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I. PROBLEMS, ISSUES, AND STRATEGIES
A. INTRODUCTION: THE COMMUNITY

AS KEY TO THE FUTURE

The Mayor and three City Commissioners were on hand to "kick off" the festivities. "This neighborhood has achieved a lot in the past 10 years," said the Mayor. "Congratulations are in order for all of you—residents, businesses, property owners, and everybody—who have worked together to solve your problems and decide on your own future. You have made your neighborhood and your city a better place."
The purpose of this report is to aid the Sullivan's Gulch neighborhood in planning for its future. The neighborhood is a diverse one, with a mix of land uses, ranging from residential to industrial. Residential densities range from single-family detached houses to high-rise apartments. There are many interests concerned with the future of Sullivan's Gulch: residents, businesses, the neighborhood association, property owners, and institutions. This report attempts to address the concerns of all these groups as, together, they are the neighborhood.

The diversity of Sullivan's Gulch lends a distinctive quality to the character of the neighborhood. The neighborhood is many things to many people; it provides a variety of living, shopping, and employment opportunities to a diverse population. Residents and others interested in the area have come to value the diversity of opportunity available in the neighborhood and the area.

There has been an increasing awareness and concern about current problems in the neighborhood, such as crime, and about the potential for development and change in the area: the Light Rail Transit system and the eventual development of vacant land, among other factors, will have an impact on the neighborhood.

Many are concerned that the current problems, coupled with the pressures for development and change, will result in deterioration of the character and quality of Sullivan's Gulch. There is a growing sentiment that measures should be taken to assure the preservation of that character and quality. Current problems must be solved and the inevitable development and change must be directed so as to be
beneficial to the neighborhood as a whole, including residents, businesses, institutions and property owners.

What follows is a discussion of issues important to the neighborhood. The five sections address development and change, public and recreational space, transportation, safety and security, and neighborhood organization. The last section, neighborhood organization, is key; ultimately, the future of the neighborhood rests within the neighborhood itself. The strategies developed in each section are recommendations for neighborhood action, since only by working together can problems be solved and the future be planned.

As resources shrink, neighborhoods must become more self-reliant, and must actively pursue their goals and objectives. Indeed, neighborhoods cannot do everything—they cannot re-zone property or build a freeway—but they can work with the appropriate individuals, agencies, and government bodies to bring about the desired objectives.

The critical element in achieving any solution, both to present and future problems, is community organization. The strategies recommended in this report are tools that, in addition to dealing with specific problems, will both require and foster neighborhood participation, by involving the many people and diverse interests in Sullivan's Gulch.

The effectiveness of each strategy cannot be predicted in absolute terms, although many of the strategies, such as the Block Watch program, have been successful in other neighborhoods; it is the people of Sullivan's Gulch, working together, who will determine the effectiveness of any strategy in their own neighborhood.
Each section is divided into several sub-sections:

—An issue statement that defines the problem or issue

—Findings, which summarize important information about the issue. (More detailed information on each issue is in Section II of this report.)

—Goals to be adopted by the neighborhood.

—Objectives and Strategies to achieve these goals.
A mini-park linking the Pedestrian Path with Lloyd Center is part of a residential complex on NE 16th and Wasco. Design guidelines developed by the neighborhood association and negotiation with the developer were the keys to obtaining the land for public use, said Spencer. The same process—using adopted design guidelines and negotiation with developers—has given the neighborhood a great deal of new development that blends in well with the older, single-family houses in the area. "We've had a lot of change here, and all these new apartment buildings and shops could have just ruined the character we've got in the neighborhood. Instead, we've still been able to have all the new things, but they fit in, and even make our neighborhood better," said Spencer.
As detailed in the Introduction, the diversity of land uses in Sullivan’s Gulch is one of its most distinctive characteristics. However, this diversity is being affected by economic forces, construction of the Banfield Light Rail system, a changing population, and a host of other development pressures. The potential for development and change is large.

In order to understand, develop, and direct policy, the diversity of land uses in the neighborhood must be addressed. The neighborhood can easily be divided into five distinct districts, delineated by zoning and Comprehensive Plan designations and, to some extent, current land uses. An evaluation by district allows problems and issues unique to each area to receive special consideration. The five areas are:

Area 1: the commercial strip along NE Broadway between 15th and 33rd Streets.
Area 2: the high-density multi-family residential area adjacent to Lloyd Center.
Area 3: the low-density multi-family residential area bounded by NE Broadway, the Banfield Freeway, 17th and 21st Streets.
Area 4: the attached single-family residential area between NE 21st and 28th Streets.
Area 5: the manufacturing and warehousing area, which forms most of the eastern and southern boundaries of the neighborhood.

(See Figure 1)

GOAL

Preserve, maintain and enhance the mixed use character of the neighborhood through an approach that guides and directs development and change for the overall benefit of its users, including but not limited to residents, businesses, institutions, commercial and manufacturing interests.
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Figure 1
ISSUE STATEMENT

Area 1 is a mixture of commercial and residential uses. The commercial uses on Broadway, while physically part of the neighborhood, are not neighborhood-oriented; they primarily serve those outside of Sullivan's Gulch. The residential properties fronting on Weidler are significantly affected by their proximity to the commercial properties: Traffic volumes are high, backyards abut the commercial properties, and there is a lack of aesthetic quality. These factors act as a disincentive for adequate maintenance of structures and overall beautification of the area, and contribute to the lack of cohesiveness in the area.
FINDINGS

—The half-blocks fronting on Broadway are zoned for C2, general commercial use. The half-blocks fronting on Weidler are zoned R2, low-density multi-family and R2.5, attached residential. These parcels are currently zoned to the maximum allowed by the Comprehensive Plan.

—There are more than 10,000 vehicle trips per day on Broadway and Weidler to 24th Street.

—Underdeveloped parcels are scattered throughout the area.

—The lack of pedestrian amenities and the volume and speed of traffic on Broadway and Weidler contribute to an unpleasant pedestrian environment.

GOAL

Promote this area to foster a renewed vitality. The diverse and mixed use quality of the area should be maintained by encouraging a smooth transition from the commercial uses on Broadway to the residential uses to the south. Traffic impacts should be minimized.

OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES

Objective 1: Encourage neighborhood-oriented mixed uses (residential and commercial) which are compatible with abutting properties and which blend with the neighborhood at large.

Strategy 1.1: Rezone the half-blocks fronting on Weidler between 17th and 28th to RH, high-density multi-family. The purpose of the RH zone, as defined by the Portland Zoning Code, is to provide for mid- to high-density apartment opportunities. Single lot development would not be significantly affected by this rezoning. Neighborhood commercial uses (C4) are allowed as part of development
in the RH zone if certain conditions are met. This zoning allows convenience retail and professional offices in residential areas. This zone would be particularly well suited to this area in that it is oriented to the pedestrian. Highly auto-oriented uses are not allowed.

Strategy 1.2: Encourage the location of "home occupations" to serve the immediate vicinity.

Objective 2: Provide a pleasant and safe living, shopping, and pedestrian environment through beautification and buffering elements.

Strategy 2.1: Landscape the area to reduce the noise and visual impacts of high traffic volumes. This might include widening sidewalks on Broadway and Weidler. The addition of landscaping elements such as street trees and street furniture, i.e., bus stops and benches, trash receptacles and water fountains, is also recommended.

Strategy 2.2: Investigate the possibility of providing a median strip down the center of Broadway. This would both beautify the boulevard and provide a safe refuge for the slower pedestrian crossing the street.
ISSUE STATEMENT

The area between 15th and 16th Streets and the streets themselves present a formidable barrier to the neighborhood. Lloyd Corporation development has not been particularly sensitive to the neighborhood on this edge. Paved, open parking lots lack any screening or landscaping. Visually, the neighborhood is isolated from the Lloyd Center. Concerns for safety when crossing this expanse contribute to the isolation. The development potential of these parcels could have substantial ramifications for the neighborhood in terms of the intensity of use, population and traffic.
FINDINGS

--The Zoning and Comprehensive Plan Map designations permit general and local commercial (C2 and C3) activities as well as high-density multi-family development (RH).

--Sullivan's Gulch, and Area 2 in particular, is strongly affected by traffic circulation patterns.

--15th and 16th Streets are currently identified as major traffic and transit streets by the Portland Arterial Street Classification Policy. Downgrading to neighborhood collector status has been proposed. Broadway and Weidler are also major traffic and transit streets.

--Area 2 is largely underdeveloped. Surface parking lots and vacant lots predominate. The area between 15th and 16th Streets and the streets themselves are a barrier between the neighborhood and Lloyd Center. The impression is one of a sea of asphalt, creating a poor pedestrian environment and an unattractive entryway into the neighborhood. There is little or no landscaping.

--The Lloyd Corporation owns a significant amount of land in this area.

--Holladay Park, the only public open space in the neighborhood, is in Area 2. However, this does not act as a neighborhood park. (See Section I (C), Public and Recreational Space.)

--The Lloyd Center Station of the Banfield Light Rail system will be in Area 2. (See Section I(D), Transportation.)

--A permit was issued in late 1980, to expire in two years, for construction of an office building just west of 21st and south of the properties fronting on Multnomah. The developers may
seek a one-year extension of the permit if they can show that circumstances have not changed.

Due to the development potential of the area, an increase in the intensity of use can be expected in the future. A rough estimate of potential development, assuming conformance to the Comprehensive Plan designations, is given below:

Densities are particularly affected by the Floor Area Ratios (FAR) assigned to the area. The FAR is a method used to determine the maximum gross floor area permitted for a building on a given site. For example, a full-block development with a FAR of 3:1 would be allowed to rise three stories. The illustration below shows the development potential of this area, assuming full-block development.

The area bounded by 15th, 16th, Broadway, and Holladay Streets is designated by the Comprehensive Plan for commercial use; currently, it is zoned for residential use. Development and re-development
is likely to occur in this area, with the exception of the existing apartment buildings, which will probably remain. There are approximately 11 blocks (200' x 200') of commercially-zoned land in area 2.

The C2 and C3 zones have no limitations on lot size or lot coverage. North of Multnomah, the FAR on most properties is 3:1. Maximum height is 45 feet or three stories, whichever is less. The allowable intensity of development is much greater south of Multnomah: Higher densities are permitted 400 feet or more from the residentially-zoned (R2) area, with a maximum FAR of 12:1 and maximum height of 250 feet. Thus, the potential exists for development of 540,000 square feet of commercial floor space north of Multnomah, and for development of 3,120,000 square feet of commercial floor space south of Multnomah.

The land between 16th and 17th Streets is currently zoned and designated by the Comprehensive Plan for RH, high-density multi-family development. There are approximately 10 blocks of developable land in this designation. The FAR is 4:1 and maximum lot coverage permitted is 80%, allowing about 1,280,000 square feet of floor area. About 20% of this will likely be required for service facilities, i.e., elevators, hallways, etc., leaving about 1,024,000 square feet for residential units. (The figure represents a very rough estimate.) Assuming a range of unit sizes from 700 square feet to 1,200 square feet, 853 to 1,462 new residential units might be built in this area.

Development at these intensities obviously is not certain; developers may choose to build less than the maximum allowed. However, these figures do give an indication of what is possible. What is clear is that increased residential and commercial activity
in this area is likely to result in increased through traffic on neighborhood streets if it is not properly directed.

GOAL

Encourage a transition between the high-intensity commercial development of Lloyd Center and the lower intensity of the residential area to diminish the barrier created by Area 2.

OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES

Objective 1: Encourage development of the area in a manner compatible with the overall character of the neighborhood, especially with the residential area to the west. The pedestrian environment should be a major focus.

Strategy 1.1: Establish on-going communication with the Lloyd Corporation and other developers with interests in the neighborhood. If developers are aware of specific needs and desires of the neighborhood, they can present proposals responsive to those needs and desires. Neighborhood residents cannot dictate how a particular piece of property should be developed, and cannot deny or grant building permits and land use applications. However, if a developer is cognizant of the special concerns of a near-by interest group, and if these concerns are not overly restrictive, the developer and the neighborhood may very well be able to work together towards mutually beneficial goals. This approach can be successful only if constant and repeated contact is made with the appropriate individuals. (Property ownership records available from the Tax Assessor's Office can be used to identify potential developers.) The developers must be made aware that the neighborhood is committed to and consistent about their goals.
**Strategy 1.2:** Development of design guidelines by the neighborhood.

Design of new development should be compatible with the scale and character of residentially-zoned areas to the east. Specific design guidelines should be developed by residents to provide direction and continuity to the neighborhood in its relations with potential developers. Design guidelines can address the height, scale, and placement of buildings and preferred amenities to directly benefit pedestrians, such as open space and street furniture. Guidelines should be developed with the pedestrian in mind to provide a link between the Lloyd Center and the residential neighborhood; the provision of open space through parks and plazas should be an integral part of the guidelines. Super-blocks, full block development, or a Planned Unit Development-type* approach to siting buildings can all provide the opportunity to address design issues in an innovative manner.

**Objective 2:** Soften the barrier presented by the area between 15th and 16th Streets and the streets themselves. This softening should also address the issues of beautification and safety.

**Strategy 2.1:** Develop a well-defined visual and pedestrian link between Lloyd Center and areas to the east. (See Section I(C), Public and Recreational Space.) Elements of this softening might include a median strip in the center of 15th and 16th Streets. Given the possible down-grading of these streets, this may be a practical solution. The median strip would provide landscaping sorely

---

* A Planned Unit Development allows waiving of traditional zoning regulations for a specific site. Housing units or commercial space can be clustered on part of a site to provide open space or other amenities available to the public.
needed in the area and would also offer a safe refuge for slower pedestrians crossing the streets. A flashing yellow light or a traffic signal activated by the pedestrian would help to provide this link; the existing painted crosswalk is insufficient.
ISSUE STATEMENT

In the future, the zoning of Area 3 will remain low-density multi-family in accordance with the Portland Comprehensive Plan. However, there has been pressure to re-designate some of this area for higher densities. There is no consensus on the possible impacts this re-designation might have. Some residents are apprehensive that high-density development on aggregated lots within this area will have a negative impact on the character of the neighborhood. There is an additional concern that this development will result in an increase of the traffic on residential streets.
FINDINGS

--This area is zoned R2 (low-density multi-family). The purpose of this zone is to provide opportunities for a variety of lower density housing types (other than single-family detached), while limiting the scale and intensity of new development to maintain compatibility with adjacent areas.

--The zoning and the Comprehensive Plan are at the same level.

--This area does not have a significantly greater proportion of apartment complexes than is presently in the rest of the neighborhood.

--The area contains a large elderly population.

--There are few vacant parcels in this area.

--The area is bordered by three major arterial streets: Weidler on the north, Multnomah on the south and 21st Avenue on the east.

--Landscaping is inconsistent. For example, street trees and shrubs on Wasco overhang and intrude on streets and sidewalks, while there is little or no landscaping on Multnomah.

GOAL

Ensure that the established character of the neighborhood will benefit from new residential development.

OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES

Objective 1: Minimize the impact of traffic generated by new development on residential streets.

Strategy 1.1: Require new development to provide adequate off-street parking.

