yet to experience higher density apartment complex development.

Social consequences of allowing conflicting uses includes the displacement of residents and the breakdown of the existing single-family character of the ensemble. Preservation of this resource will help to maintain the single family character of the area and enable continued home ownership opportunities. By preventing redevelopment in the form of conflicting uses the odds of displacement occurring are reduced.

Gentrification of the NE Tillamook St. ensemble may reduce the chance for renters to live in traditional single-family living spaces. If gentrification of an ensemble occurs, renters are most likely to be impacted when former rental homes are purchased for renovation and property values rise. Past studies show, as former residents are replaced with new people of a different social and economic background, the effect is to break down the ties of the original community. (So and Getzels, p.354)

Environmental Consequences of Conflicting Uses

The ensemble designation will help to maintain the visual environment of the area. However, preservation of the ensemble with the current underutilization of land may negatively impact the regional environment, however, by forcing development outward where land is available for development. This result will increase the demand to develop
land presently in agricultural or forest use. This has the effect of creating urban sprawl.

The need for site alteration is another consequence of allowing the identified conflicting uses. Natural resources such as open space and trees, that are vulnerable to higher density development will be lost to site preparation.

Energy Consequences of Conflicting Uses

Protection of the ensemble may increase energy use by limiting the density of development and forcing regional development outward resulting in urban sprawl. Energy use may also increase by allowing the continued use of structures not built to current energy efficiency standards.

However, new construction would require energy usage. This energy could be saved by not tearing down existing dwellings and by not consuming new materials. It is possible to save resources by reusing attractive building materials available from salvaged buildings in this ensemble.
 Ensemble Recommendations

✓ The historic and community value of an ensemble is created by connections to the past and present identity of the area. When property owners, residents and neighbors nominate an ensemble, their research, and commitment to improvement become part of the site's value as a historic and community resource.

✓ If the less than rare parts of history and architectural appearance in a small group or cluster add up to something special for the neighborhood or the city, they deserve representation in the city's planning and in the Historic Resources Inventory. While historic districts are large and require the effort and agreement of many landowners and interests, ensembles can be the effective work of just a few persons.

✓ The tools necessary for a small scale grass roots approach to historic districts should be based on a simple and open process for designation, a variety of incentive and education programs, and the influence of a review body concerned with the historic and design issues that arise. Overly restrictive and complex regulations for ensemble protection will need to be subordinate to the voluntary agreements made by residents and neighbors required for designation.

✓ Ensembles should be recognized in Portland's HRI as an equivalent to ranked individual properties. The quality of an ensemble and its importance can be determined during the nomination process by property owners and residents. An evaluation can then be done by a local historic resources committee relative to established neighborhood support and standards. Ensembles that have significance to the city or region could be ranked and evaluated through the existing HRI process just as individual sites are now.
✓ A study should be conducted to determine the fit between lot size requirements for commercial and high density residential development/redevelopment and an inventory of vacant land and redevelopable sites in those zones. A study should also determine what conditions are required for development/redevelopment to take place and if these conditions are present in the Albina area. If land is zoned for commercial or high density residential use without meeting practical lot development requirements, the land may be in transition. When land is in transition, owners may withhold investments in properties in anticipation of a change in land use. If development does not occur in a reasonable length of time the area can become blighted and historical resources can be in danger of decay and demolition.
Historic preservation is an important and complex issue that is difficult to define, prioritize, and implement. Public officials must attempt to fit historic preservation into an already crowded public agenda. Issues such as unemployment, housing safety, drug abuse, school dropout rates and community livability are frequently viewed by the community as more important. Often no relationship is seen between these issues. It may be difficult for a family struggling financially to see the importance of attending a neighborhood meeting to discuss historic resources.

#### Implementation Findings

- **Historic preservation case law supports historic preservation as a legitimate activity of local government.** In the case of Penn-Central vs. New York City, the United States Supreme Court defended protection of landmark and historic districts as a valid public purpose and a legitimate function of local government (Roddewig, 1989).

- **Taking of private property and Inverse condemnation are legal grounds by which owners of historic property can challenge historic designation of their property.** A taking of private property involves private property taken for public use without just compensation. Inverse condemnation is a claim on the part of an owner of property that regulation has gone so far as to take all reasonable use of property from a private owner, and therefore should result in the payment of money damages (Roddewig, 1985).

- **Historic preservation can be pursued in conjunction with economic revitalization.** Oregon's State Planning Goals call for both preservation of historic resources and promotion of economic development. The Albina Community Plan includes both historic preservation and economic development in its planning process.
The impact of historic designation on designated properties and surrounding properties is not clear. Past research indicates that property values improve as a result of historic designation in some cases and not in others. The impact depends on the interaction of the variables in a given situation (Benson & Klein, 1988).

Tourism is often a by-product of historic preservation. Communities such as Charleston, South Carolina promote preservation of historic properties as a mechanism to attract tourists and new residents (Appendix, D1).

Gentrification and displacement of households are possible side effects of historic preservation activities. This can occur as new residents begin to move into an area. Increases in land values brought about by historic preservation can result in the current residents of an area being priced out of their homes due to market pressures for conversion of rental houses into owner occupancy, and increases in assessed values and thus taxes paid (Schill & Nathan, 1982).

State Planning Goal 10 calls for the provision of an affordable supply of housing. Compliance with this goal will need to be closely monitored if historic preservation efforts influence the property values in Albina.

There are two state-level organizations which engage in education, training, and advocacy for historic preservation. These are the Oregon Historical Society and the Historic Preservation League of Oregon. No organizations exist at the neighborhood level which engage in similar activities.

Strong citizen involvement is the key to a successful historic preservation effort. Past historic preservation efforts have included organized groups of citizens which actively sought preservation of historic properties. A positive aspect of citizen involvement is the experience people gain in organizing and promoting their community.
IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Research of preservation and implementation indicates that no part of the community can survive alone, and very little can be done within the community without creating a ripple in the system. In this regard it is important that each recommendation be thoroughly studied to understand the impacts on implementation.

☑ Complete a study to determine the extent of the City's compliance with State Goal 5.

☑ Develop a citizen-initiated process for nominating sites for historic designation.

☑ The Historic Resources Inventory should be adopted by the Portland Planning Commission as an official document for use in the decision-making processes of historic preservation planning.

☑ A program of incentives should be developed to encourage citizens to preserve historic properties.

☑ Further study needs to be done to determine the economic impacts of historical designation on individual sites and surrounding properties.

☑ Albina's economic revitalization strategy needs to be developed, and coordinated with historic preservation efforts.

☑ The City of Portland, the Oregon Historical Society and the Historic Preservation League of Oregon should coordinate their efforts in the development of a neighborhood-based historic preservation association for the Albina area.
Historic preservation needs to be included as a component in the planning process to allow professional planners and public agencies an opportunity to conserve, renew, and reuse cultural resources.

Flexible regulations, including zoning, need to be incorporated into historic preservation to allow specific actions to meet the needs of individual areas.

Ongoing assessments of the social impacts of historic preservation needs to be made to prevent displacement of households and gentrification, and to monitor the affordability of housing in the community.

Evaluation criteria need to be established to predict and monitor the displacement of households, neighborhood gentrification, and the affordability of housing in Albina.

An education program should be developed and implemented to encourage, excite and motivate citizens to become involved in historic preservation efforts.

The potential social impacts of implementation needs to be evaluated before and during the community planning process.
CONCLUSIONS

This workshop took a bold and different approach compared to past workshops. Instead of developing a neighborhood plan or district plan as past workshops have, we have studied one component of the Albina Community Plan in a comprehensive fashion. The work done this term will aid the Albina Community Plan planning process through our recommendations concerning preservation and protection of historic resources in the Albina community.

Community involvement is the key ingredient to successful efforts at preserving Albina's historic resources. This includes the need to educate citizens, so that they know why historic preservation is important to them. The legacy of Model Cities and past land clearance projects has left many citizens of Albina disenchanted with planning interventions. Community building, financial incentives, and education will be needed to motivate people to get involved in preserving Albina's historic resources for themselves and future generations.

Historic preservation and economic revitalization should occur together. A balance needs to be achieved between historic preservation and the need for revitalization in the Albina community. The community must be made an integral part of this process in Albina. Analysis of the uses that conflict with historic preservation is a means of striking the needed balance between preservation of the community's historic resources and redevelopment.

In order for preservation and revitalization to occur in harmony, education must not stop with just residents of the community. Developers must also be made aware of the virtues and necessities of preserving significant resources from the past. Developers must be encouraged to undertake projects which are compatible with the historic qualities of a neighborhood. They need to understand that historic preservation efforts are not a means of preventing development in Albina, but rather, an opportunity for revitalization and reuse.

Ensembles are an exciting way to bring about small-scale, grass-roots community involvement in historic preservation. An ensemble provides the community with a way to preserve and value small groups of historically significant resources. Designation of
an ensemble must be a process easily initiated by residents and property owners. Guidelines for ensemble protection must be diverse in order to reflect the varied qualities and characteristics of individual ensembles. Ensemble protection can work effectively as a preservation technique for both the City of Portland and the Albina community. In order to do this, however, ensembles must be recognized in the city’s zoning code.

Historic preservation can have negative social impacts such as the displacement of residents due to increasing rent and property values. Persons that are most vulnerable to gentrification include single persons households, female-headed households and low income households. Historic preservation efforts in the Albina community must be sensitive to the needs of these groups. Historic preservation would not be worth the effort if the only result was the preservation of old structures at the expense of the needs of the existing community.

Another social consequence of historic preservation that must be considered is the burden of increased costs associated with historically accurate or design compatible housing. Residents must not be driven from their homes because of costs. This may result in the breakdown of the existing social ties present in the Albina community and the reduction of homeownership opportunities for present residents in the area. Analysis of the economic, social, energy, and environmental consequences of conflicting uses should be used to monitor the consequences of historic preservation in Albina.

Ongoing assessment of the social impacts of historic preservation needs to occur in order to predict and mitigate these impacts. Evaluation criteria are necessary in order to monitor the problems of potential displacement and affordability of housing in Albina. Non-profit organizations have a role here in taking care of historic structures and teaching people to be advocates of historic resources.

The City of Portland Historic Resources Inventory and the Municipal Zoning Code are fundamental steps in preserving the significant places and events that shape our communities. The inventory, however, can still be improved. An analysis of the consequences of conflicting uses must be examined for all resources including ensembles. The inventory must also be brought into compliance with Oregon’s statewide planning goals.
The municipal zoning code can be improved by implementing the protection of non-
landmark resources including ensembles. The municipal code must reflect what is actually in the inventory. Only by fully implementing the progressive concepts embodied in the City of Portland’s historic preservation program can Portland be a true leader in historic preservation.

Historic preservation can be used as a way to improve the image of an area. The strengths of a neighborhood often go unnoticed as only the more negative and sensational aspects of a community are communicated in the media. This negative image needs to be countered by ongoing coverage of the positive activities and achievements of the Albina community.

Historic preservation can be used as a rallying point for neighbors and concerned citizens. Albina has a rich and diverse history and this is reflected in its urban landscape. The mistakes of past planning programs must not be repeated. As the 100th anniversary of the consolidation of the City of Albina with Portland approaches in 1991, it is time to reflect on our past achievements. Let us start and go forward in Albina.

Delahunt House, NE 15th & Tillamook, Demolished 1960’s (OHS)
GLOSSARY

ALBINA COMMUNITY PLAN - This is a comprehensive study of the social, physical, and economic aspects of the area of North and North East Portland, which roughly corresponds to the boundaries of the old city of Albina. This plan is currently being conducted by the Portland Planning Bureau, in an effort to coordinate the revitalization of the area.

DESIGN REVIEW - A process through which new structures must pass to ensure their compatibility with the pre-existing structures in the area.

ENSEMBLE - A group of significant buildings, places, and objects which taken together, reflect the people and events which make up the history and identity of the neighborhood or city.

ESEE - An analysis of significant resources, required by Goal 5 of the Statewide Planning Guidelines. The purpose of an ESEE, is to identify the economic, social, environmental, and energy consequences of the planned uses of the resource.

GENTRIFICATION - This term refers to an economic process, in which an area becomes a more desirable place to live and do business. As more investment is made in the area, rents and taxes increase, forcing out the original users of the area who cannot afford the higher costs.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION - The protecting of buildings and sites which are a product of an areas past.

HISTORIC RESOURCE - A building, group of buildings, or a site which represents a significant part of the communities past history or lifestyle.

HISTORIC RESOURCES INVENTORY - A process which was conducted in 1984 by the city of Portland to identify the cities significant historic resources. The process included input from individuals, neighborhoods, and the city's inventory team.
INFILL POLICY - A regulation which controls the nature and/or style of the structures which can be erected in an area so as to ensure compatibility with the neighborhood character.

PRESERVATION TOOL - A regulation or incentive, intended to encourage the preservation of historic structures or sites.

POTENTIAL CONSERVATION DISTRICT - An area which has been recommended for conservation district protection but which has not been adopted by the City Council.

RANKING - This refers to the process of categorizing historic properties on a scale of three to one, with a rank one being of more historical significance than a two or a three.

URBAN SPRAWL - The growth of a city or region into the surrounding open space, creating an unbroken expanse of developed land and urban land uses.