Objective 2: Provide the neighborhood with the means for evaluating the impact of the development of new housing opportunities on the established residential character of the neighborhood.
Strategy 2.1: Develop a program of neighborhood workshops with the Bureau of Planning and others to educate residents. Discuss alternatives to conventional low-density multi-family housing. Present case study information on what has been done in other neighborhoods and the impact. Educate as to the positive impacts of the R2 zone (e.g. affordable housing for first-time homeowners, manageable/affordable housing for the elderly, opportunities for energy conservation).

Strategy 2.2: Work with an architect to design alternative multi-family housing that will be in keeping with established character of the neighborhood.

Objective 3: Encourage consistent landscaping in the neighborhood to promote beautification and safety.

Strategy 3.1: Develop a vegetation maintenance program. Organize work parties to prune overgrown street trees and shrubs to increase the accessibility of the sidewalks and allow more sunlight during the day and street light during the night to reach the ground. This program should be developed in conjunction with an annual neighborhood clean-up campaign.

Strategy 3.2: Develop a street landscaping program to improve those streets where there is no landscaping. This would include the planting of street trees and shrubs. (For assistance, contact the City of Portland Street Tree Division.)
In the future, the zoning of Area 4 will remain R2.5 (attached residential) in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan. However, concern has been expressed about preservation of the single-family character of the neighborhood, and some apprehension exists over the possibility that this character will be compromised by insensitive design of row-houses and town-houses. In addition, there is some concern that higher-density development will add to traffic congestion on residential streets.

There is no public open space in this area.
FINDINGS

--This area is zoned R2.5 (attached residential). The purpose of this zone is to allow a high density form of single family residential that takes advantage of the energy and cost saving potential of common wall construction and small lot size, while providing that such homes will have private outdoor space and maintain the single-family character of residential neighborhoods.

--The zoning and the Comprehensive Plan are at the same level.

--The area is primarily comprised of older single-family homes.

--There is heavy traffic on the streets bordering all four sides of this area resulting in high traffic volumes.

--There are few vacant parcels of land in this area.

--There is no public open space in this area.

--Landscaping is inconsistent.

GOAL

Enhance and improve the residential character of the area.

OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES

Objective 1: Provide the neighborhood with a mechanism for ensuring that new development is compatible with the single family character of the neighborhood.

Strategy 1.1: Develop a program to educate the neighborhood (See discussion of Area 3, Strategy 2.1).

Strategy 1.2: Initiate a program of cooperation within the neighborhood aimed at jointly directing future development. Working in a group comprised of residents, non-resident property owners, large and small business concerns, developers and corporations, develop neighborhood Design Standards.
**Objective 2:** Provide for a diversity of opportunities to enjoy the neighborhood environment.

**Strategy 2.1:** Develop a pedestrian path (See Section I(C), Public and Recreational Space).

**Strategy 2.2:** Develop a neighborhood park (See Section I(C)).

**Strategy 2.3:** Investigate alternative street designs in order to more efficiently meet on-street parking needs (See Section I(D), Transportation).

**Strategy 2.4:** Develop a neighborhood clean-up/vegetation maintenance program (See discussion of Area 3, Strategy 3.1).

**Strategy 2.5:** Develop a street tree, street shrub planting program (See discussion of Area 3, Strategy 3.2).
ISSUE STATEMENT

Most of this area is zoned for heavy (M1) or general manufacturing (M2) uses; most of the land is either vacant or in light industrial and warehouse use. By and large, neighborhood residents have come to coexist peacefully with these activities. However, there is concern that should this area change in ownership or use, there could be extremely adverse impacts on the adjacent residential area. The zoning would permit much more intense uses than currently exist; most of those uses would not be compatible with the residential area.
FINDINGS

—The zoning in this area is predominantly M1 and M2 (heavy manufacturing and general manufacturing). The purpose of these zones is to provide opportunities for increased manufacturing activities and to protect these activities against intrusion of non-manufacturing uses. The allowable intensity of use within the M1 zone is extreme.

—For the M1 and M2 zones, the zoning and Comprehensive Plan are at the same level.

—A small portion of this area is zoned RI (medium-density multi-family).

—The RI zone within this area has a Comprehensive Plan designation of M3 (light manufacturing). The M3 zone permits light industrial, residential and commercial uses.

—Small portions of this area along 28th Avenue are zoned C2 and C4 (neighborhood commercial).

—For the C2 and C4 zones the zoning and the Comprehensive Plan are at the same level.

—There are large parcels of vacant land in the gulch.

—There are three major property owners in this area: Hyster, Weston and Arnston. However, Hyster may close its plant (See Appendix).

—Truck traffic from Hyster does not have a severe impact on the rest of the neighborhood. They presently enter the Hyster complex along 30th and 32nd Avenues.

—Access to the warehousing below Multnomah is primarily from the south side of the Banfield Freeway.

—There is no public open space in this area.
GOAL

Preserve the compatibility of the manufacturing-warehousing uses with the residential uses. Preserve the mixed-use character of the neighborhood by encouraging existing manufacturing activities in this area to remain.

OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES

Objective 1: Ensure that traffic generated by manufacturing-warehousing uses has a minimal impact on the residential area.

Strategy 1.1: Establish on-going communication with the manufacturing-warehousing activities to discuss possible alternative solutions to dealing with traffic congestion problems. For example, stagger shifts at Hyster to reduce rush hour traffic, ride-sharing to reduce automobile congestion, a bus-fare subsidy program to reduce automobile dependency.

Strategy 1.2: Redirect truck traffic to avoid affecting the residential area. For example, identify an alternative to Multnomah Street for a western access to the manufacturing-warehousing activities in the gulch. (Also see Section I(D), Transportation.)

Objective 2: Explore alternatives to M1 and M2 zoning east of 28th.

These designations are restrictive in that they do not allow non-manufacturing uses. This is contrary to the mixed-use emphasis of the neighborhood. In addition, many of the uses permitted in the M1 zone are too intense to be compatible with adjacent residential uses.

Strategy 2.1: Investigate the possibility of rezoning this area M3. Within this zone single-family houses, duplexes, attached housing, and low- and medium-density apartments are permitted, as are general commercial activities, labor intensive industry, light
manufacturing, warehousing and distribution. M3 zoning would not preclude the uses that currently exist in this area.

**Strategy 2.2:** If rezoning to M3 is not practical, investigate the possibility of rezoning the M1 area M2. The purpose of the M2 zone is similar to that of the M1 zone in protecting against the intrusion of non-manufacturing uses. It does, however, allow certain commercial and residential uses which the M1 zone does not. M2 uses are less intense than M1 uses, and so more compatible with the residential area.

**Objective 3:** Encourage an atmosphere of cooperation between the residential area and the manufacturing-warehousing area.

**Strategy 3.1:** Develop a Neighborhood Watch program to protect against vandalism occurring within manufacturing and warehousing properties.

**Strategy 3.2:** Construct a landscaped berm along the east side of 28th at the corner of Halsey. This would provide much-needed landscaping and also protect the Hyster property from damage caused by automobiles missing the turn at Halsey and 28th.

**Strategy 3.3:** Develop a park (See Section I (C), Public and Recreational Space).
A "Gift Catalogue" was used to raise money and materials for the small park, completed last month, and for beautification of the Pedestrian Path—a network of safe, pleasant streets to walk along. Items in the Catalogue, ranging from benches to grass seed, were donated or purchased with donated funds.

"The businesses and corporations in the area, along with private citizens, really pitched in to buy out the Catalogue," said Spencer. Several annual events, including Neighbor Day, will raise funds for maintenance of the new park and the Pedestrian Path.
ISSUE STATEMENT

There is no public recreational or open space in Sullivan's Gulch; no common ground for people to gather socially and therefore no place for people to meet and develop a sense of belonging to their neighborhood. Vacant land suitable for a community park is at a premium, and generally owned by corporations with an eye toward future development. Planning for and locating public recreational space will require creativity, time and money, but the process and product will benefit the neighborhood.

FINDINGS

Holladay Park, the "designated" park for Sullivan's Gulch, is in the extreme southwest corner of the neighborhood. Access to Holladay Park for neighborhood residents is restricted. Fifteenth and 16th Streets are heavily travelled (5,000-10,000 vehicles/day) and act as barriers between the neighborhood and the park. The park itself is essentially walled off from residents by Lloyd Corporation property on the west, the future Light Rail transit station on the south, the GSA building on the east and Lloyd Center on the north. In addition, the creation of the light rail station in the park and associated design changes will reduce its value for neighborhood use. Realistically, Holladay Park does not serve the neighborhood as a community park.

The creation of parks or recreational space was one of the major issues identified at the Neighborhood Workshop. The telephone survey of neighborhood residents found that 67% of the respondents would use a park if it were available, 54% would utilize places...
to sit, 46% would utilize arts and crafts facilities, 43% would use a swimming pool and 42% would use places to jog.

--Vacant land that is available and/or suitable for a park is scarce. Such land is privately owned, generally by large corporations (Lloyd/Weston/Hyster) and more than likely scheduled for future commercial development.

--There are few if any pedestrian amenities in Sullivan's Gulch, i.e., fountains, bus shelters, kiosks.

--Large vacant parcels on the southern boundary of Area 5 are steeply sloped. They could be terraced, but noise from the Banfield Freeway would be unpleasant and disruptive. In addition, exhaust fumes from cars on the Freeway would be detrimental to health, especially for those exercising.

--The City does not have funds to acquire or maintain any new parks. The City's reluctance to accept operation and maintenance of parks less than two acres in size directly affects this neighborhood.

--An innovative, thoughtful approach is required to provide recreational and open-space opportunities for Sullivan's Gulch.

GOAL

Create a liveable environment for neighborhood residents through the creation of public recreational and open space. Attainment of the goal will serve to pull the community together; provide places to meet and socialize for all ages; provide play areas for children, safe from the dangers of traffic; possibly provide garden space for apartment dwellers and identify a safe route for pedestrian traffic.

OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES

Planning for and implementation of this goal will require considerable effort by neighborhood residents on three levels; design and siting,
funding, and the acquisition of property. What follows are the objectives and strategies for meeting this goal. The objectives are not exclusive and sequential, but will need to be worked on concurrently with one another, i.e., land procurement and funding. Therefore, the initial step should be formation of a parks planning committee to work with residents, businesses, corporations and government agencies.

In addition to the design, funding and acquisition of property, the parks committee will have to choose management strategies for the recreational spaces and determine who will be responsible for maintenance of these spaces.

**Objective 1:** Identify land available and suitable for recreational and open space in the neighborhood. Provide recreational spaces throughout the neighborhood for the various segments of the neighborhood population. There exists an immediate need for recreational space. For this reason a short-term approach for the location of these spaces is presented below. Most of the strategies suggest obtaining the permission of the various property owners for the use of land currently vacant or unused. Specific details with regard to the duration of use, maintenance responsibilities and conditions will need to be addressed. Eventually, a long term solution can be pursued for donation or purchase of these or more suitable properties.

**Strategy 1.1:** Using the vacant land map and ownership data (provided in Section II), identify potential parcels available to the neighborhood. Once identified, the appropriate property owners can then be approached with specific proposal. (Some potential parcels are identified in Strategies 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, and 1.7,)
Strategy 1.2: Walk through potential sites to determine what types of activities would be suitable at the specific location.

Strategy 1.3: Meet with the Bureau of Parks, Bureau of Streets, and Office of Housing and Community Development to determine available resources and constraints.

Strategy 1.4: Locate a "vest pocket" or mini park with the senior resident in mind. For example, the Lloyd Corporation owns a vacant lot at the southwest corner of 17th and Wasco (See Figure 2). The lot could provide an excellent outdoor area for the residents of Holladay Park Plaza and the Fontaine. Lloyd Corporation should be approached with a proposal for temporary use of the vacant parcel in order to establish a "senior" park. Temporary park furniture, benches, flower basins, checkerboards, etc., could be located on the site. The possibility of permanently securing this property through donation or purchase should be investigated.

Strategy 1.5: Provide activity space for teens and adults. A parking lot at the northeast corner of 17th and Wasco (See Figure 2) appears to be under-utilized as a parking lot. The owners might be approached with the idea of surrendering part of this lot for neighborhood activities. Basketball court markings could be painted on the pavement and a net erected at one end. Volleyball games might also be a possibility here. This lot would also be an excellent space for auctions or sales.

Hyster owns vacant property on 28th between Weidler and Halsey (see Figure 2). Currently, this grassy area is fenced to prevent vandalism. Hyster should be approached by the park committee with a proposal for use of this space. The fence could be pulled back to allow access to the field while still maintaining the necessary security.
Strategy 1.6: The possibility of closing part of a street should be investigated as another method for providing open space. A half-block segment on 27th Street, south of Wasco, could be such an opportunity (see Figure 2). Another variation on the street/park theme is the Play Street concept. Portland's Arterial Street Classification Policy states that:

"A Play Street is intended to provide for non-transportation uses of a Local Service Street. A Play Street should be designated in accordance with the Neighborhood Traffic Control Program, for closure, either permanent or for specific limited periods of time. A Play Street should be closed in such a manner as to provide necessary access to abutting properties and for emergency vehicles."

Strategy 1.7: Provide a vest pocket or mini-park, safe for small children. A vacant lot on Multnomah between 21st and 22nd (See Figure 2) may be appropriate for a "tot" lot. The lot is centrally located and is set back from the street. There already exists a mature hedge and tree on this grassy lot. Benches, a sand box, a water fountain and play equipment could all be secured for the site on either a temporary or permanent basis. Play equipment need not be elaborate, perhaps some old tires, pipes or even an old tractor for climbing might be donated by Hyster. The possibility of procuring the site on a permanent basis should be investigated as well as possible expansion to the south.

Objective 2: Raise funds for recreational and open space.

Strategy 2.1: Investigate forming a non-profit, tax-exempt organization to receive tax-deductible contributions of cash, land or materials. (See Section I (F), Neighborhood Organization.)

Strategy 2.2: Plan fundraising events to generate money for the non-profit organization or public agency. (See Section I (F))

Strategy 2.3: Solicit contributions from neighborhood businesses and residents as well as those in the larger community.
Strategy 2.4: Publish a gift catalogue. A gift catalogue is a portfolio that identifies specific recreation items that individuals, organizations, businesses or corporations can "buy" for the neighborhood. This list may include specific items such as park benches, water fountains, trees, etc. It may also identify specific cash needs and/or "donated service" possibilities. Not only does the community as a whole become familiar and sensitive to their own needs through the catalogue, but it provides a ready "wish list."

Strategy 2.5: Investigate forming a Local Improvement District.
(See Section I (E), Strategy 3.6)

Strategy 2.6: Contact the Bureau of Parks to obtain information on funds available for operation/maintenance, or information on the projected costs of operation/maintenance if the neighborhood identifies other funding sources.

Strategy 2.7: Contact the Housing and Community Development office to attempt to renegotiate funding on the basis of Holladay Park not being available to neighborhood residents.

Contacts/Resources:

1. Trust for Public Land
   Room 2, Box 37A
   Burton, Washington
   (206) 463-3636
   OR
   82 Second Street
   San Francisco, CA 94105
   (415) 495-4014

   Their National Urban Land Program helps neighborhoods organize around recreational land acquisition and development.