WINDSHIELD SURVEY - The process of driving through an area to collect information.
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5. OPEN SPACES, SCENIC AND HISTORIC AREAS, AND NATURAL RESOURCES

GOAL: To conserve open space and protect natural and scenic resources.

Programs shall be provided that will: (1) Insure open space, (2) protect scenic and historic areas and natural resources for future generations, and (3) promote healthy and visually attractive environments in harmony with the natural landscape character. The location, quality and quantity of the following resources shall be inventoried:

a. Land needed or desirable for open space;
b. Mineral and aggregate resources;
c. Energy sources;
d. Fish and wildlife areas and habitats;
e. Ecologically and scientifically significant natural areas, including desert areas;
f. Outstanding scenic views and sites;
g. Water areas, wetlands, watersheds and groundwater resources;
h. Wilderness areas;
i. Historic areas, sites, structures and objects;
j. Cultural areas;
k. Potential and approved Oregon recreation trails;
l. Potential and approved federal wild and scenic waterways and state scenic waterways.

Where no conflicting uses for such resources have been identified, such resources shall be managed so as to preserve their original character. Where conflicting uses have been identified the economic, social, environmental and energy needs of the conflicting uses shall be determined and programs developed to achieve the goal.

Cultural Area — refers to an area characterized by evidence of an ethnic, religious or social group with distinctive traits, belief and social forms.

Historic Area — are lands with sites, structures and objects that have local, regional, statewide or national historical significance.

Natural Area — includes lands and water that has substantially retained its natural character and land and water that, although altered in character, is important as habitats for plant, animal or marine life, for the study of its natural processes, scientific or palaeontological features, or for the appreciation of its natural features.

Open Space — consists of lands used for agricultural or forest uses, and any land area that would, if preserved and continued in its present use:

(a) Conserve and enhance natural or scenic resources;
(b) Protect air or streams or water supply;
(c) Promote conservation of soils, wetlands, beaches or tidal marshes;
(d) Conserve landscaped areas, such as public or private golf courses, that reduce air pollution and enhance the value of abutting or neighboring property;
(e) Enhance the value to the public of abutting or neighboring parks, forests, wildlife preserves, nature reservations or sanctuaries or other open space;
(f) Promote orderly urban development.

Scenic Areas — are lands that are valued for their aesthetic appearance.

Wilderness Areas — are areas where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. It is an area of undeveloped land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvement or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions and which (1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable; (2) has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation; (3) may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic or historic value.

GUIDELINES:
A. Planning:
1. The need for open space in the planning area should be determined, and standards developed for the amount, distribution, and type of open space.
2. Criteria should be developed and utilized to determine what uses are consistent with open space values and to evaluate the effect of converting open space lands into inconsistent uses. The maintenance and development of open space in urban areas should be encouraged.
3. Natural resources and required sites for the generation of energy (i.e. natural gas, oil, coal, hydro, geothermal, uranium, solar and others) should be conserved and protected; reservoir sites should be identified and protected against irreversible loss.
4. Plans providing for open space, scenic and historic areas, and natural resources should consider as a major determinant the carrying capacity of the air, land and water resources of the planning area. The land conservation and development actions provided for by such plans should not exceed the carrying capacity of such resources.
5. The National Register of Historic Places and the recommendations of the State Advisory Committee on Historic Preservation should be utilized in designating historic sites. Used in designating historic sites.
6. In conjunction with the inventory of mineral and aggregate resources, sites for removal and processing of such resources should be identified and protected.
7. As a general rule, plans should prohibit outdoor advertising signs except in commercial or industrial zones. Plans should not provide for the reclassification of land for the purpose of accommodating an outdoor advertising sign. The term "outdoor advertising sign" has the meaning set forth in ORS 377.710(23).

B. Implementation:
1. Development should be planned and directed so as to conserve the needed amount of open space.
2. The conservation of both renewable and nonrenewable natural resources and physical limitations of the land should be used as the basis for determining the quantity, quality, location, rate and type of growth in the planning area.
3. The efficient consumption of energy should be considered when utilizing natural resources.
4. Fish and wildlife areas and habitats should be protected and managed in accordance with the Oregon Wildlife Commission's fish and wildlife management plans.
5. Stream flow and water levels should be protected and managed at a level adequate for fish, wildlife, pollution abatement, recreation, aesthetics and other features of scientific, educational, ecological and recreational needs for significant natural areas.
6. Significant natural areas that are historically, ecologically or scientifically unique, outstanding or important, including those identified by the State Natural Area Preservation Advisory Committee, should be inventoried and evaluated. Plans should provide for protection of natural areas consistent with the inventory of scientific, educational, ecological and recreational needs for significant natural areas.
7. Local, regional and state governments should be encouraged to investigate and utilize fee acquisition, easements, cluster developments, preferential assessment, development rights acquisition and similar techniques to implement this goal.
8. State and federal agencies should develop statewide natural resource, open space, scenic and historic area plans and provide technical assistance to local and regional agencies. State and federal plans should be reviewed and coordinated with local and regional plans.
9. Areas identified as having nonrenewable mineral and aggregate resources should be planned for in interim, transitional and "second use" utilization as well as for the primary use.
Chapter 33.120

HISTORICAL DISTRICTS, BUILDINGS, AND SITES

(New Chapter substituted by Ord. No. 140096; passed June 19, effective July 6, 1975.)

Sections:
33.120.010 Special Purpose.
33.120.050 Designation of Historical Building or Site.
33.120.055 Designation of Conservation Districts.
33.120.060 Designation of Historical Districts.
33.120.065 Designation not a Recommendation for Federal Action.
33.120.080 Landmark Review.
33.120.090 Demolition Permits- Building Condemnation.
33.120.100 Record of Demolished Historical Buildings- Artifacts.
33.120.110 Signs-Plaques.
33.120.120 Redevelopment and Neighborhood Improvement Projects.
33.120.130 Recommended Historical Building, Site, or District, or Conservation District.
33.120.010 Special Purpose.
Buildings and sites in the City, having special historic associations or significance or of special architectural merit or significance, should be preserved as part of the heritage of the citizens of the City, and for the education, enjoyment, and pride of the citizens, as well as the beautification of the City and enhancement of the values of such property. To that end, regulatory controls and administrative procedures are necessary.

33.120.020 Portland Historical Landmarks Commission. (Repealed by Ord. No. 157619 effective Aug. 19, 1985.)

33.120.030 Officers, Meetings, Rules, and Procedure. (Repealed by Ord. No. 157619 effective Aug. 19, 1985.)

33.120.040 Functions and Duties. (Repealed by Ord. No. 157619 effective Aug. 19, 1985.)

33.120.050 Designation of Historical Building or Site. (Amended by Ord. No. 144324; and 161335 effective Oct. 19, 1988.)

(a) Procedure. Designation of historical buildings, interior spaces, and sites are processed through a Type II procedure assigned to the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission. Any person may apply for historical landmark designation of any building, site and/or interior.

(b) Application requirements. The application requirements of the Landmark Designation application packet are in lieu of the requirements of Section 33.215.120.

(c) Approval criteria. Applications for designation of buildings, sites and/or interiors as historical landmarks may be approved if on review it is found that the property has architectural and/or historical importance.

(d) Removal of designation. If a designated landmark is removed or altered to such degree that, in the view of the Historical Landmarks Commission its merit as a landmark is lost, the Commission may remove the landmark designation. Proceedings to consider removal of landmark designation may be initiated by the Director and are processed through a Type II procedure assigned to the Historical Landmarks Commission.

33.120.055 Designation of Conservation Districts. (Added by Ord. No. 144324; passed and effective Sept. 8, 1977.)

(a) Upon receipt of a request to designate any area as a conservation district, or upon direction by the City Council on its own motion, the City Auditor shall advise the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission, the Portland Planning Commission, and the Bureau of Buildings of the City, and shall fix a date and a time for a public hearing before the City Council thereon. The Auditor shall notify owners within the proposed conservation district and shall transmit a copy of the request to the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission unless such request has come from that Commission. The Portland Historical Landmarks Commission shall review all proposals for designation of a conservation district unless the initial request has been made by the Commission, and shall submit its recommendation to the City Council prior to the public hearing.
(b) At such hearing the owners of any property involved, the owners of all abutting property, a representative of the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission, a representative for the Portland Planning Commission, and from the Bureau of Buildings of the City shall be entitled to be heard, and the Council may hear all other interested parties.

(c) If the City Council determines that an area proposed to be designated as a conservation district has architectural significance or is of historical importance based upon past and/or present use, the Council may designate such area as a conservation district. All sites or buildings within a district need not be of historical or architectural significance provided the district as a whole is of such importance or significance.

(d) If the primary or significant buildings within a conservation district have been demolished or destroyed, the City Council on its own motion or upon recommendation of the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission, may remove the conservation district designation. If the designation is proposed to be removed from any conservation district for any other reason than set forth in the preceding sentence, then similar notices, recommendations, and hearings shall be held as upon the designation of the conservation district in the first instance.

33.120.060 Designation of Historical Districts.

(a) (Amended by Ord. No. 144324; passed and effective Sept. 8, 1977.) Upon receipt of a request to designate any area as an historical district, or upon direction by the City Council on its own motion, the City Auditor shall advise the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission, the Portland Planning Commission, and the Bureau of Buildings of the City, and shall fix a date and time for a public hearing before the City Council thereon. The Auditor shall notify owners within the proposed historical district and shall transmit a copy of the request to the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission unless such request has come from the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission. The Portland Historical Landmarks Commission shall review all proposals for designation of an historical district unless the initial request has been made by the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission, and shall submit its recommendation to the City Council prior to the public hearing.

(b) At such hearing the owners of any property involved, the owners of all abutting property, a representative of the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission, a representative from the Portland Planning Commission, and from the Bureau of Buildings of the City shall be entitled to be heard, and the Council may hear all other interested parties.

(c) If the City Council determines that an area proposed to be designated as an historical district has an architectural significance or is of historical importance based upon past or present use, the Council may designate such area as an historical district. All sites or buildings within a district need not be of historical or architectural significance provided the district as a whole is of such importance or significance.

(d) If the primary or significant buildings within an historic district have been demolished or destroyed, the City Council on its own motion or upon recommendation of the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission, may remove the
historical district designation. If the designation is proposed to be removed from any historical district for any other reason than set forth in the preceding sentence, then similar notices, recommendations, and hearings shall be held as upon the designation of the historical district in the first instance.

33.120.065 Designation not a Recommendation for Federal Action. (Amended by Ord. No. 144324; passed and effective Sept. 8, 1977.) Nothing in this Chapter nor the designation of a historical or conservation district under Sections 33.120.055 or 33.120.060 shall be interpreted as a recommendation by the Council of the City of Portland supporting designation of any building or structure as a "Certified Historic Structure" for purposes of Section 191 (d) (1) (B) or (C) of the Tax Reform Act of 1976. No such recommendation or certification shall be made by the City of Portland without notice to the affected parties and an additional hearing thereon.

33.120.070 District Advisory Councils. (Repealed by Ord. No. 157619 effective Aug. 19, 1985.)

33.120.080 (Amended by Ord. No. 144324, 153108, 154256, 155124, 156431, 156866; and 159256 effective Jan. 1, 1987.) Landmark Review.

(a) Required review. Landmark review is required for the following: Exterior remodeling of any designated historical building, construction of a new structure on a designated historical site, or exterior remodeling of any building or new construction on any site wholly or partially within a designated historical district, or construction of a new structure on any site within a designated conservation district.

Exterior remodeling as governed by this Chapter shall be deemed to include any change or alteration in color, design, or other exterior treatment.

(b) Procedure. When a request for landmark review is determined to be minor in nature as provided by paragraph 33.210.120 D.2, it is processed through a Type I procedure. A Type I application which has been denied, or approved with conditions unacceptable to the applicant, may be reapplied for through a Type III procedure assigned to the Landmarks Commission. When a request for landmark review is determined to be major in nature as provided by Paragraph 33.210.120 D.2, it is processed through a Type III procedure assigned to the Landmarks Commission.

The requirement for a pre-application conference may be waived by the Director if, in the process of accepting the application, or in the determination of whether a minor or major project, significant and pertinent information is exchanged making the pre-application conference redundant.

The Director may modify required elements of an application as stated in 33.215.120 (Application Requirements), as is necessary for the evaluation of the request.

A 1 inch equals 50 feet cardboard model of new buildings or additions or changes in mass of existing buildings in Historic Districts within the Z Zone, shall be furnished at the time an application is filed for (design) landmark review, and a 1 inch equals 50 feet wooden model constructed to the City's specifications shall be required for newly constructed buildings as built.

(c) Approval Criteria. The request shall be approved if it is found that:

(1) The treatment proposed is determined to be harmonious and compatible with the appearance and character of the historical building or historical district.

(2) The treatment proposed is not detrimental as unsightly, grotesque, otherwise adversely affecting the stability of values of adjacent property or adversely affecting the architectural significance, the integrity of historical appearance and the
eductional and historical value of the building or surrounding buildings.

(3) The proposed remodeling or new structure will not adversely affect the character of the district, building, or site, and is in the public interest, or that the proposed exterior remodeling or new structure will enhance the historical value of the district, the building, or site.