2. The Heritage Conservation and Recreational Service
   440 G Street NW
   Washington, D.C. 20243

   Their Private Sector Involvement Workbook provides detailed information on community organizing, fundraising, and gifts catalogues

3. The Oregon Parks Foundation, Inc. (Larry Espey, Coordinator)
   297-6043

   They can help formulate funding strategies
Objective 3: Develop a Pedestrian Pathway. The Pedestrian Pathway has two main purposes: 1) to provide a recreational opportunity for the neighborhood and 2) to designate a safe, secure and pleasant route for circulation within the neighborhood and to points outside. The Pathway is a recreational element in and of itself. It can also be part of a larger scheme, whereby small parks (see Objective 4), scattered throughout the neighborhood, are linked by the Path network. The Pathway can unite the neighborhood, encourage pedestrian activity, and provide aesthetic benefits to the area.

Strategy 3.1: Designate a route for the Pedestrian Pathway. One possible route is shown in Figure 2. This route was chosen for several reasons:

--It is intended to provide connections and access to specific points such as the higher population concentrations throughout the area, potential park sites, bus stops, schools (See Figure 3), Lloyd Center, Hyster and the shops on Broadway.

--The condition of the sidewalks, location of curb cuts and the overall attractiveness of specific streets/blocks/housing was generally good.

Strategy 3.2: Design special treatment for the Pedestrian Path and parks. This treatment would include the provision of pedestrian amenities. Street furniture such as park benches, permanent checker boards, trash receptacles, water fountains, kiosks, and bus shelters could be located along the length of the Pathway. Sidewalks might be widened on some blocks or realigned to provide larger grass areas in the public right-of-way. Crosswalks should be painted wherever the path crosses an intersection. This will
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add to pedestrians' feelings of safety and will also help delineate the designated route. Signing the route, for purposes of identification, is also suggested. (An example is the Portland Scenic Drive system, where signs identify a chosen scenic auto route.) The neighborhood could devise their own logo or name for these signs. (Perhaps the parks planning committee could sponsor a neighborhood contest for the naming of the Pathway.)

Strategy 3.3: Use the City tree planting program to enhance the pathway and the neighborhood as a whole.

Objective 4: Locate and provide community garden space for apartment residents.

Strategy 4.1: Negotiate with owners of vacant lots for temporary use of that land for community gardens.

Strategy 4.2: Test soil for lead or other toxic substances residual in the soil from old buildings/paints/pipes. (The State will do this for free.)

Strategy 4.3: Plan a neighborhood meeting solely around this issue, hopefully pulling renters and the elderly into the neighborhood association.

Objective 5: Provide a community center.

Strategy 5.1: A vacant warehouse could provide an excellent location for a community center. Arts and crafts, education, book-lending, indoor volleyball, tennis and swimming are all possible activities. There are a number of options for structuring and organizing the center. The center might be run as a cooperative. Volunteers would be responsible for staffing and management. (To investigate this approach, contact other co-ops—the Food Front in northwest Portland is one. Other approaches may be investigated by contacting the Northwest Service Center at 228-6972. Vancouver, B.C. also has a community center network.)
Other signs of change are also visible in Sullivan's Gulch, according to Spencer. "More pedestrians use the streets now, and there's a lot less traffic roaring through the area." She attributes the improvements to increased residential development, both multi-family and row houses, and traffic diverters and chokers, which narrow streets to discourage traffic.
ISSUE STATEMENT

High volumes of traffic on residential streets is a serious concern in Sullivan's Gulch. Residents feel the increasing volumes and speeds of vehicles passing through the neighborhood are fostering an unsafe environment. The location and effects of heavily traveled streets act as a disincentive to neighborhood cohesion; certain streets are barriers which pedestrians are reluctant to cross. In addition, land use and development patterns are affected.

FINDINGS

--Sullivan's Gulch is bordered and bisected by a number of heavily traveled streets: Broadway, Weidler, Halsey, 15th, 16th, 21st, and Multnomah to 21st and 28th.
--When compared to the city as a whole, the neighborhood's minor traffic streets have higher than average traffic volumes.
--Light Rail construction will cause permanent closure of Holladay Way, temporary closure of the 28th Avenue bridge (two years), and narrowing of the 21st Avenue bridge from four to two lanes (two years).
--The neighborhood will be affected by the street closures; traffic volumes are likely to increase on Multnomah, 21st and other neighborhood streets.
--There is a lack of up-to-date traffic volume counts on neighborhood streets.
--Neighborhood Need Reports submitted in the past four years focus on the issue of traffic volumes and speeds on residential streets.
--The City of Portland's Traffic Bureau does not feel there is a problem in this neighborhood. Specifically, they feel that
volumes and speeds are not excessive and therefore no action is needed.

--Many residential streets in the neighborhood are narrow.

--Some of the residences and businesses do not have off-street parking.

--Residents feel that speed limits are not observed or enforced.

--The speeds and volume of vehicles on 21st Street act as a barrier, dividing the neighborhood.

--More curb cuts and crosswalks are needed throughout the neighborhood.

--Increased development may exacerbate traffic problems.

--Downgrading 15th and 16th Streets to neighborhood collector status has been proposed the Arterial Streets Classification Policy update.

--The telephone survey of residents found that traffic noise is a concern of some residents.

**GOAL**

*Lessen the impact of traffic on the neighborhood.*

**OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES**

**Objective 1:** Obtain up-to-date traffic volume and speed data to address both short- and long-term problems. Traffic counts should be taken on east-west as well as north-south streets. Special attention should be directed toward Multnomah to monitor impacts of Light Rail and its surrounding development.

**Strategy 1.1:** Persuade the Traffic Bureau to take traffic counts throughout the neighborhood for peak traffic flow as well as average daily flow. The counts should be taken as soon as possible. Repeated contacts and requests will be necessary to persuade the
Traffic Bureau. Contacting the Commissioner in charge of the Bureau may be effective.

**Strategy 1.2:** If the neighborhood is unable to persuade the Traffic Bureau to take the counts, residents may take the counts themselves. Since careful methods must be used to give the counts credibility outside the neighborhood, the neighborhood should:

- Ask a professional (planner, traffic consultant, etc.) to advise them on appropriate methods,
- Apply for a technical assistance grant from the Office of Neighborhood Associations or a private foundation to hire such a professional, or
- Talk with other neighborhood associations that have collected their own traffic data (The Office of Neighborhood Associations may know which neighborhoods have done this).

**Objective 2:** Monitor the effects of Light Rail and where appropriate, take steps to alleviate problems. A short-term emphasis is recommended to address congestion and increases in speed and volume caused by street closures.

**Strategy 2.1:** Ask the Portland Planning Bureau's Transportation Department to perform a neighborhood-wide traffic study to assess the short- and long-range effects of Light Rail. This would be more comprehensive than taking traffic counts.

**Strategy 2.2:** Investigate the possibility of placing temporary barriers at strategic locations to discourage use of neighborhood streets by through traffic. The street closures will frustrate motorists, which may result in attempts to find short cuts through the residential neighborhood, higher speeds and careless driving. Consider
designating certain streets as major collectors during construction, e.g., Multnomah and 28th, to reduce through traffic on all residential streets during Light Rail construction period.

**Strategy 2.3:** Request police patrols to monitor and enforce speed limits and to assure that if temporary barriers are erected, they are not abused.

**Strategy 2.4:** Investigate the possibility of adjusting the traffic signal at Multnomah and 21st to alleviate congestion caused by the narrowed bridge. Changing the signal from "two-way" to "four-way" (i.e., only eastbound traffic could travel through the intersection, then only northbound, etc.) might be one solution; right- and left-turn lanes (with or without traffic signal arrows) might be another.

**Objective 3:** Create a formal mechanism for on-going participation in planning and monitoring of the Light Rail system. While Objectives 1 and 2 recommend strategies to identify and alleviate specific problems, there should also be a recognized mechanism for communication and exchange of information with Tri-Met, city bureaus, and developers.

**Strategy 3.1:** Appoint a person or committee as the "official contact" for Light Rail. A representative from the committee should attend the monthly meetings of Tri-Met's Banfield Light Rail Citizens Forum, and should explore the possibility of establishing a committee representing only the neighborhoods surrounding the Lloyd Center Light Rail station.

Contacts: Sharon Mainzer, Tri-Met Community Relations Specialist; 238-5836. (She is responsible for the Citizens' Forum)
Objectives 4: Encourage residential use and control of streets with the emphasis on increased liveability. Emphasize pedestrian use of the street and sidewalk as opposed to the predominant auto orientation.

Strategy 4.1: Discourage use of residential streets by through traffic. There are a number of options for reducing the easy flow of traffic.

--Installation of stop signs is a relatively inexpensive and accepted approach. Numerous stops effectively reduce overall speed and inconvenience through traffic, making other routes more attractive to the motorist.

--Reduction of speed limits, if enforced, can discourage traffic.

--Signs prohibiting turns can also be effective.

--Installation of temporary or permanent barriers or diverters can divert or bar traffic from a particular route. The flow and direction of traffic can be controlled through the placement of such devices. A semi-diverter is a physical barrier permitting travel in one direction only. Diverters are usually placed diagonally across four-way intersections, turning a grid system into loops and cul-de-sacs.

Other options include:

--Barriers, placed close to an intersection, allow auto access at only one end of a block. Barriers can be temporary wooden sawhorses, simple planting areas, or even small playgrounds. (See Figure 4)
Chokers narrow a street, reducing traffic flow. Permanent chokers are somewhat expensive as they require reconstruction of sidewalks and drainage facilities. However, they provide many benefits; if placed at an intersection, pedestrian travel is easier as streets are narrowed and sidewalks are expanded. If placed at mid-block, places to play or sit become available. One-way routing of traffic and alternative parking schemes are often used with chokers. They can enhance the aesthetic quality of a street. (See Figure 4)

A mid-block park allows traffic to enter from both ends of the block, but not travel through.

Other options are discussed in Section I (C), Public and Recreational Space.

Objective 5: Increase pedestrian safety.

Strategy 5.1: Install curb cuts (wheelchair ramps) at intersections. Those along the Pedestrian Path (See Section I (C)) and in areas with high population concentrations should be given priority.

Strategy 5.2: Paint crosswalks at intersections. Install "Crosswalk Ahead" signs at mid-block and flashing signs above crosswalks.

Strategy 5.3: Install elevated crosswalks, where the street is elevated to curb level at intersections. The effect is similar to that of a curb cut, and also provides a "speed bump" to slow traffic.

Strategy 5.4: Adjust the timing of traffic signals to allow sufficient time for pedestrians to cross busy streets.

Strategy 5.5: Install "demand signals," where the pedestrian presses a button to change the traffic signal.

Strategy 5.6: Install median strips. (See Section I (B), Change and Development, discussion of Area 2)

Strategy 5.7: Institute a program of neighborhood policing where
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license plates of speeding cars are recorded and reported to the Police Bureau.

Objective 6: Divert truck traffic from residential streets.

Strategy 6.1: Post signs prohibiting trucks over a certain tonnage.

Strategy 6.2: If warehousing activities continue to develop south of Multnomah, investigate the possibility of constructing a new road to divert truck traffic from Multnomah. One possible route would enter from the southwest corner of the neighborhood near 16th Drive.

Objective 7: Conduct a comprehensive traffic study in the neighborhood and formulate a long-range plan for traffic circulation.

Strategy 7.1: Contact the Transportation Section of the Portland Bureau of Planning to request the study and plan.

Strategy 7.2: Conduct a private study. (See Strategy 1.2 for sources of technical assistance.)

Strategy 7.3: Approach the School of Urban and Public Affairs at Portland State University about graduate planning students undertaking the study and plan as a class project.

Objective 8: Monitor new development to ensure that it does not negatively affect traffic patterns and the residential quality of the neighborhood.

Strategy 8.1: Analyze proposed access points from new development.

Recommend that access be directed away from sensitive or congested streets whenever possible.

Strategy 8.2: Review proposed development plans to assure provision of adequate off-street parking.
Crime was the first problem tackled by the "energized and expanded" neighborhood association in 1983, said Spencer. Community education sessions are held each month. Projects such as PLOT (Porch Lights On Tonight) and tree trimming to increase street lighting efficiency have been effective in making the streets brighter and safer at night. The Block Watch program has expanded throughout the neighborhood, spurred by the success of the program—crime rates have continued to drop as more blocks participate in the program.

Teenagers distribute newsletters about the projects and operate an escort service for elderly residents apprehensive about walking alone in the neighborhood. Teenagers also serve on the neighborhood association's committee on juvenile activities.
ISSUE STATEMENT

Crime is a significant problem in Sullivan's Gulch in terms of both actual crimes and residents' perceptions. Residents' fears are evidenced by reduced social activities and little pedestrian traffic after dark. This contributes to the lack of cohesiveness in the neighborhood and may in itself make the neighborhood more vulnerable to crime. Crime prevention comes not so much from police intervention as from establishment of a vital community in which all regular users of the streets recognize that they constitute the community, and are prepared to become personally involved.

FINDINGS

--Sullivan's Gulch has a higher crime rate (crimes per 1000 population) than the city as a whole or the Outer Northeast District.

--Although the number of crimes is similar both east and west of NE 21st, the crime rate is higher to the west because the population is smaller.

--In the telephone survey of neighborhood residents, 27% of the respondents said crime was one of the three things they disliked most about the neighborhood. While 71% of the respondents said they feel "safe" or "very safe" while walking in their neighborhood during the day, only 22% report similar feelings of safety when walking after dark. Twenty percent say they feel only "somewhat safe" after dark. Eighteen percent report feeling "unsafe" or "very unsafe," and 40% say they do not go out at all after dark.
"More crime patrols" was identified as the third most important issue at the Neighborhood Workshop.

Research done in 1972 on crime in Portland found that most crimes occurred between 9 p.m. and midnight, followed by midnight to 3 a.m., and then 3 a.m. to 6 a.m. The same study found that most crimes occur in the street. The second most frequent location of crimes is residences, followed by businesses, including taverns.

GOAL

Reduce crime in Sullivan's Gulch and provide neighborhood residents with a sense of safety and security in their neighborhood.

OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES

Objective 1: Educate the community on crime and crime prevention


Strategy 1.2: Institute a crime education program involving speakers and discussion at monthly meetings. A format is suggested below:

MONTH 1

TOPIC: The Block Watch program
RESOURCES: Neighborhoods Against Crime (248-4763)
Block Home Program (346-6760), Frances Potter
OUTCOME: List of names of individuals willing to sponsor block meetings to set up block program.

MONTH 2

TOPIC: Crime on the streets of Sullivan's Gulch
RESOURCES: East Precinct, Portland Police Bureau (248-5696)
Crime Prevention Unit—crimes against the elderly (248-4226, Jim Nelson)
Downtown Community Association—escort service (223-9949, Jessica Richman)
OUTCOME: Set up self-defense program, identify people interested in developing an "escort program"
MONTH 3

TOPIC: Crime in the home
RESOURCES: Crime Prevention Unit (248-4126)
East Precinct (248-5696)
OUTCOME: Schedule loaning of electric engraver.
Schedule individual home security surveys.
Develop a Lock Installation Program.

MONTH 4

TOPIC: Crime deterrence through community organization
RESOURCES: Representatives from other neighborhood organizations
which have been successful in organizing, i.e.,
Buckman, Northwest District Association
OUTCOME: Scheduling community events to draw neighbors together
(see Section I(F), Neighborhood Organization)

MONTH 5

TOPIC: Crime deterrence through environmental design
RESOURCES: Neighborhoods Against Crime (248-4763)
OUTCOMES: Street illumination program, tree trimming program,
park program

MONTH 6

TOPIC: Family violence
RESOURCES: Child Abuse Program (238-7555)
Domestic Violence Program (235-5333)
OUTCOME: Family assistance program (See Objective 6)

MONTH 7

TOPIC: Juvenile crimes
RESOURCES: Gerry Blake, Portland State University (229-4043)
OUTCOME: Teen program (See Objective 5)

MONTH 8

TOPIC: Evaluating and setting priorities
OUTCOME: Establish a time frame to address the problems,
and identify people to take responsibility for
coordinating the activities; establishing topics
for future educational programs.

Someone should take notes on each of the sessions to be
put in the newsletter, hopefully drawing more people to
subsequent sessions.

Funding for educational program

While most of the resource people are from the City or are
volunteers, individual businesses or corporations may
sponsor sessions to cover the cost of flyers, refreshments,
advertising, etc.
Objective 2: Develop a Block Watch program

Strategy 2.1: Devote one of the educational sessions to the topic of Block Homes and identify those who are willing to hold a block meeting in their home.

Strategy 2.2: Organize one block for the program to get an idea of how much time it takes to establish each block. Then develop a schedule designed to organize every block by a given date.

Objective 3: Increase illumination of neighborhood streets.

Strategy 3.1: Porch light program: Initiate turning on porch lights through the educational program and the newsletter. Incorporate the porch light program into the Block Watch program.

Strategy 3.2: Trim overhanging trees that block streetlights.

Strategy 3.3: Identify streets without street lights, and compile data on the necessity for street lights under the City Emergency Street Light Program. To initiate this process, contact the Bureau of Streets (796-7196) to have a representative come to a neighborhood meeting.

Strategy 3.4: Request additional street lights through the Neighborhood Need Reports.

Strategy 3.5: Raise funds to purchase street lights. Each light costs approximately $750. After the neighborhood pays for installation, the City will maintain the lights.

Strategy 3.6: Investigate forming a Local Improvement District (LID) to purchase street lights. A minimum of 10 lights must be purchased, at an approximate minimum cost of $750 per light. Owners of 51% of the property in the neighborhood must sign a petition asking for the LID, and the costs are paid by property owners through a temporary increase in their tax assessments.
Objective 4: Establish an emergency communications system

Strategy 4.1: Within the Block Watch program, have neighbor systems for contacting each other to get or provide help in emergencies; a list of phone numbers and special skills (a neighbor knows CPR) may suffice.

Strategy 4.2: Publish a map in the newsletter showing the locations of police and fire call boxes, along with an article on the call boxes and the 911 emergency system.

Strategy 4.3: Request call boxes for areas without them. (Police 248-5600, Fire: 248-4375)

Strategy 4.4: Work with the Police and Fire Bureaus to have call boxes placed closer to the ground, where children and those in wheelchairs can reach them.

Objective 5: Reduce juvenile crime.

Strategy 5.1: Organize juvenile recreation programs.

Strategy 5.2: Work with churches and/or businesses to set up programs for educational programs (e.g., skilled retirees teaching plumbers, carpentry, etc.) in a coffee house, or counseling program.

Strategy 5.3: Develop a program to involve teenagers in rehabilitation of abandoned houses in the neighborhood. (Elliot neighborhood has a similar program)

Strategy 5.4: Develop employment opportunities for teenagers. Make donations from businesses and residents, pay teens to distribute newsletters, trim trees, and so on.

Strategy 5.5: Develop a program where teenagers assist the elderly or disabled with housework, shopping, etc. (Contact Jerry Bla)
Strategy 5.6: Establish a committee of adults and teenagers to plan and coordinate these activities. Involving teenagers from the start will help ensure success.

Objective 6: Develop an awareness of the problem of family violence, methods of prevention and identification of avenues for intervention.

Strategy 6.1: Devote one of the educational sessions to the topic of family violence.

Strategy 6.2: Include articles on family violence in the neighborhood newsletter.

Strategy 6.3: Discuss the issue at neighborhood meetings.

Strategy 6.4: Develop a family assistance program which could include child care programs and/or a grandparent program.

Objective 7: Develop programs to deal with abandoned and dilapidated buildings, and neighborhood litter.

Strategy 7.1: Provide the Bureau of Buildings with the addresses of abandoned houses, and encourage the Bureau to enforce the Abandoned Housing Ordinance.

Strategy 7.2: Rehabilitate buildings, using teenagers (See Strategy 5.3). Contact the Portland Development Commission for information on other rehabilitation programs.

Strategy 7.3: Sponsor a neighborhood clean-up day. Organize people to help neighbors who are unable to pick up or transport their own trash.

Objective 8: Collect neighborhood data. The City's methods of collecting and aggregating data are not always suitable to the needs of specific neighborhoods: information on location of crime within a neighborhood is not retained, nor are statistics for time periods less than one year.

Strategy 8.1: Institute an incident-reporting system. Appoint one person to collect and analyze reports. A form for reporting could be included in the newsletter, to be brought to meetings or mailed to the "data collector."
F. NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION

Neighbor Day, started in 1983 as a neighborhood picnic, has grown each year—more than 3000 attended yesterday’s festivities. “Most of the neighborhood residents turned out, along with others concerned with the vitality of our neighborhood, and, of course, people who come just because it’s a lot of fun,” said Spencer.

Live music and dancing, along with booths offering food, crafts, and information, filled the recently completed “vest pocket” park as well as two streets that are part of the Pedestrian Path in the neighborhood.

“During the past 10 years, the Sullivan’s Gulch Neighborhood Association has gradually acquired the skills and support we needed to achieve our goals,” said Spencer. “We started with small things, and each of the small successes gave us fuel for the next challenge.”
ISSUE STATEMENT

Portland's neighborhood associations typically are small groups of hard-working people. Generally, they are reactive rather than active; they spend the bulk of their time and energy reacting to City actions, development proposals, and immediate problems, and thus have little energy left to act—to plan, to set long-range goals, to think about themselves as an organization and evaluate their function and direction. This pattern is characteristic of most interest groups, and the Sullivan's Gulch Neighborhood Association (SGNA) is no exception.

FINDINGS

The SGNA has recognized the need to recruit more active members. The neighborhood association, a small group and predominantly homeowners, needs both to expand membership and to seek representation of the diverse interests in the neighborhood by creating more interest in their activities. In Portland, neighborhood associations are not intended to be strictly representative of the interests within their boundaries. However, the more representative a neighborhood association is, the more effective it can be.

The difficulty for most groups is that to create the time and energy to become better organized, they must be better organized. Taking on new or expanded activities requires more participation, more time, and more energy. However, at the same time, those activities frequently serve to foster more participation. A neighborhood association that has been primarily active in land use issues may recruit a new segment of the community with a primary interest in crime prevention; a neighborhood association active in social issues, such as services for the low-income...
and elderly, may find new members who are concerned about energy conservation or recreation. In addition, the new and expanded activities can make the neighborhood association more visible and more attractive to new members. While sponsoring an event or program requires time and energy, the rewards are great: the organization gains confidence and a feeling of accomplishment. Successfully tackling a new challenge often can revitalize an organization by bringing in new members and renewing the enthusiasm of old members.

The key to success is the gradual development of skills that enable an organization to implement plans of action through their own efforts. The best way to begin this process is to plan and undertake small neighborhood projects; small successes lead to large ones. By taking the initiative and planning for positive action, those with an interest in Sullivan's Gulch can deal with their concerns and direct the future of their neighborhood.

The process of neighborhood organization must be developed in progressive stages. Limited goals should be set first, with smaller efforts implemented before larger goals and major projects are attempted. These smaller goals establish confidence and a working foundation for the neighborhood.

The Sullivan's Gulch Neighborhood Association seems to have a clear idea of the problems and issues they are concerned with. A number of people within the association have already established themselves as active participants and leaders. It is these people who can act as catalysts in the community, to recruit members, initiate projects, and organize participation of the larger community.

The process of neighborhood organization may take many paths. Identifying goals—both larger, long-term goals and smaller, more immediate goals—and setting priorities is a initial step. Not all goals need to
be clear at the outset, with specific programs to implement them in mind; they may develop later in the process. The neighborhood may select one or two areas that have high priority and form a committee to develop a specific course of action.

Any committee formed to approach an issue or project must be clear in its purpose. Identification of a series of small goals, in hierarchical form, will help to initiate action.

Identification of problem, issues, and goals, and anticipation of future trends can provide the basis for positive action by the neighborhood. To effect change, the neighborhood must choose courses of action and mobilize the resources to achieve goals and objectives.

The goals, objectives, and strategies in this section are related both to each other and to the goals, objectives, and strategies in the preceding sections of this report, as illustrated in Figure 5. The process of implementing goals and objectives while carrying out strategies, will both require and foster neighborhood organization. Neighborhood organization serves as a catalyst to bring people together. It is the mechanism by which issues can be discussed, common goals formulated, possible solutions evaluated, courses of action developed, and problems solved.

**GOAL**

*Build a cohesive, vital, and healthy neighborhood by increasing the effectiveness of the neighborhood association.*

**OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES**

**Objective 1:** Establish long- and short-term goals, develop a short-term program of action to achieve the goals, and implement the program.

To some extent, this study addresses this objective. Goals are
NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION

CRIME
- Neighborhood Watch Program
- Crime Prevention Tips in Monthly Newsletter

PARKS
- Community Garden
- Tool Library

GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT
- Committee Formation

TRAFFIC
- Committee Formation

Monthly Association Meetings
Monthly Newsletter
Recruitment Program
Social Events

Figure 5
suggested throughout the preceding sections that the neighborhood association may adopt, and strategies for achieving the goals are presented. However, more work needs to be done by the neighborhood association.

**Strategy 1.1:** Establish long- and short-term goals for the neighborhood and the neighborhood association. There are many techniques for setting goals, including that used at the Neighborhood Workshop, or just scheduling several discussions. It is important that consensus be reached; no one person should draft the final set of goals. The goals recommended in this report, along with information from the Neighborhood Workshop (See Appendix), the telephone survey of residents, and the interviews with special interest groups (See Section II(F)) should be considered in developing goals. (The Office of Neighborhood Associations can provide information on techniques for setting goals and reaching consensus.)

Goals do not have to be hopelessly vague or unreachable. "Reduce crime" can be a goal, along with "Establish a Block Watch program". It may be easier to establish broad goals first, and then refine them into "sub-goals," commonly called "objectives," that are more specific.

**Strategy 1.2:** Develop and implement a short-term program of action.

Choose several goals and/or programs to implement immediately.

Develop a detailed program of implementation. This report offers many resources and program suggestions; choose the ones that seem the most "do-able," considering the resources available. Develop detailed information, identify resources, and set target dates.

It may be easier, if several projects are started at once, to form sub-committees, e.g., one on crime, one to organize a neighborhood activity (See Objective 3), one to concentrate on increasing membership (See Objective 2).
Objective 2: Increase the active membership of the neighborhood association and the degree to which the membership reflects the diverse interests of the neighborhood.

Strategy 2.1: Ask each active member to bring one person to each meeting. This can double attendance.

Strategy 2.2: Hand-deliver newsletters to residents and businesses to meet and personally invite them to meetings.

Strategy 2.3: Find one person on each block and in each large apartment building to act as the "contact" for the neighborhood association.

Strategy 2.4: Identify segments of the community that are not active in the neighborhood association (e.g., elderly, teenagers, renters, businesses) and formulate strategies to recruit them. For example, talk to the managers of the apartment buildings for elderly residents about holding a meeting in one of the buildings. Consider what factors may keep people who would like to attend from coming to meetings. For example, some may be apprehensive about walking home in the dark after an evening meeting. Offer, in newsletters publicizing meetings, to walk people home after dark.

Strategy 2.5: Increase the visibility of the neighborhood association:

--- Put out monthly newsletters (or at least meeting announcements). The newsletter can be used to publicize neighborhood association projects and events, and stimulate interest. Funding may be available through the Office of Neighborhood Associations, or local businesses may donate money, materials, or printing. A strong effort to reach those in apartment buildings should be made, either by asking building managers to allow distribution, or by mailing the newsletters—the reverse telephone directory can provide names and addresses, or, for a small fee, the County can provide adhesive mailing labels listing all registered voters in the neighborhood.
---Seek coverage of the neighborhood and neighborhood events by the media. The City Office of Neighborhood Associations can provide advice on how to contact the press.

---Sponsor neighborhood events. (See Objective 3)

---Implement some of the strategies recommended in this report. (See Objective 1)

---Ensure that people know that monthly meetings are open to the public, and are not restricted to Board Members.

Objective 3: Sponsor neighborhood events to increase the visibility of and stimulate interest in the neighborhood association, and to foster a sense of community. Events can also raise money for neighborhood association activities. When planning neighborhood events, it is important to start small; taking on a large and complex event without previous experience increases the chances of failure, with a resulting loss of confidence. Staging small events builds both skills and confidence, and teaches some of the problems (e.g., publicity) common to larger events. Some hints that will help in staging any event:

---Don't underestimate the complexity of any event; what sounds simple often isn't. Talk to other neighborhood associations that have sponsored similar events, and ask what problems they ran into the first time they did that particular event.

---Expect unexpected problems, especially at the last minute. Allow some extra time and money for the last-minute crises, and don't be surprised by them.

---Remember that "the first one is the one you learn on." Keep expectations reasonable, and expect to make mistakes the first time you stage a particular event. The only way to learn how to put on an event is to do it, so think of the first time as
being the one that teaches you how to do it.

**Strategy 3.1:** Begin with small events that require little energy, advance work, or capital. Examples might include:

- An annual Neighbor Day featuring a neighborhood picnic in Holladay Park or on some vacant property. Residents bring their own lunch and the neighborhood association provides (free or for sale) one popular item, such as lemonade or ice cream, donated by a local business. Neighbor Day could later be expanded (See Strategy 3.2).

- A Halloween parade for children in the neighborhood, with prizes for costumes. This could replace the traditional "trick-or-treating." Elderly residents could distribute candy or judge costumes.

- Block parties can be held by any group of neighbors. Have petitions and procedures available through the neighborhood association, and discuss the idea in newsletters.

**Strategy 3.2:** After the neighborhood association is experienced in staging small events, take on a larger one. For example, expand Neighbor Day to include a street dance with live music. The neighborhood association can sell food and beverages. Booths selling crafts and offering information on various subjects, such as crime prevention, can be set up. Neighborhood garage sales, where everyone brings their goods, and the neighborhood association takes a percentage, have been sponsored by other neighborhood associations.