If the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission finds such action appropriate, it may approve the application upon conditions which the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission imposes, to promote and preserve the historical or architectural integrity of the district, building, or site. However, if found necessary and appropriate, the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission may reject the application.

33.120.090 Demolition Permits - Building Condemnation. (Amended by Ord. No. 144324; passed and effective Sept. 8, 1977.)

(a) If an application is received from the Bureau of Buildings or is initially made to the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission for a permit for demolition of any historical building, or the demolition of a structure on a designated historical site or within a designated historical district, or the demolition of a structure within a designated conservation district, the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission shall within 30 days after the application is initially filed, hold a hearing on the issuance of such permit. The applicant for permit, the owner of the property and any occupant of the property shall be entitled to be heard. The Portland Historical Landmarks Commission may hear all other interested parties. The Portland Historical Landmarks Commission shall consider the state of repair of the building, the reasonableness of the cost of restoration or repair, taking into account the purpose of preserving the designated historical districts, conservation districts, building, and sites, the character of the neighborhood, and all other factors which it finds appropriate. The Portland Historical Landmarks Commission may approve the issuance of the permit, in which event the Bureau of Buildings may issue the permit in compliance with all codes and ordinances of the City. If the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission may reject the application for permit if it determines that in the interest of preserving historical values the structure should not be demolished, and in that event issuance of the permit shall be suspended for a period fixed by the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission, but not exceeding 120 days from the date of application. Within the suspension period, the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission may request an extension of the suspension period by the City Council. If the City Council determines that there is a program or project under way which could result in public or private acquisition of the historical building or site and the preservation or restoration of such building or site, and that there is reasonable ground to believe that the program or project may be successful, then the Council, in its discretion, may extend the suspension period of an additional period not exceeding 180 days, to a total of not more than 300 days from the date of application for demolition permit. During the period of suspension of permit application, no permit shall be issued for such demolition nor shall any person demolish the building or structure, unless the Council has granted an appeal and directed the issuance. If at the end of 300 days the program or project is unsuccessful and the applicant has not withdrawn his application for demolition permit, the Bureau of Buildings shall issue the permit, if the applicant otherwise complies with the codes and ordinances of the City.

(b) Action by the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission suspending issuance of permit for demolition may be appealed by the applicant for permit, the owner or the occupant, by filing a notice of appeal in the same manner as provided in this Chapter for appeals from disapproval of remodeling permit. If the appeal is made, the procedure thereafter shall be the same as set forth in Section 33.120.080.

(c) Before taking any action to
condemn a building or structure as designated as an historical building or site, or any building or structure within a designated historic or conservation district, the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission shall review the report of the Bureau of Buildings and any other City Bureau relating to the condition of the building and premises and the extent of its danger, deterioration, or decay. The Portland Historical Landmarks Commission shall report on its review and make its recommendation concerning City action to the Commissioner In Charge for transmission to the City Council if official action of condemnation is instituted.

(d) The Portland Historical Landmarks Commission may identify specific structures within a designated historical or conservation district which may be exempt from the provisions of this Section governing review of a permit for demolition.

33.120.100 Record of Demolished Historical Buildings - Artifacts.

(a) If a designated historical building is to be demolished, insofar as practicable and as funds are available, the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission shall keep a pictorial and graphic history of the historical building or historical site with additional data as it may obtain.

(b) To the extent funds are available or the Commission may obtain donations thereof, the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission shall obtain artifacts from the building or site which it deems worthy of preservation, such as carvings, cast iron work, or other materials it deems of artistic or historical importance.

33.120.110 Signs - Plaques.

(a) (Amended by Ord. No. 144324; passed and effective Sept. 8, 1977.) Either before or after submission to the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission or a committee thereof, or to any other board or commission of the City, and before issuance of a permit therefor, an application to replace or erect a sign on a designated historical building on the property on which the designated historical building is located, or on a designated historical site, or on any building or site in a designated historical district, or on any building or site in a designated conservation district, and before issuance of a permit therefor, the application for the permit shall be reviewed by the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission. The Portland Historical Landmarks Commission shall hold a hearing on the sign application, at which hearing the applicant, the owner, and the occupant of the premises shall be entitled to be heard. If the Portland Historical District Landmarks Commission finds that the proposed sign will not unreasonably detract from the architectural and historical significance of the premises, taking into account the size, location, construction, and any lighting of such sign, then the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission shall approve the issuance of a permit therefor. Otherwise, the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission may impose special conditions on the size, location, construction, or other characteristics of the proposed sign, or may reject the same. The hearing shall be held within 30 days after the submission of the application to the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission. The applicant, owner, or occupant shall have the same right of appeal and under the same procedural conditions set forth in this Chapter for appeals from actions of the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission relating to building permits for exterior remodeling of a designated historical building. The Council may sustain, modify, or overrule the action of the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission.

(b) The owner of a designated historical building or site or the occupant thereof with the consent of the owner may, at his own expense, install an identification plaque indicating the name, date, architect, or other appropriate information upon the property, provided that the size, material, design, location, and text of such plaque is first approved by the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission.
33.120.120 Redevelopment and Neighborhood Improvement Projects. (Amended by Ord. No. 144324; passed and effective Sept. 8, 1977.) In any redevelopment project or neighborhood improvement project administered or supervised by the City or submitted to the City for its review and recommendations, proposed action relating to a designated historical district, building, or site shall be submitted to the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission for its review and recommendation. A report thereon by the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission shall be filed with the City Council and a copy shall be sent to the appropriate City department.

33.120.130 Recommended Historical Building, Site, or District, or Conservation District. (Added by Ord. No. 148813; passed and effective Nov. 29, 1979.)

(a) Wherever reference is made in this Chapter, either expressly or implicitly, to a designated historical building, site, or district, or to a designated conservation district, such reference shall be deemed to include any building, site, or district that has been recommended by the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission for any such designation but for which the recommendation has not yet been heard by the City Council, and the provisions of this Chapter, especially those of Sections 33.120.080 and 33.120.090 relating to the remodeling and demolition of designated buildings, sites, or districts, shall extend and apply to such recommended buildings, sites, or districts from the date of such hearing. The hearing shall be scheduled on the earliest possible Council Calendar, not to exceed a total of 21 days from the date of recommendation.

(b) Whenever a building site or district is recommended for landmark designation to City Council by the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission, the Commission shall notify the Bureau of Buildings in writing immediately of the pending Council hearing of the recommended landmark designation. The Bureau of Buildings shall not issue any alteration or demolition permits on recommended landmarks, unless approved by the Landmark Commission or unless the time between the landmark recommendation and the City Council hearing exceeds 21 days.
Chapter 33.200
ADMINISTRATION AND PROCEDURES
PURPOSE
(Added by Ord. No. 157619 passed July 18 effective Aug. 19, 1983.)

Sections:
33.200.010 Purpose.
33.200.020 Content.

33.200.010 Purpose. The Chapters in this heading provide the foundation for implementation of the City's zoning code. The first Chapter covers administration and enforcement of the Code. The relationship of zoning to other parts of the municipal code and to other governmental regulations is addressed. The second Chapter establishes the review bodies and decision makers for land use regulations and land use reviews. The third Chapter presents the three types of procedures for all land use reviews. The procedures cover the mechanics of land use reviews and are intended to provide a simplified and systematic approach to processing land use applications. The fourth Chapter presents the procedures for legislative actions. The last Chapter states the fees for land use reviews.

33.200.020 Content. The administration and procedures Chapters contain the following chapters:

Chapter 33.205. Administration
Chapter 33.210. Review Bodies
Chapter 33.215. Procedures
Chapter 33.220. Legislative Actions
Chapter 33.225. Fees

Chapter 33.205
ADMINISTRATION
(Added by Ord. No. 157619 passed July 18, effective Aug. 19, 1983.)

Sections:
33.205.010 Purpose.
33.205.020 Conformance and Permits Required.
33.205.030 Enforcement and Violations.
33.205.035 Revocation.
33.205.040 Interpretations of this Title.
33.205.050 Transfer of Approval Rights.
33.205.060 Amendments to Title 33.

33.205.010 Purpose. Effective, accurate and timely administration of the zoning regulations helps to fulfill the Comprehensive Plan. Administration of the Code incorporates interpretations, application and enforcement.

33.205.020 Conformance and Permits Required. All development shall conform to the regulations in this Title. No use, construction, remodeling or change which requires a building permit or certificate of occupancy from the Bureau of Buildings shall be issued without prior review by the Planning Director to determine that the proposed development, building, structure and use meet the requirements of this Title.

33.205.030 Enforcement and Violations. (Amended by Ord. No. 159256 effective Jan. 1, 1987.)

A. It shall be unlawful for any person to violate any provisions of this Title, or to permit or maintain such violation or refuse to obey any provision or regulations. Proof of such unlawful act or failure to act shall be deemed prima facie evidence that such act is that of the owner. Prosecution or lack thereof of either the owner or of the occupant shall not be deemed to relieve the other.

B. It shall be the duty of the Director of the Bureau of Buildings to enforce regulations of this Title except
where otherwise specifically provided.

C. It shall be unlawful for any person to undertake or maintain any use unless all conditions of approval granted have been met under this Title.

D. The Bureau of Buildings shall give notice of violations of this Title, or of quasi-judicial decisions, including conditions, to the owner and the operator if different. Notice shall be given in a manner reasonably calculated to provide the owner and operator with actual notice of the violations. If a violation exists the Director of the Bureau of Buildings, or the Director's delegate may take remedial action as provided for by Section 3.30.015 (Remedies) of Title 3. A failure of the owner or operator to receive actual notice of the violations shall not invalidate any action taken by the Director of the Bureau of Buildings or the Code Hearings Officer pursuant to Section 3.30.015.

33.205.035 Revocation. (Added by Ord. No. 160498 effective Mar. 21, 1988.)

A. Authority and Procedure. An approved revocable permit or a conditional use permit may be considered for revocation as follows:

1. The Planning Director may initiate the revocation process if there is evidence that any of the criteria of Subsection B of this Section are applicable.

2. Revocation may be initiated by the Bureau of Buildings as provided for in Subsection 33.205.030 D. The Bureau of Buildings may refer the matter in writing to the Planning Director if total compliance has not been achieved through the enforcement process.

3. After initiation, the revocation is processed following the provisions of Subsections 33.215.050 B through F. This is a modified Type III procedure. A pre-application conference is not required and no fee is charged. The revocation review is assigned to the land use Hearings Officer. The property owner and operator, if different, will be notified that the revocation process has been initiated. Such notice will be mailed 30 days prior to the scheduled hearing and will comply with the notice requirements of 33.215.130 C.

B. Revocation criteria. The revocable permit or conditional use permit may be revoked if the review body finds that any of the following criteria are met:

1. The land use being conducted on the site is not the same use, is of greater scale or is of greater intensity than that which was approved; or

2. A material misrepresentation or mistake of fact was made by the applicant in the application or the testimony whether intentional or unintentional and it was relied upon in making the decision; or

3. A failure to comply with the terms and conditions of approval;

4. The operation of the use unreasonably interferes with the enjoyment of the neighboring property; or

5. In the case of a revocable permit, the circumstances on the site or within the surrounding area, have changed sufficiently so that the current approval criteria for revocable permits are not being met.

C. Actions.

1. The review body may take the following actions:

a. May revoke the permit if it finds that any of the criteria of Subsection B of this Section have been met;

b. May find that the activity being conducted on the site is within the intent of the approval and conditions and may be permitted to continue;

c. May clarify the original approval or the conditions of the approval as they relate to limits on the scale or the intensity or make other clarifications necessary in individual cases; or

d. It may add conditions necessary to carry out the original intent of the approval in order to assure the operation of the use is the same intensity and the same scale as that which was approved or it may add conditions to assure the use does not unreasonably interfere with the enjoyment of neighboring property.

2. In the case of a revocable permit, the decision making body may impose additional conditions to ensure compliance with the current approval criteria.
3. In the case of a conditional use, the decision making body may not approve an increase in scale or increase in intensity of use over the amount previously approved.

D. Enforcement of revocation.
1. In the event that a permit is revoked, the property owner and operator, if different, must terminate the prohibited land use on the property within 21 days of final action unless the decision to rescind permit approval provides otherwise.
2. Enforcement may take place as provided by Section 33.205.030, Enforcement and Violations.

33.205.040 Interpretations of this Title. (Amended by Ord. No. 159256; and 161335, effective Oct. 19, 1988.)
A. The Planning Director is responsible for the initial interpretation and application of this Title and of any Comprehensive Plan provisions. Requests for a written interpretation of the content or application of this Title or of any Comprehensive Plan provision must be in writing. The Planning Director must issue the initial written interpretation within 10 working days of receipt of a written request. A fee must be charged in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 33.225. A copy of the written interpretation must be forwarded to the members of the appropriate commission as indicated in Subsection B of this Section.
B. Review of interpretation to a commission. A request for review of the interpretation made by the Planning Director shall be to a commission. Design zone and portions of the Code assigned to the Design Commission shall be interpreted by the Design Commission. Historic designations and districts as authorized by Section 33.210.120 D shall be interpreted by the Landmarks Commission. All other Code provisions shall be interpreted by the Planning Commission.
A person requesting an interpretation by commission shall submit the request in writing and may offer an opinion or recommendation. The fee for an interpretation from a private person to a commission shall be paid in compliance with Chapter 33.225. Public notification shall be mailed at least 14 days prior to the hearing to interested persons and recognized organizations.

The commission shall issue a written response as soon as possible, but within a maximum of 45 days from receipt of the request for interpretation. A commission interpretation shall be made in writing and transmitted to the review body or person requesting the interpretation.
C. Appeal to the City Council. Appeals from a commission interpretation to the City Council may be filed in compliance with 33.215.190, Appeals to City Council. The appeal fee shall be one-half of the filing fee of the interpretation by a commission.
D. Interpretation effectiveness. Interpretations issued in writing by the Planning Director, a commission or the Council shall be binding on the City and the petitioner on the facts presented. A record shall be kept of written interpretations.

33.205.050 Transfer of Approval Rights.
A. All approvals including conditions and restrictions shall run with the land and shall be transferable except revocable permits and residential care facilities (RCFs). Revocable permits and RCFs are personal and are not transferable.
B. Conditions or time limits may be placed upon Type I, II and III approvals. Such conditions or time limits shall be part of the final approval and shall be binding if the property is transferred.

33.205.060 Amendments to Title 33. (Amended by Ord. No. 159256 effective Jan. 1, 1987.) The Planning Commission shall be empowered to recommend amendments to this Title to City Council as prescribed in Chapter 33.220. Legislative Actions.
Chapter 33.210

REVIEW BODIES

(Added by Ord. No. 157619 passed July 18, effective Aug. 19, 1985.)

Sections:
33.210.010 Purpose.
33.210.030 Commissions and Committees
Generally.
33.210.120 Historical Landmarks Commission.
33.210.130 Variance Committee.
33.210.140 Planning Director.
33.210.150 Hearings Officer.

33.210.010 Purpose. Review bodies are established by this Chapter to make decisions on land use actions. The diversity of review bodies provides an opportunity for citizen involvement, ensures proper expertise for specific topic areas, and balances the need for prompt decision making. The provisions of this Chapter set the powers and duties for each review body, and state how each body shall be structured.

33.210.020 Delegation of Authority. The commissions, committees and officers provided in this Chapter are empowered to perform, on behalf of the City Council, all duties assigned to them by this Title.

A. Length of terms. Members of commissions and committees provided under this Chapter shall be appointed to terms of not more than four years. Initial appointments for newly formed commissions or committees shall include a sufficient number of appointments for less than the maximum four-year term of office to provide overlap and a continuity of membership. Members may be reappointed upon expiration for their terms of office. Vacancies which may occur shall be filled for the unexpired term. Members shall be limited to a maximum of two full consecutive terms.

B. Required attendance. If a member fails to attend three consecutive meetings or misses 20 percent or more of the meetings held during a calendar year, the position may be considered vacant by the Mayor.

C. Officers. Each commission and committee shall elect its own presiding officers and shall adopt such written rules of procedure as are necessary to fulfill its duties.

D. Voting. No individual member shall be entitled to more than one vote for the conduct of commission or committee business.

E. Remuneration. All voting members on a commission or committee shall serve without pay.

F. Public meetings. All meetings including informal reviews shall be open to the public as provided by the Oregon Public Meetings law.

G. Staff. The Planning Director shall provide each commission and committee with staff assistance necessary to enable it to discharge its duties.

H. Records. The Planning Director shall keep an accurate record or minutes of all proceedings of each commission and committee.

(Amended by Ord. No. 139256 effective Jan. 1, 1987.)

A. Purpose. The Planning Commission shall develop City planning policy, foster public communication and insure planning and policy implementation. The Planning Commission shall make recommendations to the City Council and other public authorities concerning planning issues such as streets, housing, land development, land use, alternative energy protection, economic development as are advisable from promoting the public health, safety, comfort, convenience of the City. The Planning Commission shall be a comprehensive and broad-based commission which develops and recommends plans.
Design Commission shall hold hearings and have and exercise all of the powers and duties assigned to it under this Title and by the City Council, and shall prepare for City Council review, adoption and use design guidelines for each separate area included in an area subject to design review.

The Design Commission shall have the power to divide its membership into special committees which may be authorized to act on behalf of the Commission for the assigned purpose. Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum on such committees. When less than a quorum of a committee votes favorably on a motion, the item under discussion shall automatically be referred to the Commission as a whole.

E. Annual report. The Design Commission shall make an annual report of the actions and accomplishments of the preceding fiscal year. The report shall be filed with the Planning Director by the first working day of September of each year for inclusion in the Bureau of Planning report to the City Council.

F. Reference designation. All reference to the Design Committee in this Title or other Titles of the Code shall be construed to refer to the Design Commission.


A. Purpose. The Portland Historical Landmarks Commission shall carry out all functions, duties and responsibilities assigned to it under this Title. The Commission is charged with the protection and preservation of historic areas, districts, buildings, objects, sites and spaces in the City that have special historical associations or significance, or of special architectural merit. It is important that historic areas, districts, buildings, objects, sites and spaces be preserved as a part of the heritage of the City, for the education, enjoyment and pride of the citizens, as well as for the beautification of the City and enhancement of the values of such property. The Commission's leadership and expertise on the subject of maintaining and enhancing Portland's historical and architectural heritage shall be exerted through its designated powers, policies and administrative procedures for the aesthetic, historic and economic enrichment of a City of diverse peoples, styles and structures.

B. Membership. The Historical Landmarks Commission shall consist of seven members, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council. The membership shall consist of: a member of the City Planning Commission; a member from the staff of the Oregon Historical Society; a member from the Portland Chapter of the American Institute of Architects; and four members from the citizens at large.

C. Meetings. The Historical Landmarks Commission shall meet at least once every month, or as required to act on applications, appeals and projects. Meetings shall be conducted in accordance with adopted, official rules of order. Four members shall constitute a quorum at a meeting.

D. Powers and duties. The Historical Landmarks Commission shall have and exercise all of the powers and duties assigned to it under this Title, by the City Council and:

1. Shall serve in an advisory capacity and make recommendations concerning historical districts, conservation districts, buildings, objects, sites and spaces to the City Council, the Portland Planning Commission, the Portland Development Commission, and other public or private agencies on matters relating to the preservation of such districts, buildings, objects, sites and spaces.

2. May adopt such rules and regulations as it finds necessary or appropriate to carry out the intent of this Title.

3. Shall receive requests from any person or may on its own motion make decisions concerning the designation of particular districts, buildings, objects, sites and spaces as historic districts, conservation districts, historic landmarks or historic sites.
4. Shall remove designated historic districts, conservation districts, buildings, objects, sites and spaces it finds no longer worthy of the designation.

5. Shall have the authority to inspect and investigate any district, building, object, site or space in the City for which a designation has been requested and/or which it has reason to believe is of special historic significance or architectural importance.

6. Shall review all information which it has and shall hold hearings as prescribed in this Title and transmit the results to the City officials as required.

7. Shall have authority to coordinate historical preservation programs of the City, county, state and federal governments as they relate to property in the City.

8. May recommend to City Council or the State legislature any changes of law which it finds appropriate or needed.

9. Shall have the authority to make information available to the public concerning its activities and the various designated districts, landmarks and sites.

10. Shall have the authority to make information available to the public concerning its activities and the various designated districts, landmarks and sites.

11. Shall compile and maintain a current list of all historical districts, conservation districts, buildings, objects, sites and spaces which have been designated with a brief description of each and the special reasons for its designation.

12. Shall assist and coordinate the work of district advisory councils with respect to historical and conservation districts.

13. Shall perform such other duties relating to historical districts, conservation districts, buildings, objects, sites and spaces as the City Council or the Mayor may request.


15. Shall have the power to divide its membership into special committees which may be authorized to act on behalf of the Commission for the assigned purpose. Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum on such committees. When less than a quorum of a committee votes favorably on a motion, the item under discussion shall automatically be referred to the Commission as a whole.

E. Annual report. The Portland Historical Landmarks Commission shall make an annual written report of its actions and accomplishments during the preceding fiscal year. The report shall be filed with the Planning Director by the first working day of September of each year for inclusion in the Bureau of Planning report to the City Council.

F. Advisory councils. Each historic district and historic conservation district shall have a five-member advisory council. Each advisory council shall include one citizen-at-large appointed by the Mayor; the chair of the Landmarks Commission or another member of the Landmarks Commission appointed by the chair; and three additional members selected by the Landmarks Commission and approved by the City Council, including representation of residents and property owners within the district. In a district composed of 50 percent or more residential structures, a minimum of three members shall be property owners residing in the district. The advisory councils shall be advisory to the Landmarks Commission and shall make recommendations to the Landmarks Commission with respect to guidelines, development criteria and permits for construction within the district. Advisory councils for historic districts shall also make recommendations to the Commission with respect to exterior remodeling of properties within the district. Advisory councils shall not have standing to appeal decisions of the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission.


A. Purpose. The purpose of the Variance Committee is to hold public
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REQUIREMENTS AND APPLICATION
PROCEDURES FOR COMPLYING WITH
STATEWIDE GOAL 5

Inventor Goal 5 Resources

660-16-000 (1) The inventory process for Statewide Planning Goal 5 begins with the collection of available data from as many sources as possible including experts in the field, local citizens and landowners. The local government then analyzes and refines the data and determines whether there is sufficient information on the location, quality and quantity of each resource site to properly complete the Goal 5 process. This analysis also includes whether a particular natural area is "ecologically and scientifically significant", or an open space area is "needed", or a scenic area is "outstanding", as outlined in the Goal. Based on the evidence and local government's analysis of those data, the local government then determines which resource sites are of significance and includes those sites on the final plan inventory.

(2) A "valid" inventory of a Goal 5 resource under subsection (3)(c) of this rule must include a determination of the location, quantity and quality of each of the resource sites. Some Goal 5 resources (e.g., natural areas, historic sites, mineral and aggregate sites, scenic waterways) are more "site-specific" than others (e.g., groundwater, energy sources). For site-specific resources, determination of location must include a description or map of the boundaries of the resource site and of the impact area to be affected, if different. For non-site-specific resources, "determination must be as specific as possible.

(3) The determination of quality requires some consideration of the resource site's relative value, as compared to other examples of the same resource in at least the jurisdiction itself. A determination of quality requires consideration of the relative abundance of the resource (of any given quality). The level of detail that is provided will depend on how much information is available or "obtainable".

(4) The inventory completed at the local level, including options (5)(a), (b), and (c) of this rule, will be adequate for Goal compliance unless it can be shown to be based on inaccurate data, or does not adequately address location, quality or quantity. The issue of adequacy may be raised by the Department or objectors, but final determination is made by the Commission.

(5) Based on data collected, analyzed and refined by the local government, as outlined above, a jurisdiction has three basic options:

(a) Do Not Include on Inventory: Based on information that is available on location, quality and quantity, the local government might determine that a particular resource site is not important enough to warrant inclusion on the plan inventory, or is not required to be included in the inventory based on the specific Goal standards. No further action need be taken with regard to these sites. The local government is not required to justify in its comprehensive plan a decision not to include a particular site in the plan inventory unless challenged by the Department, objectors or the Commission based upon contrary information.

(b) Delay Goal 5 Process: When some information is available, indicating the possible existence of a resource site, but that information is not adequate to identify with particularity the location, quality and quantity of the resource site, the local government should only include the site on the comprehensive plan inventory as a special category. The local government must express its intent relative to the resource site through a plan policy to address that resource site and proceed through the Goal 5 process in the future. The plan should include a time-frame for this review. Special implementation measures are not appropriate or required for Goal 5 compliance purposes until adequate information is available to enable further review and adoption of such measures. The statement in the plan commits the local government to address the resource site through the Goal 5 process in the post-acknowledgment period. Such future actions could require a plan amendment.

(c) Include on Plan Inventory: When information is available on location, quality and quantity, and the local government has determined a site to be significant or important as a result of the data collection and analysis process, the local government must include the site on its plan inventory and indicate the location, quality and quantity of the resource site (see above). Items included on this inventory must proceed through the remainder of the Goal 5 process.

Stat. Auth.: ORS Ch. 183 & 197
Hts: LCD 5-1981(Temp), f. & ef. 5-8-81; LCD 7-1981, f. & ef. 6-29-81

[ED. NOTE: The text of Temporary Rules is not printed in the Oregon Administrative Rules Compilation. Copies may be obtained from the adopting agency or the Secretary of State.]

Identity Conflicting Uses

660-16-005 It is the responsibility of local government to identify conflicts with inventoried Goal 5 resource sites. This is done primarily by examining the uses allowed in broad zoning districts established by the jurisdiction (e.g., forest and agricultural zones). A conflicting use is one which, if allowed, could negatively impact a Goal 5 resource site. Where conflicting uses have been identified, Goal 5 resource sites may impact those uses. These impacts must be considered in analyzing the economic, social, environmental and energy (ESEE) consequences:

(1) Preserve the Resource Site: If there are no conflicting uses for an identified resource site, the jurisdiction must adopt policies and ordinance provisions, as appropriate, which insure preservation of the resource site.