**Strategy 3.3:** Talk to the Office of Neighborhood Associations and to other neighborhood groups to get ideas for events that may work in Sullivan's Gulch. Other neighborhood associations sponsor a variety of activities, from pancake breakfasts, spaghetti dinners, and neighborhood picnics, to full-fledged street fairs.
Objective 4: Raise money. While most neighborhood associations have little money, the more they have, the more they can achieve, whether it is to stage larger neighborhood events, purchase street lights for the neighborhood, send out more newsletters, or send members to workshops to improve their skills. Given current City budget cuts, which are likely to continue, neighborhood fund-raising is increasingly important. The Office of Neighborhood Associations can provide more information on most of these strategies.

Strategy 4.1: Sponsor neighborhood events where money can be raised (See Objective 3).

Strategy 4.2: Obtain IRS non-profit status. This status is invaluable when raising funds, as donations to the organization are tax-deductible. Such status is fairly easy to obtain. (The Accountants for the Public Interest can provide information on how to obtain this status, as can most accountants and attorneys.)

Strategy 4.3: Solicit donations from residents, businesses, and others with interests in the neighborhood.

Strategy 4.4: Request grants from the Office of Neighborhood Associations. They have limited funds available for neighborhood self-help projects. The grants are usually small, and given one time only; they are meant to act as "seed" money rather than operating funds.

Strategy 4.5: Apply to private foundations for grants. The Office of Neighborhood Associations may provide some assistance in writing the grants, depending on the purpose.
II. BACKGROUND
A. HISTORY

Approach

Research was done at the Oregon Historical Society and the Portland State University Library. The City of Portland Archives was also helpful and shared portions of their historic inventory. Most of the information was drawn from The Oregonian and The Oregon Journal between the years of 1908 and 1978.

Findings

The first people to settle claims on the land that is now the Sullivan's Gulch Neighborhood were William Irving, Jacob Wheeler and Timothy Sullivan between 1850 and 1852. Timothy Sullivan, for whom the gulch is named, farmed both north and south of the gulch. Most of his holdings were south of the gulch.

Today, most of the neighborhood lies in the Holladay Park Addition, though parts of the neighborhood lie in Holladay's Addition, Sullivan's Addition and Irving's Addition. These additions were originally tracts of land in private ownership, and were platted, or sub-divided, between 1866 and 1887. In 1866, Wheeler and others had some of their land platted for the new city of East Portland. The boundaries of that city, incorporated in 1870, were what is now Halsey Street on the north, 24th on the east, Holgate Street on the south and the Willamette River on the west.

The same year the city of East Portland was incorporated, Ben Holladay established himself in the area. Ben Holladay was considered a transportation tycoon of his day—the railroad king. He came to Portland
around 1868 after selling his stagecoach company to Wells Fargo. He was a loud, rude man who drank profusely. He had a blunt business style, part of which was to "buy" politicians. He was a controversial figure—some felt his presence was a benefit to Portland, while others felt he was a selfish man who wanted to control the state. He was a powerful figure in town, and usually got what he wanted. Holladay controlled railroads all along the West Coast, owned all steamship operations in and out of Portland, and built Portland's first streetcar line.

In 1870 Ben Holladay bought property, Holladay's Addition, in East Portland. He platted it into 61 blocks, and established the four-block park, Holladay Park. Holladay Park Addition immediately to the east of Holladay's Addition was platted in 1887 when William Irving's land also was platted.

When Holladay's Addition was platted in 1870, Ben Holladay had the opportunity to dedicate and name the streets which now run through the Sullivan's Gulch neighborhood. He named them Weidler after George Weidler, a business associate of Holladay's; Halsey after Holladay's New York aide, William L. Halsey; and Hassalo after one of his boats that operated on the Columbia River. Clackamas and Wasco are both Indian tribes and Multnomah is an Indian word.

The first public transportation to stretch east from downtown Portland to Holladay's Addition was the steam car in 1888. The line went up Morrison and Belmont. By 1889 a cable car ran across the new Steel Bridge, up Holladay to Multnomah and then along 15th going north. By 1918 there were electric cars across the Broadway and Steel Bridges, travelling as far east as 24th. The first sewers and paved streets came into the area in 1921. Until that time, all sewerage was dumped into the river.
East Portland and Albina were incorporated into the City of Portland in 1891. During the next 20 years, Holladay's Addition and part of the Holladay Park Addition grew into a neighborhood of large middle- and upper-class homes. The neighborhood was a popular place to live for prominent businessmen, lawyers, and politicians. Fifteenth Avenue was lined with beautiful mansions and was known as "Senators' Row." Some homes, identified as being of historic interest by the Sullivan's Gulch Neighborhood Association and the Portland Planning Bureau, still stand, including the residence of George Joseph, a prominent lawyer (1217 NE 16th) and the residence of Charles W. Fulton, a State Senator and lawyer (1936-38 NE Weidler). A complete listing of properties of historic interest is in the Appendix.

The Lloyd name has been well established in the Sullivan's Gulch neighborhood for many years. Ralph Lloyd worked in Portland for six years at a pipe company before he left for California to make a fortune in oil. In the 1920's Lloyd started buying up land on the east side of Portland and began to talk about his dream of building a fine hotel. By 1929 he owned 55 blocks and was still buying. In 1933 Lloyd proposed development of an office building, a baseball park and a store, to help the economy out of the depression. Portland was delighted with Lloyd's proposals and with his new dream of a shopping center. By 1953 Lloyd owned 100 city blocks—a large enough tract to build his shopping center. On August 1, 1960, his shopping center opened. It was the largest of its kind in the world.

The Gulch itself has a story all its own. The Gulch was once filled with trees, a clear spring with waterfalls and a pool. The waterfall
was near what is now 19th Street and was called Sullivan's Spring. It was a favorite picnic area. By 1894 the firs were harvested and the Union Pacific Railroad ran through the bottom of the Gulch.

In 1926 the Highway Commission revealed plans for a freeway in the Gulch, but some city commissioners urged that it be turned into a park area. No action was taken and later part of it was developed into a golf course by the Lloyd Corporation.

Between 1932 and 1941 the Gulch developed a town of its own, "Hooverville" or "Shantytown," where over 300 homeless men lived. By this time the Gulch was no longer used for picnics; the stream was stagnant and polluted. A fire in the Gulch destroyed most of Shantytown and in 1941, the last shack was torn down to prepare for a modern expressway. The freeway was finished in 1957 and, after much controversy, named the Banfield Freeway after the head of the Highway Commission instead of for Timothy Sullivan.

B. DEMOGRAPHICS

Approach

Figures from the U.S. Census and those of the Portland Housing and Community Development Program (HCD)* were reviewed. HCD figures, while partially based on Census figures, were primarily derived from P. L. Polk Company data, a compilation of institutional, business, and home addresses and phone numbers. There are some discrepancies between the Census and HCD figures. For example, HCD figures indicate the population of Sullivan's Gulch was 4,767 in 1970 and 3,864 in 1979, while Census population figures for the last decade have not exceeded

* The HCD figures were derived as "profile information" on neighborhoods qualified for HCD funds. Sullivan's Gulch qualified because more than 51% of the households are low- and moderate-income.
2,577. HCD figures also place the number of households at 1,947 in 1970 and 2,019 in 1979: Census figures show less than 1600 households for 1970 and 1980. The discrepancies might be explained by use of different neighborhood boundaries by HCD and the Census, and different methods for deriving the data. It is not possible to verify the accuracy of the data, however a comparison with the land use data indicates that the Census data provides the most consistent information. The Census figures for the neighborhood are compared for 1970 and 1980, and for the neighborhood and the City of Portland.

Findings

Sullivan's Gulch is a small neighborhood: less than 7% of the population of Portland lives there. The 1980 population was 2,557, while in 1970 the population 2,527. The number of people between the ages of 25 and 44 and the number aged 75 and over increased between 1970 and 1980. There were fewer children in the neighborhood in 1980 than in 1970.

The male population increased in the neighborhood between 1970 and 1980, while the female population decreased. However, there were more females than males in both years. Generally, there was an increase in the number of younger males and females, and in the number of elderly females in Sullivan's Gulch between 1970 and 1980. The City of Portland had an increase in the number of people between the ages of 18 and 44 and in the number aged 65 and over during the same period. (See Figures 6-9)

The number of households in Sullivan's Gulch increased from 1,430 in 1970 to 1,578 in 1980. The percentage of households renting their homes (73%) was the same in both years. The average household size was 1.74 persons in 1970 and 1.57 persons in 1980. For the City of Portland, the average household size also dropped, from 2.56 persons
Figures 6 and 7:

Percent of Population by Age for Sullivan's Gulch and City of Portland - 1970

Percent of Population by Age for Sullivan's Gulch and City of Portland - 1980
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Population by Age and Sex: 1970

Figure 9

Population by Age and Sex: 1980
in 1970 to 2.25 persons in 1980. The Census defines a "family household" as one containing two or more people related by blood, marriage, or adoption. A "non-family household" is one where two or more unrelated people live together. In Sullivan's Gulch, the number of households headed by married couples decreased between 1970 and 1980, while the number of family households headed by single males or females increased. (Typical examples of the latter type of household would be a single parent living with children, or two brothers sharing a house.) In 1980 57% of the non-family households in the neighborhood were headed by males and 43% were headed by females. City-wide, the percentages for non-family households were similar—59% headed by males and 41% headed by females. Between 1970 and 1980 the number of men living alone or with non-relatives increased 13%, while the number of women living alone or with non-relatives decreased 7% in the neighborhood. (See Tables 1 and 2)

Housing costs increased in Sullivan's Gulch between 1970 and 1980. The median rent rose from $119 per month in 1970 to $206 per month in 1980. This trend was similar to that for the City of Portland, where median rent was $91 in 1970 and $206 in 1980. Owner-occupied housing also increased in cost from a median value of $14,850 in 1970 to a median value of $59,700 in 1980 in the neighborhood, and from $14,400 in 1970 to $54,800 in 1980 in the City of Portland. (See Table 3)

While the Census figures show that the majority of the neighborhood population was white in both 1970 and 1980, the percentage of white households dropped from 99% in 1970 to 91% in 1980.* Blacks, Asians, * The 1980 data on ethnic and nationality groups is generally considered unreliable because of the large numbers reported in the "Race unknown" category. In addition, there is a large discrepancy between the number of such households reported for the city as a whole and the sum of such households reported by neighborhood.
**TABLE 1: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS, SULLIVAN'S GULCH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>Net, Change (No.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1416</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>1159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family Households:**</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>.57%</td>
<td>966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headed by Male</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headed by Female</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Person Family:</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headed by Married Couple</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headed by Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headed by Female</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Person Non-Family:</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headed by Male</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headed by Female</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*"---" means less than 1%*

**In the 1970 Census, "Non-Family Households" included all households with one or more unrelated persons. The "Two or More Person Non-Family Households" were included with "Non-Family Households." The 1980 Census defined "Non-Family Households" as those containing only one person, and added the category of "Two or More Person Non-Family Household" for households with two or more unrelated persons."
### TABLE 2: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS,  
CITY OF PORTLAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1970</th>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th></th>
<th>Net Chan (No.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS</td>
<td>145 082</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>158 847</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+13 765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>136 009</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>142 437</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>+ 6 428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6 541</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9 935</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>+ 3 394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 532</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6 475</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>+ 3 943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>81 930</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>84 619</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>+ 2 689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter</td>
<td>63 152</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>74 228</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>+11 076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family Households:*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headed by Male</td>
<td>17 669</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23 356</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>+ 5 687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headed by Female</td>
<td>30 743</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33 150</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>+ 2 407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Person Family:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headed by Married Couple</td>
<td>81 454</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>68 693</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>-12 761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headed by Male</td>
<td>2 527</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4 089</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>+ 1 562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headed by Female</td>
<td>12 689</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15 890</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>+ 3 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Person Non-Family:*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headed by Male</td>
<td>8 123</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5 546</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headed by Female</td>
<td>5 546</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5 546</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In the 1970 Census, "Non-Family Households" included all households with one or more unrelated persons. The "Two or More Person Non-Family Households" were included with "Non-Family Households." The 1980 Census defined "Non-Family Households" as those containing only one person, and added the category of "Two or More Person Non-Family Household" for households with two or more unrelated persons.
# TABLE 3: HOUSING COSTS

## Value of Owner-Occupied Non-Condominiums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Sullivan's Gulch</th>
<th>City of Portland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of units: 1970</td>
<td>% of units: 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-14,999</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-19,999</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-24,999</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000-34,999</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,000-49,999</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000+</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Monthly Rent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Sullivan's Gulch</th>
<th>City of Portland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of units: 1970</td>
<td>% of units: 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $99</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100-$199</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200+</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cash rent</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and Pacific Islanders comprised the largest ethnic minority groups in the area in 1980. Asians and Pacific Islanders were included in the "Other" category in the 1970 Census, so figures are unavailable for that year. The proportion of black households increased from 2% to 5% between 1970 and 1980. Most of the black households occupy rental units. There was one black homeowner reported in both 1970 and 1980. Because other ethnic and nationality groups were all classified as "Other/Unknown" in the 1970 Census figures on home ownership, it is not possible to ascertain the trends for these other groups. (See Table 4) In 1980 89% of the city's population was white while 6% were black. Asian and Pacific Islanders made up 3% of the city's population, American Indians and Eskimo/Aleut made up 1%, and 2% were reported as "Others."

C. LAND

1. Current Land Use

Approach

A land use survey was conducted by walking through the neighborhood. The following information was collected on each piece of property:

--Land Use. The categories used for classifying land use were:

Single-Family: Residential buildings with one housing unit

Low-Density Multi-Family: Residential buildings with two to four housing units

High-Density Multi-Family: Residential buildings with more than four housing units

Commercial: Includes retail and office uses

Industrial: Includes industrial, truck terminals
TABLE 4

POPULATION BY RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sullivan's Gulch 1980</th>
<th>% of Neighborhood Population</th>
<th>City of Portland 1980</th>
<th>% of City Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2557</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>366,383</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2281</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>316,993</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27,734</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3,526</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10,636</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7,494</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Semi-Public: Includes churches, schools, hospitals, social halls
Vacant: Totally undeveloped land with no structures
Parking: paved and unpaved parking lots
Open space: Parks and green areas.

--Acreage The approximate amount of acreage devoted to each land use was estimated.

--Parking The presence or absence of off-street parking was recorded, and the number of off-street spaces present.

--Building Material Building materials were classified as (a) masonry or brick, (b) wood, or (c) mixed—wood and brick mixture.

--Building Condition The classifications and findings for building condition are in Section II (C)(5) of this report.

In the case of residential property, information was also collected on:

--Number of units The number of housing units in each structure was based on the number of mailboxes.

--Occupancy/Vacancy A building was presumed to be occupied unless there were clear signs that the unit was vacant, such as a "For Sale" sign.

In the case of multi-family buildings with a "Vacancy" sign, one vacancy was recorded regardless of the number of vacant housing units in the building.

The form used to collect this information is in the Appendix.

Findings

There is a great diversity of land uses in Sullivan's Gulch. The largest amount of land (46.7 acres) is devoted to housing. (See Figures 10 and 11) Table 5 gives the approximate areas, in acres*, devoted to each land use. The areas are rough estimates, and do not include streets and sidewalks.