(2) Determine the Economic, Social, Environmental, and Energy Consequences: If conflicting uses are identified, the economic, social, environmental and energy consequences of the conflicting uses must be determined. Both the impacts on the resource site and on the conflicting use must be considered in analyzing the ESEE consequences. The applicability and requirements of other Statewide Planning Goals must also be considered, where appropriate, at this stage of the process. A decision of the ESEE consequences of identified conflicting uses is adequate if it enables a jurisdiction to provide reasons to explain why decisions are made for specific sites.

Stat. Auth.: ORS Ch. 183 & 197
Hts: LCD 5-1981(Temp), f. & ef. 5-8-81; LCD 7-1981, f. & ef. 6-29-81

[ED. NOTE: The text of Temporary Rules is not printed in the Oregon Administrative Rules Compilation. Copies may be obtained from the adopting agency or the Secretary of State.]

Develop Program to Achieve the Goal

660-16-010 Based on the determination of the economic, social, environmental and energy consequences, a jurisdiction must "develop a program to achieve the Goal". Assuming there is adequate information on the location, quality, and quantity of the resource site as well as on the nature of the conflicting use and ESEE consequences, a jurisdiction is expected to "resolve" conflicts with specific sites in any of the following three ways listed below. Compliance with Goal 5 shall also be based on the plan's overall ability to protect and 
conserve each Goal 5 resource. The issue of adequacy of the overall program adopted or of decisions made under sections (1), (2) and (3) of this rule may be raised by the Department or objects, but final determination is made by the Commission, pursuant to usual procedures:  

(1) Protect the Resource Site: Based on the analysis of the ESEE consequences, a jurisdiction may determine that the resource site is of such importance, relative to the conflicting uses, and the ESEE consequences of allowing conflicting uses are so great that the resource site should be protected and all conflicting uses prohibited on the site and possibly within the impact area identified in OAR 660-16-000(5)(a). Reasons which support this decision must be presented in the comprehensive plan, and plan and zone designations must be consistent with this decision.

(2) Allow Conflicting Uses Fully: Based on the analysis of ESEE consequences and other Statewide Goals, a jurisdiction may determine that the conflicting use should be allowed fully, not withstanding the possible impacts on the resource site. This approach may be used when the conflicting use for a particular site is of sufficient importance, relative to the resource site. Reasons which support this decision must be presented in the comprehensive plan, and plan and zone designations must be consistent with this decision.

(3) Limit Conflicting Uses: Based on the analysis of ESEE consequences, a jurisdiction may determine that both the resource site and the conflicting use are important relative to each other, and that the ESEE consequences should be balanced so as to allow the conflicting use but in a limited way so as to protect the resource site to some desired extent. To implement this decision, the jurisdiction must designate with certainty what uses and activities are allowed fully, what uses and activities are not allowed at all and which uses are allowed conditionally, and what specific standards or limitations are placed on the permitted and conditional uses and activities for each resource site. Whatever mechanisms are used, they must be specific enough so that affected property owners are able to determine what uses and activities are allowed, not allowed, or allowed conditionally and under what clear and objective conditions or standards. Reasons which support this decision must be presented in the comprehensive plan, and plan and zone designations must be consistent with this decision.

-- End NOTE: The text of Temporary Rules is not printed in the Oregon Administrative Rules Compilation. Copies may be obtained from the adopting agency or the Secretary of State --

Landowner Involvement

660-16-020 (1) The development of inventory data, identification of conflicting uses and adoption of implementing measures must, under Statewide Planning Goals 1 and 2, provide opportunities for citizen involvement and agency coordination. In addition, the adoption of regulations or plan provisions carries with it basic legal notice requirements. (County or city legal counsel can advise the planning department and governing body of these requirements.) Depending upon the type of action involved, the form and method of landowner notification will vary. State statutes and local charter provisions contain basic notice requirements. Because of the nature of the Goal 5 process as outlined in this paper it is important to provide for notification and involvement of landowners, including public agencies, at the earliest possible opportunity. This will likely avoid problems or disagreements later in the process and improve the local decision-making process in the development of the plan and implementing measures.

(2) As the Goal 5 process progresses and more specificity about the nature of resources, identified conflicting uses, ESEE consequences and implementing measures is known, notice and involvement of affected parties will become more meaningful. Such notice and landowner involvement, although not identified as a Goal 5 requirement is in the opinion of the Commission, imperative.

Stat. Auth.: ORS Ch. 183 & 197  
Net: LCD 5-1981(Temp), f. & ef. 5-8-81; LCD 7-1981, f. & ef. 6-29-81

[ED. NOTE: The text of Temporary Rules is not printed in the Oregon Administrative Rules Compilation. Copies may be obtained from the adopting agency or the Secretary of State --]

Policy Application

660-16-025 OAR 660-16-000 through 660-16-025 are applicable to jurisdictions as specified below:

(1) Category 1: Compliance with OAR 660-16-000 through 660-16-025 is required prior to granting acknowledgment of compliance under ORS 197.251 and OAR 660-03-000 through 660-03-040 for those jurisdictions which:

(a) Have not submitted their comprehensive plan for acknowledgment as of the date of adoption of this rule;

(b) Are under denial orders as of the date of adoption of this rule;

(c) Are not scheduled for review prior to or at the June 1981 Commission meeting.

(2) Category 2:

(a) Compliance with OAR 660-16-000 through 660-16-025 is required as outlined below for those jurisdictions which:

(A) Are under continuance orders adopted pursuant to OAR 660-03-040;

(B) Are scheduled for review at the April 30-May 1, May 29 or June 1981 Commission meetings.

(b) For these jurisdictions a notice will be given to all parties on the original notice list providing a 45-day period to object to the plan based on OAR 660-16-000 through 660-16-025.

(c) OAR 660-16-000 will be applied based on objections alleging violations of specific provisions of the rule on specific resource sites. Objections must be filed following requirements outlined in OAR 660-03-000 through 660-03-040 (Acknowledgment of Compliance Rule). Where no objections are filed or objections are not specific as to which elements of OAR 660-16-000 through 660-16-025 have been violated, and on what resource sites, the plan will be reviewed against Goal 5

(September, 1981)
standards as they existed prior to adoption of OAR 660-16-000 through 660-16-025.

(3) Jurisdictions which receive acknowledgment of compliance (as outlined in ORS 197.251) at the April 30/May 1, 1981 Commission meeting will not be subject to review procedures outlined above, but will be treated as other previously acknowledged jurisdictions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Rank I</th>
<th>Rank II</th>
<th>Rank III</th>
<th>Rank IV</th>
<th>Landmarks</th>
<th>Other Sites</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arbor Lodge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvington</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlook</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlawn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HISTORIC RESOURCES FIELD TEST METHODOLOGY

STEP 1

Selection of King, Vernon and Sabin neighborhoods was based on three factors:

- A dot density mapping of ranked historic resources which indicated that King, Vernon and Sabin area contained lower density of ranked resources than other neighborhoods in the Albina area. The field test area is located within Martin Luther King Blvd to 22nd and from Fremont to Ainsworth (about 250 blocks).

- This area, within the King, Vernon and Sabin neighborhoods was thought to contain unranked resources by neighborhood association members and by survey workers involved in the Historic Resource Inventory.

- It was thought that neighborhoods with a low level of citizen participation in the inventory process received a less complete coverage by the 1984 survey.

STEP 2

On February 3 and February 24, 1990 windshield surveys were conducted in the test area by three surveyors worked together. All three surveyors had experience in survey work and one had architectural survey experience. Sites were selected following criteria that was used on the original survey. Field notes contain observations other than those discovered using field test criteria.

STEP 3

After the survey all potential resources were screened to see if they had been included in the Historic Resource Inventory or in the Selected Properties file of ranked I, II, III, and IV resources.

STEP 4

To test our findings we solicited the expertise of an architectural historian who participated in a field check of the 29 sites on March 3, 1990. The historian concluded that:
• Many of the sites may merit rank I or II status if further documentation was done.

• King, Vernon and Sabin neighborhoods contain several potential ensembles.

• Several of the 29 sites may not merit ranking on their own but as an ensemble may be of historical significance.

• Resource nomination is to some extent subjective, some sites may have been overlooked in the initial windshield survey.