* 1 acre = 43,560 square feet
Table 5

Land Use in Sullivan's Gulch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Use</th>
<th>Acres in Neighborhood</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Acres in Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Density Multi-Family</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Density Multi-Family</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Public</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>119.4 acres</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERCENTAGE OF LAND
DEVOTED TO EACH LAND USE

Figure 11

SINGLE FAMILY 35%
MULTI-FAMILY 10%
INDUSTRIAL 10%
COMMERICAL 10%
PUBLIC SPACE 5%
PRIVATE SPACE 5%
MISSING VALUE 2.5%
SEMI-PUBLIC .5%

Of the 1,597 housing units in the neighborhood, 276 are single-family houses, 245 are in low-density multi-family buildings, and 1,076 are in high-density multi-family buildings. Most residential buildings have off-street parking, but a significant number do not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Have off-street parking</th>
<th>Do not have off-street parking</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Houses</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Density Multi-Family Units</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Density Multi-Family Units</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey of neighborhood residents (See Section II (F)(1)) found that 50% of the respondents own one car and 21% own two or more. If this is representative of the neighborhood, then about 250 cars belonging to residents are parked on the street.*

Of the 87 non-residential structures in the neighborhood, 62 are commercial, 21 are industrial, and 4 are semi-public. Forty-five (73%) of the commercial structures have off-street parking, while 17 (27%) do not. Parking was not recorded for the industrial and semi-public structures.

More than half (54%) of the buildings in Sullivan's Gulch are constructed of masonry or brick. Thirty-eight percent are wood structures and 8% are a mixture of wood and bricks.

2. **Zoning**

Land use in Sullivan's Gulch is governed by the Portland zoning code. The zoning code establishes what uses are permitted on each property, and to what intensity each use may be developed. Sullivan's

* This is a very rough estimate. Number of cars owned varies with income, age, household size, and so on.
Gulch has a diversity of land uses, as reflected in the zoning of the neighborhood, which includes residential, commercial, and industrial areas. Generally, the residentially-zoned areas form the core of the neighborhood. A strip zoned for commercial use forms the northern border of the neighborhood and properties zoned for industrial use form the eastern and southern boundaries. A list of the different zones, along with a general description of the purpose and intent of each zone, is given below. The current zoning in Sullivan's Gulch is illustrated in Figure 12.

Land uses are also controlled by the Portland Comprehensive Plan, detailed in Section II (C)(3).

Zones: Intent and Purposes

RESIDENTIAL

R2.5--Attached Single-Family Residential

The R2.5 zone permits attached residential development (row-houses/town-houses) and single-family dwellings. The intent is to provide for a high density form of single-family development while maintaining the single-family character of residential neighborhoods. Infill redevelopment is allowed on a minimum of two lots each averaging 2,500 square feet.

R2--Low Density Multi-Family Residential

The R2 zone encourages a variety of lower density housing types in addition to the single-family detached unit. For example, duplexes, row houses, and garden apartments are allowed. Emphasis is placed on compatibility of new development with adjacent areas. The minimum lot size for single-family detached units is 4,000 square feet. The minimum lot size is 1,800 square feet for attached single-family units, and 2,000 square feet for multi-family units.
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RL—Medium Density Multi-Family Residential

This is a flexible density apartment zone, intended to add to the diversity of housing in the city. One-, two-, and three family dwellings may be constructed with minimum lot sizes of 4,000 square feet. Four to seven units have a minimum lot size of 6,000–9,500 square feet and, on sites of 10,000 square feet or larger, 1,000 square feet are required for each dwelling unit. There are a series of "amenity packages," which allow an increase in density.

RH—High Density Multi-Family Residential

The RH zone has been established to provide for mid- to high-density apartment opportunities. The bulk of new construction in this zone must be residential. However, in some cases, neighborhood commercial uses are allowed. Single-family attached and detached units are permitted, as well as multi-family units. A minimum lot size of 4,000 square feet is required for single-family dwellings, duplexes and three unit multi-family development. Other densities are determined by a "floor area ratio," where the size of the building varies with the size of the lot.

COMMERCIAL

C4—Neighborhood Commercial

The purpose of the C4 commercial zone is to allow for convenience retail uses and professional office in residential areas which are not served by nearby general commercial centers. Highly auto-oriented uses are not permitted, and although there is no requirement for off-street parking, there is a maximum number of spaces allowed.

C3—Local Commercial

The C3 zone encourages retail and service uses which are particularly supportive of transit services. Specifically, all uses and
operations are to be predominately pedestrian- or transit-oriented. As in the C4 zone, there are no minimum parking requirements. A variety of residential and mixed-use opportunities may be allowed under certain circumstances.

**C2—General Commercial**

The C2 zone allows a full range of commercial uses, some light industrial activities, and some residential uses. Transit- and auto-related uses in this zone are to be developed along major traffic streets, as designated in the Arterial Street Classification Policy. (Broadway and Weidler are major traffic streets.)

**MANUFACTURING**

**M3—Light Manufacturing**

The M3 zone is a versatile zone, allowing light manufacturing, commercial, office and residential activities. Off-street parking requirements are based on the particular use.

**M2—General Manufacturing**

Warehousing, manufacturing and all but the heaviest manufacturing activities are allowed in the M2 zone. The industrial activities, and the districts within which they lie, are to be protected from the intrusion of non-manufacturing uses, particularly residential.

**M1—Heavy Manufacturing**

The M1 zone is the most intense in the zoning code. It is meant to provide for a full range of manufacturing activities, sea and rail terminals and associated warehousing. Like the M2 zone, it is to be protected from the intrusion of non-manufacturing uses.

3. **Comprehensive Plan**

uses and intensities permitted now, the Comprehensive Plan is a guide for the future. It prescribes where land uses may be changed or intensified to accommodate growth and change in the city. The zoning on any property may be changed to that designated in the Comprehensive Plan if public facilities and services (water and sewer service, streets, police and fire protection) are adequate to meet the demands of the new zone. City Council must approve the rezoning.

The Comprehensive Plan designations for Sullivan's Gulch (See Figure 13) are not significantly different from the zoning in place now. However, there are two areas of the neighborhood where changes may occur. One is the area between NE 15th and 16th, which the Comprehensive Plan designates as suitable for commercial development. Currently, the three-block segment is zoned for high-density multi-family residential use. The other area where change may occur is two blocks in the northeast corner of the neighborhood. The blocks are currently zoned for residential use, but are designated for light manufacturing by the Comprehensive Plan.

4. Land Ownership and Land Value: Potential for Development Approach

Data was obtained by reviewing the Tax Assessment Records of the Sullivan's Gulch neighborhood by addition, block and tax lot.

The term "non-resident" is defined for the purpose of this study as corporations who hold property in Sullivan's Gulch and/or individuals or groups who own property on which they do not reside. "Property" in this instance is a term which will be used interchangeably with "Tax Lots." Under-developed land is property where the assessed cash value of the land is equal to or more than the assessed cash value of the improvements or structures on the land.
Non-resident owners were identified by taking the names of owners whose mailing addresses were different than the tax lot address. To exclude those owners who might reside on the property, but have their tax assessment sent to a third party, the reverse telephone and Polk directories were used. The mailing addresses of the non-residents were then used to identify whether those owners live within the neighborhood, in Portland, in Oregon, or are from out-of-state. Multiple site ownership, or ownership of more than one tax lot by a non-resident, was identified by creating a list of non-resident owners and then listing their individual properties.

Finally, to identify under-developed property a structure-to-land ratio formula was devised: $\frac{\text{STRUCTURE}}{\text{LAND}}$. The value of 1.0 or less was considered to indicate under-developed land. This formula was applied to all properties in Sullivan's Gulch. This value is only a coarse measurement, and may only indicate that the structure on the land does not meet the potential zoned capacity for the land, although the structure may be perfectly sound and no redevelopment planned.

Findings

There are a total of 669 tax lots in Sullivan's Gulch; 301 (45%) are owned by residents, and 368 (55%) are owned by non-residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PARCELS IN NEIGHBORHOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-RESIDENT OWNED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENT OWNED &amp; OCCUPY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The 368 non-resident-owned tax lots were found to be owned by 213 non-residents; 27 (13%) had mailing addresses within the neighborhood,
138 (65%) within Portland, 30 (14%) within Oregon, and 18 (8%) were from out-of-state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAILING ADDRESS OF NON-RESIDENT OWNERS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN NEIGHBORHOOD</td>
<td>27 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN PORTLAND</td>
<td>138 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN OREGON</td>
<td>30 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUT-OF-STATE</td>
<td>18 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>213 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

159 non-residents own only one piece of property each, while 31 own 2 pieces of property each. These 190 owners account for 60% of the non-resident owned tax lots. The other 40% of the non-resident owned properties are held by non-residents owning from 3 to 32 tax lots each. This information is presented in Table 6, and specific properties are identified in Figure 14. Non-residents owning more than 2 properties each are identified individually in Figure 14.

| TABLE 6 |
|-------------------|---------|
| NUMBER OF TAX LOTS OWNED BY ONE NON-RESIDENT UNIT | NUMBER OF PROPERTIES |
| NUMBER OF NON-RESIDENT OWNERS | 1-2 properties |
| 190 | 14 |
| 14 | 3-4 properties |
| 3 | 5-6 properties |
| 2 | 7-8 properties |
| 2 | 9-10 properties |
| 2 | 11 or more properties |

Out of the 669 properties in the Sullivan's Gulch Neighborhood, 175 (27%) were identified as under-developed. This number includes the 54 tax lots, or 8% of the properties, which are vacant. (See Figure 15)
In comparing resident-owned to non-resident-owned under-developed property it was found that 44 tax lots or 34% of the under-developed properties were owner-occupied, while 85 or 66% were non-resident-owned. (See Figure 17)

5. Building and Street Conditions

Approach

Information on building and street conditions was collected during the land use survey described in Section II (C)(1).

Five categories were used to rate the condition of structures in the neighborhood:

EXEMPLARY: needs no repairs
GOOD: basically sound, needs minor repair
FAIR: needs minor improvements or a few major improvements
POOR: needs major repairs to roof, foundation, walls, etc.
CRITICAL: dilapidated building—should be demolished

The street condition survey rated seven elements. The elements, and the criteria used to rate them, are given below.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENTS</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road surfaces:</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Level surface, few patches, no pot-holes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Some subsidence, patching and minor holes, but not in need of paving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs repair</td>
<td>Very uneven, pot-holes present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbs:</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Reasonably even, few cracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs repair</td>
<td>Many curbs uneven, cracked and/or have missing elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks:</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Reasonably level surfaces, uncracked pavement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs repair</td>
<td>Surfaces uneven or broken with frequent patches of grass between cement blocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street lights:</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Glass unbroken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs repair</td>
<td>Glass broken in one or more lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter:</td>
<td>Not present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A lot present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees:</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelchair ramps:</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings

Most structures in the neighborhood are in excellent (41%) or good (45%) condition. Eleven percent of the structures are in fair condition, and 3% are in poor condition. If residential structures are examined, apart from commercial and industrial structures, the percentages are similar, as shown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of residential structure</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Single-Family structures</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Low-Density Multi-Family* structures</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of High-Density Multi-Family** structures</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Low-Density Multi-Family structures contain 2-4 housing units.
** High-Density Multi-Family structures contain more than 4 housing units.
The majority of structures in poor or fair condition are clustered in two areas of the neighborhood: (1) along NE Broadway and NE Weidler and (2) in the blocks adjacent to industrial zoning, along the south side of NE Multnomah and especially in the eastern portion of the neighborhood near property owned by Hyster Corporation.

Road surfaces in the neighborhood generally are in good condition with the exception of some uneven surfaces and patches on Clackamas and Halsey Streets.* Most street curbs are cracked and have missing elements. Sidewalks have reasonably level surfaces but there are a few cracks that need repair. The street lights are all in good working condition. There is little or no litter in the neighborhood and trees are present on all streets except Broadway. However, most of the trees need to be trimmed to improve illumination from streetlights. There are no wheelchair ramps except on 21st Street and a few isolated ramps (i.e., one per intersection) in the western portion of the neighborhood.

D. TRANSPORTATION

1. Light Rail Approach

Information was collected by reviewing the City of Portland's Banfield Light Rail Transit Station Area Planning Program, Phase 1, Summary Report (Summary Report) and the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) on the project. In addition, several people were interviewed: Robert Sandmann, Oregon Department of Transportation, Banfield Light Rail Project; Sharon Mainzer, Tri-Met, Light Rail Project; Laurel Wentworth, City of Portland Bureau of Planning; and Steve Burdick, Corporation for Transit Improvement.

* Since the initial street condition survey occurred, reconstruction of portions of Multnomah has begun.
Findings

The Light Rail Transit route will exit the Banfield Freeway at the existing Lloyd Center exit. A ramp will be constructed over Lloyd Boulevard which will connect the rail to the North side of Holladay Street. Construction of this ramp will cause the temporary closure of Lloyd Boulevard, projected to be a two year closure. This will temporarily limit access to the Sullivan's Gulch Neighborhood from NE Pacific (carrying traffic from downtown across the Steel Bridge) and NE 12th. (See Figures 18 and 19)

The Lloyd Center Transit Station will be at the south end of Holladay Park, already the location of a major bus stop on the north side. The station will be a sidewalk-level platform between the existing sidewalk and curb. No park property will be required. The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), however, does discuss the need for clear pedestrian ways and mentions that the current design of this park holds rather than encourages through pedestrian traffic, the implication being that the design should be changed.

The only permanent street closure in the neighborhood caused by the Light Rail Transit will be Holladay Way. This street is a south extension of NE 15th, which curves west into Holladay Street along the Lloyd Center exit. The removal of this street will not limit access to the neighborhood as traffic can just as easily turn west onto NE Multnomah.

Other temporary (two years) changes will occur at 21st Avenue, where a temporary bridge (two lane) will be constructed, and at 28th Avenue, which will be closed. New overpasses will be constructed at both sites to accommodate the widened size of the Banfield Freeway due to the Light Rail construction and freeway improvements. The major access point to the neighborhood was 28th Avenue. Its closure, along with Lloyd Boulevard, and the narrowing of the 21st Avenue overpass will most likely increase
traffic along other major access routes (such as NE Broadway and NE Multnomah) and cause congestion along 21st Avenue. There is also the likelihood that traffic will increase on the interior neighborhood streets.

The City of Portland Planning Bureau has designated a circular area of one-quarter mile radius around each transit station as a station influence area. The boundaries of the Lloyd Station Influence Area extend to NE 17th and are within the boundaries of the neighborhood. (See Figure 19) The area enclosed within these boundaries is currently designated, primarily, for commercial and multi-family use. Much of this land is actually currently vacant.