STEP 5

Analysis of the field test showed that this area had the characteristics of low levels of citizen participation and low density of identified resources. Areas in Albina with these characteristics may also have been underestimated in the 1984 Historic Resource Inventory. The Boise neighborhood has only 12 ranked resources and would be a likely area to target for further survey work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>TaxAccount#</th>
<th>Neigh</th>
<th>SiteDescription</th>
<th>Addition</th>
<th>Qttr#</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>733 NE Prescott</td>
<td>R384302180</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>2 story</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>2531</td>
<td>7 &amp; 8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>Multi Dwelling</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706 NE Prescott</td>
<td>R497300150</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>1.5 story with basement</td>
<td>Lincoln Park Annex</td>
<td>2631</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>Single dwelling</td>
<td>1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805 NE Prescott</td>
<td>R384302030</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>2 story with basement</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>2531</td>
<td>5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>Single dwelling</td>
<td>1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>736 NE Going</td>
<td>R384302210</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>1 story</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>2531</td>
<td>11 &amp; 1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>Multi Dwelling</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617 NE Prescott</td>
<td>R384302290</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>1.5 Story W/Bsmt</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>2531</td>
<td>5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>Single dwelling</td>
<td>1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509 NE Prescott</td>
<td>R384302410</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>1.5 story with basement</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>2531</td>
<td>5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>Single dwelling</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635 NE Going</td>
<td>R384303320</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>2 stories</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>2531</td>
<td>7 &amp; 8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>Multi Dwelling</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624 NE Prescott</td>
<td>R497300470</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>1 story fin attic, basement</td>
<td>Lincoln Park Annex</td>
<td>2631</td>
<td>11 &amp; 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>Single Dwelling</td>
<td>1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>914 NE Prescott</td>
<td>R497300830</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>1 sty, Fin attic, Bsmt</td>
<td>Lincoln Park Annex</td>
<td>2631</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>Single Dwelling</td>
<td>1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911 NE Mason</td>
<td>R497301170</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>1 sty, Fin Attic, Bsmt</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>2531</td>
<td>7 &amp; 8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>single dwelling</td>
<td>1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>937 NE Going</td>
<td>R384300690</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>1 sty, Fin attic, Bsmt,</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>2531</td>
<td>7 &amp; 8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>single dwelling</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917 NE Mason St.</td>
<td>R497301172</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>1 sty, Fin Attic, Bsmt, 1 of 3</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>2531</td>
<td>7 &amp; 8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>Single Dwelling</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>835 NE Prescott</td>
<td>R384302050</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>2 story with basement</td>
<td>Lincoln Park Annex</td>
<td>2631</td>
<td>11 &amp; 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>Single Dwelling</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>828 NE Prescott</td>
<td>R497300790</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>5 story with basement</td>
<td>Lincoln Park Annex</td>
<td>2631</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>single dwelling</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>903 NE Mason</td>
<td>R497301200</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>1 sty fin attic, bsmt</td>
<td>Lincoln Park Annex</td>
<td>2631</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>Single Dwelling</td>
<td>1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>903 N. Mason</td>
<td>R497301200</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>1 of 3 Ensembles</td>
<td>Lincoln Park Annex</td>
<td>2631</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>Multi Dwelling</td>
<td>1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402 NE 7th</td>
<td>R497302670</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>2 story</td>
<td>Lincoln Park Annex</td>
<td>2631</td>
<td>4 &amp; 6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>125000</td>
<td>Single Dwelling</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4327-4329 NE 7th</td>
<td>R497300440</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>2 story w/bsmt</td>
<td>Lincoln Park Annex</td>
<td>2631</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207 NE Going St.</td>
<td>R384301020</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>1 story</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>2531</td>
<td>5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>Single Dwelling</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3807 NE 10th</td>
<td>R497100950</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>2 story w/ basement</td>
<td>Lincoln Park Annex</td>
<td>2631</td>
<td>7 &amp; 8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>Store</td>
<td>1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4606 NE 10th</td>
<td>R384300790</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>.2 story</td>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>2532</td>
<td>8 &amp; 9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>Single dwelling</td>
<td>1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503 NE Mason</td>
<td>R497301930</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>1 sty fin attic, Bsmt</td>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>2532</td>
<td>8 &amp; 9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Store</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905 NE Going</td>
<td>R660710660</td>
<td>Sabin</td>
<td>1.5 Story with basement</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>2531</td>
<td>7 &amp; 8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>Single Dwelling</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2303 NE Alberta</td>
<td>R660705840</td>
<td>Sabin</td>
<td></td>
<td>INA Park</td>
<td>2533</td>
<td>9 &amp; 10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>C2L</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>M Use</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606 NE Going</td>
<td>R660712360</td>
<td>Sabin</td>
<td>1 sty fin attic,Bsmt</td>
<td>George Place</td>
<td>2632</td>
<td>5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>Single Dwelling</td>
<td>1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608 NE Prescott</td>
<td>R421001060</td>
<td>Sabin</td>
<td>2 story w/BSMT</td>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>2532</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>Single Dwelling</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2403-2407 NE</td>
<td>R413904230</td>
<td>Sabin</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Elberta</td>
<td>2533</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>Single Dwelling</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4128 NE 20th</td>
<td>R31190-0060</td>
<td>Sabin</td>
<td>1story fin attic , BSMT</td>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>2532</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>multi dwelling</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4615-4617 NE 17th</td>
<td>R660710140</td>
<td>Sabin</td>
<td>2 stories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4622 NE 17th</td>
<td>R660710280</td>
<td>Sabin</td>
<td>1 sty,unf attic,BSMT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2634 NE Going</td>
<td>R242303350</td>
<td>Sabin</td>
<td>2 story with basement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4823 NE 18th</td>
<td>R66070-7330</td>
<td>Sabin</td>
<td>2 story with Basement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>#OF</td>
<td>FLOORS</td>
<td>WALLS</td>
<td>ROOF</td>
<td>FOUNDATION</td>
<td>PORCH/STAIRS</td>
<td>DOORS/WINDOWS</td>
<td>RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2006 N. EMERSON</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5215 N DENVER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5207 N DENVER</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2006 N BLANDEANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2016 N BLANDEANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2026 N BLANDEANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2036 N BLANDEANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2046 N BLANDEANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2056 N BLANDEANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2106 N BLANDEANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2116 N BLANDEANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2126 N BLANDEANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2136 N BLANDEANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2146 N BLANDEANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2156 N BLANDEANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2166 N BLANDENA 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2176 N BLANDEANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2115 N BLANDEANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2105 N BLANDEANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2055 N BLANDEANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2045 N BLANDEANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2035 N BLANDEANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2025 N BLANDEANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2015 N BLANDEANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2005 N BLANDEANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2145 N BLANDEANA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3952 MONTANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3962 MONTANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3974 MONTANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1224 SHAVER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2041 NE 7TH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2023 NE 7TH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2027 NE 7TH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>608 NE THOMPSON</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>600 NE THOMPSON</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>544 NE THOMPSON</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>901 SKIDMORE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>4314 MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>4303 ALBINA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>4057 MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>4057 (GREENHOUSE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>4035 MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>4025 MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>4001 MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>3967-3975 MISS.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3950-3958 MISS.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>3964 MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>3972-3978 MISS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>4000 MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>4034 MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>4038 MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>4058 MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>4064 MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>4076 MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>3914 MICHIGAN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>3922 MICHIGAN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>3926 MICHIGAN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>3984 MICHIGAN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>3986 MICHIGAN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>939 FAILING</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>927 FAILING</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>637 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>615 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>637 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>637 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>541 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>537 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>527 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>523 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>517 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>509 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>503 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>443 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>438 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>444 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>502 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>514 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>528 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>532 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>540 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>548 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>602 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>512 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>622 NE TILLAMOOK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>926 NE LIBERTY</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>2006 NE LIBERTY</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2009 NE LIBERTY</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>5417 NE 30TH</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>5425 NE 30TH</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>5429 NE 30TH</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>5424-28 NE 30TH</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>5501-19 NE 30TH</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>2908 NE KILLINGSWORTH</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>2921 NE KILLINGSWORTH</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3000-16 NE KILLINGSWORTH</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>2616 ALBERTA</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>2700 ALBERTA</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>2715 ALBERTA</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>2724 ALBERTA</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>2734 ALBERTA</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>2701-03 ALBERTA</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>2712-14 ALBERTA</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>2640 ALBERTA</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>2631-41 NE ALBERTA</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>4815 NE 23RD</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>4825 NE 23RD</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>4837 NE 23RD</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>4907 NE 23RD</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>4913 NE 23RD</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>4923 NE 23RD</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>4903 NE 23RD</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>4915 NE 17TH</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>4816 NE 17TH</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>4824 NE 17TH</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>4825 NE 17TH</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>4834 NE 17TH</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>4835 NE 17TH</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>4904 NE 17TH</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>4905 NE 17TH</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>4914 NE 17TH</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>4919 NE 17TH</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>4926 NE 9TH</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>4110 NE 9TH</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>4116 NE 9TH</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>903 NE MASON</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>911 NE MASON</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>917 NE MASON</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>BLG NE MASON</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>6124 NE 8TH</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>6204 NE 8TH</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>6210 NE 8TH</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>6215 NE 8TH</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>6218 NE 8TH</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>6223 NE 8TH</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>6226 NE 8TH</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>6240 NE 8TH</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>* = INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE OR HOUSING ELEMENTS NOT VISIBLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PRIMARY</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>LOT</th>
<th></th>
<th>87-88 LAND</th>
<th>IMPROV</th>
<th>87-88 LAND</th>
<th>IMPROV</th>
<th>89 LAND</th>
<th>IMPROV</th>
<th>89 LAND</th>
<th>IMPROV</th>
<th>TOTAL ASSMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2006 N EMERSON R5</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>10500</td>
<td></td>
<td>35300</td>
<td>9900</td>
<td>33600</td>
<td>43500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5215 N DENVER R5</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td></td>
<td>31700</td>
<td>9500</td>
<td>30100</td>
<td>39500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5207 N DENVER R5</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>10500</td>
<td></td>
<td>34500</td>
<td>9900</td>
<td>32800</td>
<td>42700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2006 N BLANDENA R5</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>11500</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td>31200</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>29600</td>
<td>39600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2036 N BLANDENA R5</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>10500</td>
<td></td>
<td>31500</td>
<td>9900</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>39900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2006 N BLANDENA R5</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>10500</td>
<td></td>
<td>31000</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>29600</td>
<td>42700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2006 N BLANDENA R5</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>14000</td>
<td></td>
<td>31000</td>
<td>13300</td>
<td>29400</td>
<td>42700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2006 N BLANDENA R5</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>13200</td>
<td></td>
<td>31300</td>
<td>12500</td>
<td>29700</td>
<td>42700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3962 MONTANA A25*</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td></td>
<td>26300</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>21800</td>
<td>25500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1224 SHAVER A25*</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td></td>
<td>24400</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>20200</td>
<td>23900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3974 MONTANA A25*</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td></td>
<td>28500</td>
<td>7700</td>
<td>24800</td>
<td>32500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>608 NE THOMPSON R1</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td></td>
<td>24000</td>
<td>5200</td>
<td>25200</td>
<td>30400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2023 NE 7TH R1</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td></td>
<td>24400</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>25600</td>
<td>30400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4124 NE 7TH R1</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>4125</td>
<td>7400</td>
<td></td>
<td>24600</td>
<td>7700</td>
<td>24800</td>
<td>32500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>615 NE TILLAMOOK R1</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>6250</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td></td>
<td>16000</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>514 NE TILLAMOOK R1</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>12500</td>
<td>20400</td>
<td></td>
<td>42500</td>
<td>21400</td>
<td>44600</td>
<td>66000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>444 NE TILLAMOOK R1</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>4125</td>
<td>7400</td>
<td></td>
<td>18700</td>
<td>7700</td>
<td>19700</td>
<td>27400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>517 NE TILLAMOOK R1</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>4125</td>
<td>7400</td>
<td></td>
<td>22600</td>
<td>7700</td>
<td>23800</td>
<td>31500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>540 NE TILLAMOOK R1</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>4125</td>
<td>7400</td>
<td></td>
<td>15800</td>
<td>7700</td>
<td>16600</td>
<td>24300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>503 TILLAMOOK R1</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>4125</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td></td>
<td>16200</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>17000</td>
<td>25400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3922-25 MICH A25*</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>6657</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td></td>
<td>28200</td>
<td>41000</td>
<td>23400</td>
<td>27500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3914 MICHIGAN A25*</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>8333</td>
<td>6800</td>
<td></td>
<td>32800</td>
<td>51000</td>
<td>37000</td>
<td>43000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3935 MICH A25*</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td></td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>5900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4314 MISSISSIPPI C2</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>11800</td>
<td></td>
<td>70000</td>
<td>9800</td>
<td>58100</td>
<td>67900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4032 ALBINA A25*</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5700</td>
<td></td>
<td>22800</td>
<td>4700</td>
<td>18900</td>
<td>23600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4057 MISSISSIPPI M3</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5900</td>
<td></td>
<td>23900</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>19700</td>
<td>24700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3957 MISSISSIPPI M3</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td></td>
<td>18100</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>18100</td>
<td>26500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3950-56 M III M3</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td></td>
<td>27400</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>27400</td>
<td>34600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4034-38 MISS C2</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>6300</td>
<td></td>
<td>22100</td>
<td>5200</td>
<td>18800</td>
<td>24000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4000-08 MISS M3</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td></td>
<td>63200</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>63200</td>
<td>71600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4057 MISSISSIPPI C2</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5900</td>
<td></td>
<td>12900</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>10800</td>
<td>15600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4301-07 MISS C2</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>14500</td>
<td></td>
<td>57600</td>
<td>12100</td>
<td>48800</td>
<td>60900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1926 NE LIBERTY R5</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>10111</td>
<td>21100</td>
<td></td>
<td>11600</td>
<td>17500</td>
<td>8600</td>
<td>27100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2006 NE LIBERTY R5</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>21100</td>
<td></td>
<td>13200</td>
<td>17500</td>
<td>10900</td>
<td>28400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2009 NE LIBERTY R5</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>10500</td>
<td></td>
<td>34000</td>
<td>8700</td>
<td>22600</td>
<td>32300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>5417 NE 30TH C2</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>14500</td>
<td></td>
<td>20600</td>
<td>14500</td>
<td>20600</td>
<td>35100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>5425 NE 30TH C2</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>20300</td>
<td></td>
<td>53200</td>
<td>20300</td>
<td>53200</td>
<td>73500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>5501-16 NE 30TH C2</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>20300</td>
<td></td>
<td>53200</td>
<td>20300</td>
<td>53200</td>
<td>73500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2908 KILLINGS R1</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>8300</td>
<td>18400</td>
<td></td>
<td>29600</td>
<td>15200</td>
<td>24600</td>
<td>39800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2921 KILLINGS C2</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td></td>
<td>31600</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>31600</td>
<td>38800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>5000-16 KILLINGS C2</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>30500</td>
<td></td>
<td>65800</td>
<td>30500</td>
<td>65800</td>
<td>96300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2700 SERVICE C2</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>6750</td>
<td>16400</td>
<td></td>
<td>25300</td>
<td>16400</td>
<td>25300</td>
<td>41700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2616</td>
<td>ALBERTA</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>21000</td>
<td>36700</td>
<td>36700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2640</td>
<td>ALBERTA</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>34200</td>
<td>31800</td>
<td>34200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>2715-17</td>
<td>ALBERTA</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>5700</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>5700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2726</td>
<td>ALBERTA</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2734</td>
<td>ALBERTA</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>22000</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>18300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>2712-14</td>
<td>ALBERTA</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>25100</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>21700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>4815</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>4845</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>4907</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>4913</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>4926</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>4931</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>4923</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>4905</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>4914</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>4919</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>4926</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>4805</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td>4815</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>4845</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td>4907</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>4913</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>4926</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>4805</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>4815</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564</td>
<td>4845</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>4907</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td>4913</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567</td>
<td>4926</td>
<td>NE 23RD</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>15800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessors Random Sample
METHODOLOGY AND CONDITIONS OF STRUCTURE

There are 30 undesignated ensembles in the Albina study and two within the planning impact area. Several undesignated ensembles within the Historic Conservation Districts were excluded since they will potentially be protected as part of the district. The stand alone ensembles are most vulnerable since no other designation will provide needed protection.

We also excluded another small part of a large ensemble that is located outside of our study area. We chose 18 undesignated ensembles for our field-condition survey as well as for the case study of the ensemble characteristics.

Two important sources were referred to for these studies: Selected Historic Property Inventory and Tax Assessment Documents in the City of Portland. The following is the findings of the ensemble condition of structure survey (referring to the Condition Survey Format in Appendix C7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition of Unit</th>
<th>#Surveyed Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Structures</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Structure</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorated Structure</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Element</th>
<th>#Slight</th>
<th>#Significant</th>
<th>#Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exterior</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch/Stairs</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors/Windows</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land As a Percent of Total Value (range): 12%-34%
Lot Size Range: 5000-10,000 Sq. Ft.
Total Square Feet/Acres: 1,592,633 ft/35.56
Decrease Range in Assessed Value (87-90): 0%-23%
Respective Zoning: R1, R2.5L, A1, A2.5, C2, C2L and M3
Value Range of Selected Properties: $10,000 - $67,900
## CONDITION OF STRUCTURE SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSING ELEMENTS</th>
<th>ROOF</th>
<th>EXTERIOR WALLS</th>
<th>FOUNDATION</th>
<th>PORCH &amp; STAIRS</th>
<th>DOORS &amp; WINDOWS</th>
<th>SIGNS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEFECTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. SLIGHT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- only minor deterioration over a small area</td>
<td>- slight crumbling of mortar between bricks</td>
<td>- concrete slab of mortar be-</td>
<td>- no apparent significant defects</td>
<td>- 1-2 broken windows</td>
<td>sign needs paint/ minor repair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SIGNIFICANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- cracks in material</td>
<td>- exterior walls out of plumb</td>
<td>- posts &amp; beams with no skirt</td>
<td>- sagging</td>
<td>- more than 2 broken windows</td>
<td>badly damaged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- missing or patched shingles</td>
<td>- paint peeling &amp; blistering over large areas</td>
<td>- wood skirt to ground</td>
<td>- partially broken stairs</td>
<td>broken or missing door</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- wavy shingles</td>
<td>- holes or open cracks in siding</td>
<td>- low to ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- no eaves</td>
<td>- loose or missing wall material</td>
<td>- substantial crumbling concrete</td>
<td>- not enough vents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- heavy moss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CRITICAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- badly curling edges</td>
<td>- no siding</td>
<td>- no foundation</td>
<td>- boarded up walls and doors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- roof sagging</td>
<td>- extreme sagging over windows &amp; doors</td>
<td>- badly cracked &amp; settled concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- large open cracks or holes</td>
<td>- substantial damage to unit</td>
<td>- no vents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- extensive water damage to unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEFINITIONS:

**STANDARD UNIT:** Unit has no visual defects or only slight defects requiring regular home maintenance which the average home owner would be capable of repairing.