According to the FEIS, "economic development would intensify and concentrate around transit stations." The City's Summary Report indicates that development and redevelopment activity will occur on Lloyd Corporation property without public sector influence. Minor population growth related to the project is expected to occur in East Portland except near the transit stations, where growth is expected to be more significant. Lloyd Station is a Type A Station, that is, "a major activity service center," and will accommodate a high volume of auto/bus and pedestrian transfers. There is no park and ride area planned for the station; auto traffic will be of the "kiss and ride" variety, i.e., commuters will be dropped off. At Lloyd Center the influence area has been determined by the Portland Bureau of Planning as already densely developed and the Light Rail Transit is expected to have minimal impact. But reviewing the influence area boundaries, it is clear that the area bounded by NE Broadway, NE 15th and 17th and the Banfield Freeway is not developed to the maximum allowances of the Portland Comprehensive Plan or the zoning code; further development
seems inevitable. It is also plausible that development pressures will cause further intensification in underdeveloped areas of the neighborhood.

In mitigation of the above possible impact "the safety and movement of pedestrians and transit riders at the transfer points and stations will be investigated thoroughly once final design of the Project commences. Modifications of Project design will be made where possible to ensure and enhance the safety aspects of the LRT facility. In addition, street-management schemes such as preferential residential parking are currently under investigation. The intent would be to reduce the impact of localized traffic increases and the demand for parking around transit stations." (FEIS) A small part of the neighborhood is designated as a street improvement area in the Summary Report. The Findings Section of the Summary Report states, "In order to effect a sense of community in this segment, to create an environment supportive of LRT, the Hollady Street Segment must be unified in design and orientation. Unifying the area, creating a habitable pedestrian environment (continuous for the length of the segment), . . . reducing the area's dependence on the automobile and establishing a visible and physical link between this area and the downtown are obtainable goals with positive effects for the entire city."

Laurel Wentworth, Portland Bureau of Planning, indicated that property within the influence boundaries is expected to be developed to the maximum limits, i.e., either in commercial and multi-family uses. She also stated that the City had already studied street improvements and the judgment was that none were needed as projected traffic increases could be handled by the current arterials. The City has no specific plans for pedestrian ways except connecting the Lloyd
She said they would like to try to convince the Lloyd Corporation to develop pedestrian ways through the area. She also mentioned that the City would like to see north/south pedestrian ways developed to increase pedestrian access to the Lloyd Center area.

The FEIS and Summary Report both note the need for street and parking management and design to enhance or preserve existing neighborhood cohesiveness. But, as indicated by Ms. Wentworth, it appears that little is planned in regards to the Sullivan's Gulch neighborhood. The City evidently feels that the impact will be minimal and the existing conditions will support any changes that occur. As noted above, it does appear likely that development will increase in the neighborhood and it appears that, despite the City's position, some planned development is appropriate.

A private non-profit corporation, legally separate from Tri-Met and the Metropolitan Service District, has been formed by Steve Burdick and Phil Whitmore, formerly employed by Metro. Its purpose is to plan coordinated and intensive development around the twenty-five transit stops. They are not currently operating in the City of Portland, but indicate that graduate students of the University of Oregon Architecture School did a specific project around the Lloyd Center Transit Station and constructed a model of the area.

2. Traffic Approach

City of Portland Traffic Engineers, Tom Neely and Linda Dartsch, were interviewed for information about road closures, traffic patterns and major traffic designations. Neighborhood Need Reports* submitted

* Neighborhood Need Reports are requests submitted to the City by neighborhood associations and similar groups. The Reports identify problems and suggest solutions to be included in the City's annual budget.
to the Traffic Bureau in 1979, 1980 and 1982 were consulted to determine
the neighborhood association’s perception of and needs for traffic
improvements. (The neighborhood did not submit Need Reports in 1981.)
The 1981 Neighborhood Information Profiles were consulted for other
information.

Findings

—Major traffic/transit streets make up a higher proportion of the
neighborhood’s streets than that of the district (See Figure 20) or
the city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Street</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major traffic/transit</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

—Sullivan’s Gulch has higher average daily traffic volumes on its
minor traffic streets than the district or city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Street</th>
<th>Average Daily Traffic Counts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Neighborhood: 14,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Neighborhood: 6,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current traffic volumes are shown in Figure 21.

—Traffic volumes have increased since the closure of NE 28th,
according to tabulations taken by the City Bureau of Traffic Engineering
before and after the closure. For example, 1,100 cars a day were
counted on NE Multnomah on August 17 and 18, before the closure; 1,416
cars were counted on September 15 and 16, after the closure.

—Speed violators have increased on Multnomah, Wasco and Clackamas
since the closure.
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Seven Neighborhood Need Reports were submitted to the Portland Bureau of Traffic Engineering in 1979, 1980, and 1982 requesting traffic improvements:

1. Enforcement of 25 MPH speed limit in neighborhood.
2. Controlled crosswalks on Clackamas at 15th and 16th and on Wasco at 15th and 16th.
3. "No trucks" signs on residential streets.
4. A speed limit of 20 MPH on Multnomah, with signs posted.
5. Stop signs on Multnomah at 22nd, 24th, and 26th.
6. Diverters to discourage through traffic on Multnomah.
7. Traffic signal at 24th and Halsey.

The Bureau of Traffic Engineering denied the first four requests, submitted in 1979 and 1980; the Bureau feels the traffic volumes and speeds do not indicate a problem. The other requests, submitted just a few months ago, have not been responded to yet.

E. SAFETY AND SECURITY

Approach

Police Bureau data on crime rates was obtained from the Police Bureau and the City of Portland's 1981 Neighborhood Information Profiles. Police Bureau data is aggregated by "radio grids." Sullivan's Gulch is divided into two radio grids: West Sullivan's Gulch, bounded by NE 15th and 21st, Broadway and Multnomah; and East Sullivan's Gulch, bounded by NE 21st and 28th, Broadway and Multnomah. Population for each radio grid was ascertained from the 1980 Census.

Police Bureau crime classifications were used. Class I crimes
include larceny, burglary,* assault, auto-theft, robbery, rape, and murder. Class II crimes include fraud, gambling, prostitution, forgery, embezzlement, vandalism, vagrancy, disorderly conduct, juvenile offenses, and others.

In addition, three people were interviewed: Gene Mahar, Crime Prevention Officer, East Precinct; an officer with the East Precinct Tactical Analysis Unit; and Sharon McCormick, Neighborhoods Against Crime.

Reader's discretion should be exercised in interpretation of this crime data. The crime rates are a function of population in the area, since they are calculated as crimes per 1,000 of population. The West Sullivan's Gulch area has a population of 692 while East Sullivan's Gulch has a population of 1,327; if the population increased in the west, and the number of crimes remained the same, the rate would decrease. For example, the rate for larceny is 89.6 in West Sullivan's Gulch, and about half that—40.7—in East Sullivan's Gulch, yet there were only eight more larceny reports (62) in West Sullivan's Gulch than in East Sullivan's Gulch (54 reports).

Findings

Table 7 compares Sullivan's Gulch crime rates with the Outer Northeast District (See Figure 20), and the City as a whole. The crime rates are from 1981. The two most frequently committee Class I crimes in Sullivan's Gulch are larceny and burglary. Overall, the neighborhood has a higher crime rate (crimes

---

* Larceny is defined by the Police Bureau as theft, taking, obtaining property of another, receiving stolen property, or threatening another so as to force them to give up their property. Burglary is defined as entering or remaining unlawfully in a building with intent to commit a crime. Purse-snatching is normally classed as larceny. However, if a threat or weapon is used, it is considered a robbery.
committed per 1,000 population) than the City as a whole in both Class I and Class II categories. Sullivan's Gulch reported 7% of the crimes in the District and 1% of those in the city. Of Class I crimes, all rates were higher than those for the district or the city except for rape and, possibly, murder. (See Table 7) Taken as a whole then, Sullivan's Gulch crime rates exceeded the city-wide rate in larceny, burglary, auto theft, and robbery. In Class II crimes, Sullivan's Gulch rates exceeded the district as well as the city.

The East Precinct keeps maps in its Tactical/Crime Analysis Unit for a three-month period on particular crimes: robbery, rape, burglary, and car prowls. Crimes are identified by dots, which are circled when an arrest is made. The maps are destroyed after three months.

In reviewing the four maps covering September, October, and November, Sullivan's Gulch seems similar to other neighborhoods. In fact, it appeared to have a lower incidence in some cases. Robberies and burglaries cluster around Lloyd Center and north of Sullivan's Gulch in Irvington. Two arrests have been made in the past month, which is expected to reduce the incidence of purse-snatching in the neighborhood.

Officer Mahar and an officer in the Crime Analysis Unit emphasized that people should learn how to report a crime and different ways they can reduce crime opportunities, such as not carrying purses, or by walking in pairs. Officer Mahar agrees that the neighborhood near Lloyd Center is poorly lit, which may increase the likelihood of crime. However, the Police Bureau cannot assist the neighborhood in obtaining increased lighting. Officer Mahar said they are currently working with the Richmond neighborhood, south of Sullivan's Gulch, on an intensive crime.
TABLE 7: REPORTED CRIME, 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WEST SULLIVAN'S GULCH (Pop. 692)</th>
<th>EAST SULLIVAN'S GULCH (Pop. 1327)</th>
<th>SULLIVAN'S GULCH TOTAL (Pop. 2557)</th>
<th>DISTRICT (Pop. 52,082)</th>
<th>CITY (Pop. 365,030)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Per 1000 Pop.</td>
<td>No. Per 1000 Pop.</td>
<td>No. Per 1000 Pop.</td>
<td>7,336 Reports Per 1000 Pop.</td>
<td>58,824 Reports Per 1000 Pop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REPORTS</td>
<td>156 225.4</td>
<td>178 134.1</td>
<td>528 203.1</td>
<td>140.8</td>
<td>161.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS I CRIMES</td>
<td>123 177.7</td>
<td>131 98.7</td>
<td>338 132.7</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>62 89.6</td>
<td>54 40.7</td>
<td>200 78.1</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>34 49.1</td>
<td>57 42.9</td>
<td>90 35.4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>6 8.7</td>
<td>11 8.3</td>
<td>22 8.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>11 15.9</td>
<td>7 5.3</td>
<td>14 5.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>9 13.0</td>
<td>2 1.5</td>
<td>11 4.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 .4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>1 1.4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS II CRIMES</td>
<td>33 47.7</td>
<td>47 35.4</td>
<td>80 31.3</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

West Sullivan's Gulch boundaries: NE 15th, 21st, Broadway, Multnomah
East Sullivan's Gulch boundaries: NE 21st, 28th, Broadway, Multnomah
Sullivan's Gulch--Total boundaries: NE 15th, 33rd, Broadway, Banfield Freeway, plus two blocks bounded by NE 11th, 13th, Multnomah, Holladay Way

There is some discrepancy between the figures for East, West, and Total because (a) the boundaries are different, and (b) the figures for East and West are exact, while the figures for Total are Police Bureau estimates.
prevention project and plan to duplicate it in other neighborhoods, including Sullivan's Gulch, some time in the future.

There are, however, some crime prevention tools available to the neighborhood. Neighborhoods Against Crime (NAC), part of the City's Office of Neighborhood Associations, offers direct services or consultation to neighborhoods. NAC can simply assist in various methods of preventing crime, including education, or can help organize blocks for a more involved approach to crime prevention. A "block program" involves organizing neighbors on a block to watch for and report crime on their block; information is shared so that neighbors can recognize strange cars and individuals.

Ms. McCormick said that "block programs" can be organized by individual blocks or by the neighborhood association. Individual residents or the neighborhood association may contact her for assistance.

F. PERCEPTIONS/ATTITUDES

1. Survey of Residents

Approach

The survey was conducted by telephone, since it was the most efficient and economical method. Using the reverse telephone directory listings, a random 10% sample of the households in the neighborhood (150 households) was selected. If the household selected did not answer the phone, did not wish to participate in the survey, or the person answering the phone was under 18 years of age, the next listing on the page was called. 141 surveys were completed for a 9.45% sample of households.

It should be noted that the survey could not reach those without phones or with unlisted numbers. In addition, the "survey population"
differs in age and sex from the neighborhood population, with a
disproportionately high percentage of respondents between the ages of
25 and 54 and age 65 and over; a disproportionately low percentage
of 16 to 24 year olds and 55 to 64 year olds; and a disproportionate
high percentage of women.

The survey questionnaire addressed three areas:

a. General perceptions of the neighborhood: what respondents like and
dislike about the neighborhood, how much they like or dislike living
there, why they chose to live there, and whether they feel the neigh-
borhood will be a better, worse, or about the same kind of place to
live five years from now.

b. Issue areas: Focusing on issues identified by the class and the
neighborhood association, respondents were asked about how safe they
feel in the neighborhood, whether noise bothers them in their homes,
if they have difficulty finding a place to park their cars, and what
new recreational facilities they might use. While additional issues
were identified by the class and the neighborhood association, they
were not issues that could be analyzed through this survey.

c. Statistics: Questions were asked on a variety of demographic and
statistical items, including respondents' length of residence in the
neighborhood, whether they rent or own their home, and age.

The questionnaire form used is in the Appendix.

The results of the survey were analyzed using three measures:
frequency, median, and cross-tabulation. Frequency is a count of how
often a response has been given, while median, falling in the middle
of all the responses, yields a single, representative number. Cross-
tabulation indicates whether there is a significant association between
two sets of information; for example, if those who own their homes are concentrated in one area of the neighborhood or are evenly distributed.

Findings

As noted above, the survey questionnaire addressed three areas:

a. General perceptions of the neighborhood,
b. Issue areas, and
c. Statistics.

NOTE: Because all percentages in this memo are rounded, not all columns will sum to 100%. In addition, several of the questions may elicit more than one response. In those cases, the percentages are the percentage of people who gave that particular response, and the total percentage will exceed 100%.

a. General perceptions of the neighborhood

Three-quarters of the people interviewed like living in Sullivan's Gulch; 38% like it very much. Only 5% do not like living there.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>like</th>
<th>dislike</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very much</td>
<td>very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very much</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents offered a variety of reasons why they live in the neighborhood:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close to shopping</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to work</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like housing unit</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just like it there</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to everything</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation (access to freeway, buses)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No choice (couldn't find another unit, live with parents, etc.)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons including; &quot;close to friends&quot; and &quot;cost of housing&quot; were mentioned by less than 10% of respondents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The things respondents like about their neighborhood parallel the reasons they live there. In response to the question "What are the three things you like most about your neighborhood?" Most respondents said "close to shopping" or "close to Lloyd Center." Other responses are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close to shopping/Lloyd Center</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to freeway/good bus service</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to work/school/downtown/church</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience/location</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like neighborhood/people</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just like it, it's home</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eight percent or less gave other responses, including "old houses," "trees," and "diversity."

Thirty percent of those surveyed said there is nothing they dislike about the neighborhood. Other frequent responses to the question "What are the three things you dislike most about the neighborhood?" were "Crime" (27%) and "traffic" (24%). Nine percent mentioned "noise" while 8% mentioned "houses or apartments not maintained." Five percent or less gave other responses, including "high density/construction of, or zoning for, high densities," "parking," or "business/industrial uses."