**MARGINAL UNIT:** Unit has significant defects in no more than three housing elements or a critical defect in one housing element (not repairable by average home owner). Rehabilitation of the unit is clearly economically feasible and is of moderate nature.

**DETERIORATED UNIT:** Unit has significant defects in four or more elements or critical defects in more than one housing element. The housing unit is in need of substantial reconstruction.

**SIGNS:** Second sign category note if sign is obsolete

**NOTE:** If the roof can be repaired by simply re-shingling, the defect is significant, not critical.
Case Study #1

General Location: NE Tillamook and NE Thompson between NE Martin Luther King Blvd. and NE Seventh St.

Neighborhood: Eliot

Zoning: R1

Area: 139,200 Square Feet

Number of Lots: 30 lots including two vacant or double lots

Assessed Value Characteristics: $15,000-$66,000 (see assessors sample.)

Condition Characteristics: 10 structures are rated as standard according to the condition survey. 18 are rated as marginal and 0 are deteriorated. Slight foundation and porch/stairs element are the most common housing problem. Ten structures exhibit significant exterior wall problems and 10 have slight roof problems repairable by the average homeowner.

Summary of Comments and Context: This ensemble is distinct from much of the surrounding developments due to the inherent single-family character of the block. Large scale conversion or redevelopment to higher density multi-family units has not occurred in the NE Tillamook ensemble. The structure in this ensemble were built during the late 1800’s and early 1900’s. This ensemble contains one vacant lot and one lot that is vacant except immediately within the ensemble. M3, light manufacturing, and a R2.5 residential zone are adjacent to the ensemble.

Tillamook Ensemble

Number of Standard structures: 10
Number of Marginal structures: 18
Number of Deteriorated structures: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Element</th>
<th>slight</th>
<th>significant</th>
<th>critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTERIOR WALLS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROOF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUNDATION</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORCH/STAIRS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOORS/WINDOWS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LAND AS PERCENT OF TOTAL VALUE: 17-33% (from random sample) 615 NE Tillamook 73%
CASE STUDY #1

AVERAGE LOT SIZE: 5000 square feet

DECREASE IN ASSESSED VALUE 1988-1989: 0% (average increase of $1400 excluding 615 NE Tillamook increase of 0%)

ZONING: R1

AVERAGE ASSESSED VALUE OF SELECTED PROPERTIES 1989: $31,350
CASE STUDY FINDINGS

Nineteen of the twenty eight dwellings (70%) exhibit slight roof problems, as defined in the condition of structure survey, as being repairable by the average homeowner.

Multi-family conversion has occurred in two of the twenty eight dwellings located in the NE Tillamook ensemble. One of the conversions has altered the historic integrity of the structure and is incompatible with the surrounding single-family homes. A large cement driveway used for parking conflicts with the lawns found in the surrounding yards.

Two primarily vacant lots exist within this ensemble. One lot can possibly be redeveloped.

The R1, multi-family residential zone allows single-family houses, rowhouses, duplexes, apartments and condominiums. Maximum height allowed in the R1 zone is 4 stories or 45 feet. All structures within the ensemble are less than three stories.

The Tillamook ensemble has approximately 139,200 square feet of developable area. Therefore in this R1, multi-family, zone 137+ units could be developed at 43 units per acre.

One structure in this ensemble is a Rank II, potential landmark, property. The ensemble designation, once implemented, can help to enhance and buffer the inherent qualities found at this ranked site by insuring that incompatible revitalization does not occur.

Two structures of the twenty eight within this ensemble have been converted to duplexes. The zoning of property within this ensemble R1, multi-family allows development of one unit per 1000 acres.
CASE STUDY #2

Case Study of a Commercial Ensemble

Located in the Humboldt neighborhood, on both sides of N. Killingsworth, crossing N. Albina, N. Mississippi and N. Michigan Avenues, the ensemble includes 19 lots, large and small, all built in the period of 1910s to 1920s. The ensemble area is zoned in C2, C2S and M3, respectively, mixed zoning area. There are variety of business activities such as grocery, restaurant, hotels, retail, repairs and furniture stores—all local neighborhood level businesses.

The ensemble facade forms good harmony and continuity in the environment. The roof skylines maintain horizontal line in rhythm forms and several roof feature cornices like that of the historic cubic buildings. The bright colors of the buildings are in good contrast with dark color of some other buildings. Pedestrian level signs and commercial signs in auto level are designed in human scale, proportional in vertical and horizontal image. Many shop windows and doors are at street level, though set back for pedestrians.

As the area was designed over sixty years ago, some of the modern shopping facilities are short, for instance, parking could be a problem for this area. Although there are some vacant sites in the ensemble area, most cases are not in derelict condition, while some serve as garbage sites for adjacent stores. Redevelopment is possible in few vacant lots of the ensemble but unity with the historic building facades must be maintained. A Goal 5 ESEE analysis is necessary to identify the conflicts.

Economic Consequences of Conflicting Uses

The property values of the ensemble structures can be at least maintained (no decline in recent years as indicated in the random sample of assessment found in this appendix) by preserving the historic commercial identity. Potential development and close-by residential conversion into commercial uses will create employment opportunities. To protect the ensemble may prohibit large-scale and intense commercial development, thus reducing the economic returns of business. New site construction subject to design compatibility review will limit commercial uses although the current uses of the ensemble are economically compatible with the resource preservation.

Social Consequences of Conflicting Uses

This ensemble provides educational opportunities and historic values. The historic link between the community and past neighborhood commercial center is easily identified by the public through this ensemble. The historic architecture of commercial buildings is clearly shown on the main street. The diversity, aesthetics and image of the ensemble reflects the cultural and social values of the area.
Environmental and Energy Consequences Of Conflicting Uses

The ensemble designation will form the visual continuity and compatibility in the environment. The underutilization or non-use of the vacant land in the ensemble environment but also hurts the integrity of the ensemble image. The ensemble is environmentally significant because it contributes to the historic character of the street.

Energy Consequences of Conflicting Uses

Ensemble preservation will reduce the energy use by preventing the demolition of the historic structures and saving the energy resources necessary for new construction and materials. Preserving the commercial uses in the neighborhood level will save customers' energy by allowing short distance trips to retail shopping.
CASE STUDY #3

GENERAL LOCATION: The 6200 block of NE 8th Avenue, between NE Ainsworth St. and NE Holman St. This ensemble location is just outside the proposed Woodlawn Historic Conservation District and 5 blocks east of the important city arterial street, Martin Luther King Blvd.

NEIGHBORHOOD: Woodlawn.

ZONING: R2.5L

AREA: 46,650 sq feet total. The east side of NE 8th has 7 contiguous lots that total 36,650 sq. feet. The two (2) west side lots are 5000 sq. feet each.

NUMBER OF LOTS: 9 lots. One lot on the east side is vacant.

ASSESSED VALUE CHARACTERISTICS: $15,700 - $26,900 assessed value for 1989-90. Land value is assessed at approximately 22% to 36% of property value. It appears that the assessments have been lowered by 17% in the past three tax years.

CONDITION CHARACTERISTICS: One structure in the ensemble has marginal or deteriorated condition of structure ratings on all exterior categories. The remainder of the structures are rated as standard. There are slight defects noted in roofing, porch and stairs, and the wooden doors and windows typical of the standard rated houses.

SUMMARY COMMENTS AND CONTEXT: This grouping of 8 homes (9 lots) on NE 8th street share a history of 1890-1909 construction. 3 of the houses are small craftsman Queen Anne style with multiple-gabled roofs, rounded turrets, and an assortment of crafted details and trim. The other five are of the same era and scale with similar peaked roofs, tall street front windows and small porches. The differences in original or 'shingled over' siding, roofing materials, and general physical condition detract somewhat from the ensemble or grouped nature. General design aspects of pattern and rhythm are still there, despite the texture inconsistencies.

These single family homes are on a narrow street of primarily single family houses on small lots. Most of the nearby homes are slightly younger than the ensemble, and are of more plain and functionally updated construction. Next to the west side ensemble house, there is a contemporary triplex on the corner of Holman and NE 8th. This structure presents a small parking lot and a ranch-style profile in views from NE 8th, and is a contrast to the context of the ensemble.
ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF CONFLICTS

The NE 8th Avenue ensemble is a turn of the century group of small single family residences in an original single family, small lot (5000 sq.ft.), and working class residential neighborhood. At present the area is experiencing declining property values, numerous foreclosures and house abandonments. There is a trend from home-ownership and small real estate investors to a pattern of speculative property investment by a small number of individuals and firms. The recent buyers are able to purchase the foreclosures and unwanted properties at very low prices and in many instances are able to rent them at close to market rental amounts.

The area around the ensemble is currently zoned R-2.5. Adjacent to one of the ensemble properties (on the corner of NE. Holman and 8th) is a single story triplex apartment structure with an off street parking lot. NE. Martin Luther King Blvd is 5 blocks to the west, a high-volume traffic arterial with extensive commercial zoning. With the current zoning, adjacent low priced lots and improvements, and the possibility of a light rail transit alignment on M.L. King Blvd., the area is underutilized and has some redevelopment potential. This redevelopment potential is modified by the narrow streets, sound and restorable houses, and largely single-family character of the ensemble area.

The economic consequences of protecting or controlling the re-development, alteration, and density of use of the 8th street ensemble include; 1. property owners' expense for labor and material (beyond ordinary costs) of historically accurate or design compatible housing improvements. 2. reducing the potential for higher density and affordable housing development (Goals 9 and 5); 3. any tax revenue and public service efficiency losses without higher density and new construction in an established urban area.

CONSEQUENCES OF SOCIAL CONFLICTS.

This ensemble is a good representative of turn of the century, craftsman housing for working class Portlanders in a residential block setting. It is a valuable historic link to an important era in the growth of the Woodlawn area and Portland itself by nature of the style of building, it's 'fit' in the neighborhood, and it's role as an affordable home for several generations.
The removal or alteration of any portion of this simple group of houses without replacement with a compatible appearance and use for the neighborhood is very possible. This loss would decrease opportunities for participating in the single-family, affordable, working class history of the homes in the Woodlawn area. The potential for losing this resource for many people is more likely to come from deterioration and incremental replacement, rather than larger scale redevelopment.

There is a need for increased home-ownership in the Albina Plan area to help offset the problems of neglect or damage to good housing associated with absentee property owners and declining property values. The houses in this ensemble are affordable and have the character that contributes to neighborhood identity and pride.

Preserving or protecting the 8th street ensemble will not have to reduce the chance for renters or families who may need more standard living spaces. Design guidelines for new or add-on construction can guide compatible and historically sensitive living space.

**CONSEQUENCES OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONFLICTS.**

The ensemble designation can help maintain the pleasing visual environment that exists in these NE Portland neighborhoods. The potential for reusing natural resources in the form of historic and attractive building materials available from salvaged structures is possible.

Retaining the lower unit density of the ensemble will have an effect on planning for keeping Portland's growth pressure off of the urban boundaries. As Portland's population increases, an adjustment of higher density housing opportunities must be made to avoid the environmental costs of sprawling development. The typical 5000 sq. foot lots here could offer room for larger household sizes and help make the adjustment without conversion to multi-family units.

**CONSEQUENCES OF ENERGY CONFLICTS.**

As in the environmental analysis of the 8th Avenue ensemble, protecting the existing single family structures will have an effect on directing some development pressure outward. Renovation of these 100 year old homes to modern energy efficiency standards can be difficult and more costly than renovating more recent construction. Until this is accomplished on a structure by structure basis, energy efficiency losses are probable.
HISTORIC PRESERVATION TOOLS

Planning and Zoning Tools

Adaptive Reuse: Adaptive Reuse of a structure can prevent a structure from being demolished. An example is the use of a single family unit or a bed and breakfast establishment.

Preservation Ordinances for Protection of Ensembles: An ordinance can be written which protects groups of structures with similar historical and/or architectural qualities. This provides protection of sites which individually may not be significant, but as a group share a common history and/or unique architectural style.

Transfer of Development Rights: A transfer of development rights can allow an owner of historic property to use these rights on another site and protect a historic property from redevelopment.

Historic Preservation Ordinance: A specific ordinance can be developed which regulates the use, maintenance, rehabilitation and demolition of historic properties.

Downzoning, Overlay Zones and Spot Zoning: These techniques can be used to protect historic structures from: 1) more intense use; 2) after designation while preserving the original use of the structure, and; 3) where a comprehensive plan demonstrates a special need such as preserving historic sites.

Uniform Building Code: The State of Oregon's Structural Specialty Code can be used to provide protection of historic structures from alteration which may alter its architectural style.

Historic Districts: A geographic district can be established which includes properties which share a common history and/or a unique architectural style. A historic district can include whole or parts of neighborhoods.

Demolition Denial and/or Moratorium: Municipalities can either deny a demolition permit application or place a moratorium on the demolition of historic properties.

Financial Tools

Grants for Historic Preservation: Grants can be awarded to property owners or nonprofit groups for maintenance and repair of historic property.

Rehabilitation Tax Credits: Historic structures can qualify for tax credit allowed by the 1986 Tax Reform Act. Credit is awarded for rehabilitation of historic structures.

Placing the Burden of Proving Economic Hardship on the Owner of A Historic Property: Criteria or formula can be developed so owners of historic property can prove economic hardship as a result of their property receiving historic designation.
**Waiving Fees:** A municipality can wave alteration permit fees so a property owner can make improvements without paying fees for alterations or new infrastructure.

**Tax Increment Financing:** Tax increment financing can be used to finance improvements to a historic district by using the property tax increment to cover rehabilitation costs.

**Equity Syndication:** Equity syndication can occur when a neighborhood group buys shares of an existing or rehabilitated historic property to secure a loan for improvements.

**Linkage Fees for New Construction:** Fees can be charged on new development which can go to maintenance or rehabilitation of historic properties.

**Fifteen Year Tax Freezes:** The National Historic Register allows property owners 15 years of frozen taxes so an owner can make improvements as values increase and taxes do not change.

**Community Organizations**

**Education, Communication, Training and Advocacy:** Organizations such as the Historic Preservation League of Oregon exist to educate, train and act as advocates for citizens in historic preservation.

**Historic Ethnic Districts:** Historic ethnic districts can be established by or for an ethnic group, which includes properties and sites of significance to a particular group.

**Non-profit Groups:** Neighborhood associations or community-based groups have successfully organized and preserved historic properties.
Comprehensive Plan Workshop
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
January 25, 1990

In attendance:

Dr. Carl Abbott        Art Alexander
Will Harper            Jean Hester
Dr. Deborah Howe       Mary Jane Melink
Kimberly Moreland      Sam McKinney
Dan Riordan            Mary Sauter
Peggy Scolnick         Al Staehli

The meeting began at approximately 7:00 p.m. The Advisory Committee was welcomed and introductions were made.

Presentations:

- Will Harper made a presentation of the project to the Committee.
- Jean Hester discussed the Albina history document.
- Dan Riordan gave a presentation using a map of the Albina community. Sites which are included in the 1985 inventory were pointed out as well as potential historical conservation districts and ensembles.

Questions and discussion:

Art Alexander wondered about the use of the oral history sources for the 1985 Historic Resources Inventory.

Al Staehli noted that most of the information was gathered from printed and visual sources.
Sam McKinney was concerned about the actual product and the results of the Committee's work. He expressed the importance of linking community heritage to historic preservation. (community heritage and architectural historic values).

Art Alexander mentioned the loss of land and heritage near Emanuel Hospital.

Sam McKinney suggested a possible project similar to the Historical Society Chinese Exhibit.

Dr. Abbott mentioned a historical approach taken in Los Angeles by Dolores Hayden. Dolores Hayden is a professor at UCLA who worked on a project in Los Angeles dealing with historic preservation and black issues.

It was suggested that there is a psychological wall around Albina. There needs to be a rehumanization of the area and a change in the public's perception of the community.

The public is concerned about crime and higher taxes.

It was suggested that the Oregon Commission of Humanities might be a source of additional support for the project.

Al Staehli has photos of the area dating from 1974.

The Committee discussed issues surrounding the deficiencies of the 1985 Historic Resource Inventory. It was stated that patterns of participation in the inventory process is a concern.

Al Staehli suggested that properties included in the inventory require more research. The research could lead to rank changes. He also suggested that additional information might be available at the City of Portland Archives Department.
Al Staehli discussed that determination on historic sites and properties were both objective and subjective. Some sites were documented better than others, therefore sites assigned ranks with little known documentation are suspect.

Al Staehli discussed how clusters of structures were identified for the 1985 Historic Resources Inventory. Often due to a lack of time or information about the individual properties, clusters or ensembles were simply circled on a map.

Press coverage of the project was discussed by the Committee as a means to get additional information. Mary Sauter suggested using press coverage as a way to get old personal photographs of the Albina community.

The NW Overton issue was discussed briefly by the Committee. The Overton demolitions indicate the need for additional research.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, February 13, 1990 at 6:30 at the Palmer House located at 4314 N. Mississippi.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

The Student Advisory Liaison Committee
Comprehensive Plan Workshop
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
February 13, 1990

Minutes

In attendance:

Dr. Carl Abbott                Jinxiang Ren
Will Harper                  Dan Riordan
Dr. Deborah Howe            Mary Sauter
Mary Jane Melink            Peggy Scolnick
Sam McKinney               Damian Syrynk
Dr. Darrell Milner         David Wadley
Kimberly Moreland

Kimberly welcomed everyone and began the meeting at 6:50 p.m.

Damian gave his presentation on the history report. The advisory committee members in attendance acknowledged they would submit comment on the report by calling Jean at the Planning Bureau.

Dave Wadley gave his presentation on the King-Sabin-Vernon survey.

Mary Sauter commented and mentioned an article in the Historic Preservation Weekly. Carl made some observations on the inventory for clarification.

There were discussion on the inventory process. Peggy Scolnick mentioned linking historical figures with structures.

Jinxiang Ren and Will Harper gave a presentation about ensembles. Will presented photos and diagrams of ensembles in Albina area and uses of ensembles.

Sam McKinney commented on extending historic preservation to the neighborhood preservation. He mentioned bringing other units which have no historical significance. He made the argument for extending the parameters so historic preservation could be a catch all and argued against strict standards or criteria.
David Wadley commented on protecting attributes.

Sam McKinney commented on composite preservation—both the social and historic fabric.

Dr. Abbott talked about the tools to apply on ensemble/district scale and pushed ensembles as a key element. Conservation districts provide focus for community organization, consensus building in drafting standards and building community support for historic preservation.

Michael Harrison discussed Albina process in regards to historic preservation. He indicated that the owner support of preservation is very important in Portland. Unwilling owners are a problem to the process.

Sam McKinney brought up the issue of not drawing limitations. He recommended using historic preservation like a big net; catch all you can. He went on to discuss the social implication; who's involved, implementation and discussion of proposals.

Dr. Howe expanded on the use of ensembles.

Mary Jane Melink gave her presentation on implementation strategies.

Michael Harrison gave a brief presentation on State Goal 5 at Sam McKinney's Request.

Sam McKinney brought up issues of how historic preservation and economic development are linked.

Melink presented community tour concept. Mary Sauter suggested the tour include Piedmont.
Kim Moreland gave a presentation on photo display. She proposed this as a follow up for next term. Those involved included Kim, Jean, David and Dan. Kim will set meeting with interested parties next week.

Kim set next meeting time for February 28 at 7:00 in Portland Building Room 1054.

Discussion about final presentation; date and who to invite. Sam McKinney recommended a community presentation.

Michael Harrison offered having Jean Hester call long-distance to Charleston to speak with a representative of their historic preservation program.
ALBINA ADDITION NAMES AND DATES

1. Alameda Place (1909)
2. Albina (1873)
3. Albina Add. (1889)
4. Albina Heights (1891)
5. Albina Homestead Add. (1882)
6. Albion Add. (1883)
7. Arbor Lodge (1891)
8. Arleta Park (1902)
9. Avenue Homes (1926)
10. Beverly (1903)
11. Blandena Heights (1911)
12. Brainard Tract (1883)
13. Brazee Street Add. (1882)
14. Burrage Tract (1883)
15. Caesar Park (1908)
16. Carter's (1871)
17. Central (1863)
18. Central Albina Add. (1888)
19. Clifford (1887)
20. Cloverdale Extension (1887)
21. Cloverdale Extension No2 (1888)
22. Cloverdale Tract (1882)
23. Columbia Heights (1889)
24. Commissioners Add. (1951)
25. Concord Heights (1905)
26. Cook's Add. (1888)
27. Cumberland (1912)
28. D.S. Shaver's 2nd Add. (1902)
29. Dahlke Add. (1958)
30. Davis (1890)
31. Dekum Court (1979)
32. Delashmutt and Oatman's (1882)
33. Dixon Place (1912)
34. East Irvington (1889)
35. El Tovar (1909)
36. Elberta (1906)
37. Elizabeth Irving's Add. (1882)
38. Erwin and Watson's Add. (1891)
39. Ethel Lynn Add. (1893)
40. Fairfield (1890)
41. Fairport (1908)
42. Farrell's (1889)
43. Farrell's 2nd Add. (1890)
44. Faubion Park (1958)
45. First Electric Add. (1888)
46. Flamingo Park (1957)
47. Florence Heights (1907)
48. Foxchase Add. (1889)
49. Frances Add. (1891)
50. Gainsborough (1928)
51. Gay Tract (1883)
52. Gay's Add. (1882)
53. Gem Add. (1890)
54. George Place (1910)
55. Gerard Add. (1911)
56. Glencyrie (1911)
57. Glenwood Park (1886)
58. Goodmorning Add. (1890)
59. Granville (1909)
60. Graybrook (1893)
61. Green C Love Add. (1914)
62. Griswold Tract (1882)
63. Haley's Add. (1914)
64. Hardiman's Add. (1905)
65. Havelock (1906)
66. Herlen Court (1950)
67. Highland (1888)
68. Highland Park (1891)
69. Highland Place (1905)
70. Highland Schoolhouse Add. (1903)
71. Hill
72. Holladay's Add. (1925)
73. Homedale (1910)
74. Ina Park (1905)
75. Interstate Add. (1925)
76. Irvington (1912)
77. Irvington Heights (1890)
78. Irvington Park (1911)
79. John Brendle's Add. (1882)
80. John Irving's 1st Add. (1882)
81. Kenmore (1909)
82. Kenton (1908)
83. Kirkmar (1929)
84. Lahoma Add. (1920)
85. Lamonte (1912)  
86. Lesh (1891)  
87. Lester Park (1906)  
88. Lincoln Park (1889)  
89. Lincoln Park Annex (1891)  
90. Lochinvar Add. (1889)  
91. Love's Add. (1916)  
92. Loveleigh (1908)  
93. Lovewood (1928)  
94. Lowell (1910)  
95. Lyon's Add. (1907)  
96. Madrona (1907)  
97. Madrona View (1920)  
98. Maegly Highland (1888)  
99. Maegly Highland Add. (1891)  
100. Masters Add. (1892)  
101. Maxwell (1909)  
102. Minrose (1909)  
103. Mock Crest (1941)  
104. Multnomah (1883)  
105. Multnomah Park (1890)  
106. Murlark Add. (1907)  
107. National Add. (1910)  
108. New Market Row (1908)  
109. Nocera (1909)  
110. North Irvington (1902)  
111. North West Piedmont (1889)  
112. Northview (1912)  
113. Nut-Grove (1906)  
114. Oakhurst (1892)  
115. Orchard Place (1890)  
116. Overlook (1906)  
117. Pacific Place (1912)  
118. Park Add. (1882)  
119. Parkway (1914)  
120. Patton's 2nd Add. (1906)  
121. Patton's Add. (1906)  
122. Patton's Tract (1909)  
123. Peddicord and Hulbert's Add. (1907)  
124. Peninsular Add. (1890)  
125. Peninsular Add. No2 (1889)  
126. Peninsular Add. No3 (1889)  
127. Peninsular Add. No4 (1890)
128. Peninsular Add. No5 (1892)
129. Piedmont (1889)
130. Pittenger's Add. (1888)
131. Principle Add. (1919)
132. Proebstel's Add. (1881)
133. Railroad Shops Add. (1883)
134. Riverside Add. (1887)
135. Riverview Add. (1882)
136. Rosalind (1894)
137. Rose Add. (1917)
138. Rosedale (1889)
139. Roselawn (1891)
140. Roselawn Annex (1902)
141. Saratoga (1889)
142. Scenic Place (1906)
143. Scoffin's Add. (1889)
144. Serene Park (1905)
145. Shannon Kenali (1911)
146. Stransberry Add. (1892)
147. Sunderland Acres (1920)
148. Swinton (1908)
149. Terminus Add. (1883)
150. Terry St. (1912)
151. University Park (1891)
152. Vernon (1903)
153. Wait's Cloverdale Annex (1888)
154. Walnut Park (1904)
155. Washburne Add. (1926)
156. West Irvington (1890)
157. Wilburton (1908)
158. Wild Rose Add. (1898)
159. Williamette (1883)
160. Williams Ave. Add. (1901)
161. Williams Ave. Add. No2 (1902)
162. Woodlawn (1889)
163. Woodlawn Heights (1891)