In response to the question "Based on what you see happening in your neighborhood now, do you think the neighborhood will be a better place, a worse place, or about the same kind of place to live five years from now?" 20% of those surveyed thought it would be a better place and 15% thought it would be a worse place. More than half (53%) felt it would be about the same, while 16% said they did not know.

b. Issue Areas

CRIME

Time of day makes a substantial difference in how safe Sullivan's Gulch residents feel walking in their neighborhood. During daylight hours,
most respondents feel "safe" or "very safe" while walking in their neighborhood (70%). (See Table 8) However, 18% report feeling "unsafe" or "very unsafe" at night. Twenty percent report feeling only "somewhat safe" and 40% say they do not go out at all. Of the 55 residents who reported that they "do not go out" after dark, 47 are female, 40 of whom are 55 years of age or older. Generally, those 55 years of age and older report feelings of fear more often than those under 55. Respondents stated overwhelmingly that they would feel safer walking with a companion at night (73%).

Nearly half of those surveyed (48%) feel the amount of crime in Sullivan's Gulch is about the same as in other neighborhoods, while 12% feel there is a "great deal" of crime in the neighborhood and 23% feel there is "not much."

NOISE

About one-third (31%) of the respondents report being bothered by noise in their homes. The source of the bothersome noise is primarily traffic on streets around the respondents' homes, including the Banfield Freeway. Of those bothered by noise, 55% said traffic noise is a problem, 16% are bothered by other tenants in their building, and 16% are bothered by noise from other buildings. Eleven percent reported dogs or children as a source of noise and 9% were bothered by noise from trains.

PARKING

Of those interviewed, half own one car and 21% own two or more. Thirty percent of the respondents do not own cars. Of those who own cars, nearly half (49%) say they never have trouble finding a place to park near their homes and an additional 39% have a private parking space or driveway. The remaining 13% of car owners report difficulty finding
### TABLE 8

**HOW SAFE RESIDENTS OF SULLIVAN'S GULCH FEEL IN THEIR NEIGHBORHOOD BY TIME OF DAY AND AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Safety</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Safe:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>40% (55)</td>
<td>7% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-54 years old</td>
<td>30% (41)</td>
<td>6% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+ years old</td>
<td>10% (14)</td>
<td>1% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>31% (42)</td>
<td>15% (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-54 years old</td>
<td>15% (20)</td>
<td>12% (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+ years old</td>
<td>16% (22)</td>
<td>3% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Safe:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>19% (26)</td>
<td>21% (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-54 years old</td>
<td>4% (6)</td>
<td>16% (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+ years old</td>
<td>15% (20)</td>
<td>5% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3% (4)</td>
<td>12% (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-54 years old</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>9% (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+ years old</td>
<td>3% (4)</td>
<td>3% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unsafe:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4% (5)</td>
<td>6% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-54 years old</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>2% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+ years old</td>
<td>4% (5)</td>
<td>4% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Go Out:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4% (5)</td>
<td>39% (53)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-54 years old</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>4% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+ years old</td>
<td>4% (5)</td>
<td>35% (47)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These figures are not identical to those given on page 116 since not all respondents answered the question on age.*
a parking space only during a particular time of day or night (10%) or all the time (3%).

RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Respondents were asked about their use of recreational facilities which might be developed in the neighborhood. More than 50% said they would use a park (67%) and "places to sit" (54%). Forty percent or more said they would use a place to do arts and crafts (46%), a swimming pool (43%), a place to jog (42%), a community center (41%) or bike paths (40%).

c. Statistics

A number of statistical questions were asked to establish demographic and other information about the sample. The results are summarized below:

--Sixty-seven percent of the respondents are renters. The remainder (33%) own their homes.

--Eighty-four percent of respondents living west of NE 21st are renters, while only 51% of those living east of 21st rent. The northeast quadrant is the only area of the neighborhood where homeowners predominate: 62% of the respondents in that area own their homes.

--Of those surveyed, 31% live in single-family detached houses, 6% live in duplexes, and 63% live in buildings with three or more housing units.

--The median household size for the sample is 1.74 persons. The majority of surveyed households contain either one (40%) or two (40%) persons.
2. **Interviews with Institutions, Businesses, and Other Special Interest Groups**

**Approach**

Selection of twelve respondents was based on six categories: non-resident property owners (3), owners of industrial property (2), owners of small commercial establishments (2), developers, both large and small (2), institutional establishments, specifically retirement homes (2), and a local church (1).

Data was collected by means of both personal and telephone interviews. Initial contact involved an effort to make an appointment for personal contact; in some instances a telephone interview was deemed to be sufficient.

**Findings**

**ISSUES OF CONCERN**

Identification of neighborhood-related issues of concern reveal that crime, ranging from street incidents such as purse snatching to robberies and problems of security was the most frequently mentioned by those interviewed. Street-related issues such as narrow streets and accessibility problems, street closures, freeway noise along the gulch ridge and impact of the Banfield Light Rail Transit, both during and after construction, were identified by half of the respondents. Lack of both an elementary school and a common open space or park in the neighborhood were mentioned by several of those interviewed.

The high incidence of non-resident property ownership in the neighborhood was mentioned twice as at least a partial explanation for deterioration and deferred maintenance of some properties.

Finally, two respondents expressed serious doubts about the credibility of the neighborhood association as representatives for the entire community.
One commented that zone changes which were the result of neighborhood association requests were unfair as those impacted by such changes were unaware of them until after the fact. (See Table 9)

PERCEPTIONS ABOUT NEIGHBORHOOD

Residents of Sullivan's Gulch are perceived as friendly neighbors by a number of respondents. Identified as a cross-section of people including the elderly, blacks and young families, they tend to be a fairly stable residency. The area is viewed as desirable, especially for the elderly, primarily due to accessibility to services, transportation, shopping, and medical care.

Identifying characteristics of the neighborhood revealed by respondents include mix of land uses, overall smallness, narrow streets, noise, variety of structures, and need for a playground or park.

Several persons mentioned witnessing a trend in recent years toward high density residential and commercial uses. Related to this observation was the comment that this area is no longer in high demand for single-family residential use, resulting in conversion of single-family houses to duplexes or triplexes. A perceived general decline in the neighborhood was attributed by one respondent to the growing number of rental units; in contrast, another person felt that apartments were generally better maintained than houses. (See Table 9)

FUTURE OF NEIGHBORHOOD

It is obvious that change and growth in the Sullivan's Gulch neighborhood is directly tied to the economy. One respondent envisions a high-rise dominated area on the west boundary within 15 years; another insists that high-rise buildings will not be built east of Lloyd Center. The majority of respondents anticipate changes in land use patterns in the community to follow trends; higher density units will
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES OF CONCERN</th>
<th>PERCEPTIONS ABOUT NEIGHBORHOOD</th>
<th>FUTURE PLANS/FUTURE OF NEIGHBORHOOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Crime and Violence (6)</td>
<td>Mix of Land Uses (5)</td>
<td>Change and growth Tied to Economy (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow Streets and Access (5)</td>
<td>Friendly Neighbors (5)</td>
<td>High Rise Buildings will not be Built (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Closures (4)</td>
<td>Trend toward High Density (4)</td>
<td>Trend toward Commercial/Light Retail Use (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Banfield Light Rail Line (3)</td>
<td>Small and Compact (4)</td>
<td>Conversion of Streets to Through Streets (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Elementary School (3)</td>
<td>Cross-section of People (4)</td>
<td>Vacation by Single Families (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deterioration/Deferred Maintenance (2)</td>
<td>Narrow Streets (3)</td>
<td>High Rise Area near West Boundary (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility of Neighborhood Assn. (2)</td>
<td>Stable Residency (3)</td>
<td>High Density Land Use (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absentee Ownership (2)</td>
<td>Neighborhood Assn. Reactive (3)</td>
<td>Mix of Apartments/Commercial on Gulch Ridge (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Problems (1)</td>
<td>Variety of Structures (3)</td>
<td>Potential Use of PUDs to provide Open Space (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise along Gulch Ridge (1)</td>
<td>Desirable Area for Oldersters (2)</td>
<td>Closure of Several Internal Streets (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Park (1)</td>
<td>No Longer Demand Area (2)</td>
<td>Office Commercial Development along Banfield Light Rail Route (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need for Open Space/Park (2)</td>
<td>Expansion of Lloyd Center West (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variety of Home Maintenance (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use Zone Changes (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers in parentheses indicate how many respondents mentioned that item.
increase since utilities to accommodate them are in place. In addition, several respondents envision a shift toward commercial and retail land uses, resulting in the loss of single-family residences. Related to this projected use of land is the belief by several respondents that streets in the area will be converted to through street status.

Office commercial development along the light rail route, but only in the Lloyd Center area, is the objective of a major developer in the area. For example, at present this major corporation is negotiating with an organization interested in obtaining 127,000 square feet of office space providing that space is on the light rail route. Long-range plans for this major corporation are centered west of Lloyd Center and include office buildings, perhaps another hotel, and retail land use expansion. It was noted that if development were to occur near NE 16th and 17th Streets, it should be accompanied by a landscaped barrier in an effort to maintain neighborhood cohesiveness.

Several corporations have requested street closures; a major manufacturing corporation has requested closure of several internal streets in an effort to fence and protect its property, and a potential request for closure of several dead-end streets in the Lloyd Center area was revealed. One respondent suggested that transportation and parking problems in the neighborhood might be alleviated by a higher density development, since off-street parking is required of new development.

The use of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) was recommended as a means to close off streets and develop common open space areas within the neighborhood confines. A PUD allows waiving of traditional zoning and subdivision regulations for a specific site. The result is a broader
range of housing types with perhaps clustering or attaching of homes to provide open space amenities. (See Table 9)
APPENDIX
A. STUDY PROCESS

This study was carried out by graduate students in the Comprehensive Planning Workshop ("The Planning Group") at Portland State University's School of Urban and Public Affairs. Of the many neighborhoods suitable for this type of study, Sullivan's Gulch seemed to be the most desirable for student work because of its small size, the diversity of issues facing the neighborhood, and the willingness of the neighborhood association to provide support for the students' efforts.

The study involved three major tasks:

1. Development of a data base to provide adequate information for planning.
2. Identification and evaluation of issues important to the neighborhood, and
3. Formulation of recommendations for further action by the neighborhood.

The study process is illustrated in Figure 24.

Preliminary identification of issues

The Planning Group (PG) attempted to familiarize themselves with the Sullivan's Gulch Neighborhood in the following ways:

1. Speaking with members of the neighborhood association
2. Taking a walking tour of the neighborhood
3. Speaking with City officials about the neighborhood
4. Reviewing the Neighborhood Need Reports* for the past four years
5. Reviewing available data and research on the neighborhood

* Neighborhood Need Reports are requests submitted to the City by neighborhood associations and similar groups. The Reports identify problems and suggest solutions to be included in the City's annual budget.
Having obtained some baseline data, the PG members were able to individually perceive some potential problem areas within the neighborhood. In order to collect appropriate data on these perceived problems to present to the neighborhood, it was necessary to arrive at some consensus within the PG.

The Nominal Group Technique (NGT) was chosen as a mechanism by which to obtain group consensus on the neighborhood issues as expeditiously as possible. The NGT basically has four components:

1. Participants silently identify issues. Then, in "round robin" fashion, these issues are listed on a flip chart.
2. After listing of issues is completed, discussion ensues so that everyone clearly understands the intent of each point.
3. Identified issues are grouped by similarity into categories.
4. Finally, a ranking of the issues occurs, which in this case was accomplished by voting.

A number of problems and issues were identified which reflect the impressions of the PG after their initial contact with the neighborhood. The problems and issues were grouped in six broad issue area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE AREA</th>
<th>PROBLEMS/ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Traffic</td>
<td>Traffic flow and circulation patterns stop signs barriers/diverters Sidewalks: curb cuts (wheelchair ramps) Pedestrian paths, including those for school-children and the elderly Noise from autos and buses On-street parking and narrow streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Land Use</td>
<td>Density mix of densities future densities Potential land use Compatibility of land uses, current and future Zoning: residential and commerical Public services: schools and libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASKS</td>
<td>WEEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDENTIFY BROAD ISSUE AREAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA COLLECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFINE ISSUE AREAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEIGHBORHOOD WORKSHOP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYNTHESIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY FEEDBACK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL PRODUCT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- PRODUCT
- NEIGHBORHOOD WORKSHOP
- AD HOC COMMITTEE MEETING

Figure 24
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3. Future | Impacts of Light Rail  
Transportation impacts/street closures  
Gentrification  
Population growth  
Institutional/Commercial expansion: potential conflicts |
| 4. Recreation | Open space  
parks  
bike paths  
Recreation: playgrounds  
Recreation for teenagers |
| 5. Safety and Welfare | Crime  
Elderly activities  
safety  
Recycling  
Establishing Block Homes  
Street lights |
| 6. Cohesiveness/Image of Neighborhood | Definition of unclear neighborhood image, boundaries  
Cohesiveness: emerging factions  
Non-resident property owners: lack of neighborhood control |

These issues provided the foundation on which the PG began its data collection. The issues were continually refined throughout the study process.

**Data Collection**

The history of Sullivan's Gulch was researched to establish empirical and experiential data; the history of an area can provide valuable insights into current problems, issues, and situations. Demographic information from the 1980 Census was analyzed and compared with 1970 data to ascertain whether the neighborhood has undergone change in population size or composition within the last decade and to identify various characteristics of the current population, including age distribution, household size, and extent of home ownership.

Land use, zoning, and Comprehensive Plan designations for the neighborhood were examined to provide a detailed picture of current
conditions in Sullivan's Gulch. To this end, a survey of building and street conditions was also carried out.

To identify the extent to which property in Sullivan's Gulch is owned by those who do not live there, information on property ownership was collected. The extent of "non-resident" ownership may be a factor in neighborhood cohesiveness. In addition, when coupled with the data collected to identify under-developed properties, the information can indicate areas that are likely to be developed or redeveloped, and areas which might be obtained for public use.

Plans for the Banfield Light Rail Transit project were reviewed to determine the effects on Sullivan's Gulch. Traffic volumes and circulation patterns in the neighborhood were examined to determine the extent of traffic-related problems, including congestion. In addition, traffic- and pedestrian-related improvements requested of the City by the neighborhood association were consulted to determine the neighborhood association's perceptions.

Information on crime in Sullivan's Gulch was collected to determine the amount and type of crime occurring in the neighborhood and how the crime rates for the neighborhood compare with near-by areas and the City as a whole.

A random telephone survey of neighborhood residents was conducted to determine residents' general perceptions of the neighborhood, identify issues, and provide demographic and other statistical information about the area. To identify issues in a neighborhood as diverse as Sullivan's Gulch, it is important to talk with a wide range of people. In addition to the survey of residents, representatives of businesses, institutions, "non-resident" property owners, and other special interest groups were interviewed as to their perceptions of the neighborhood, their future plans for the area, and their concerns and goals for Sullivan's Gulch.
The information collected is detailed in Section II of this report.

Refinement of issues

A neighborhood workshop was held in Sullivan's Gulch on November 15, 1982. The purpose of the workshop was, first, to present the data gathered by the PG to the neighborhood, and second, to ask those attending and workshop to identify issues, concerns, and priorities.

Information was presented by PG members on land use, demographics, land ownership and value, transportation (including traffic and impacts of Light Rail construction), and crime. In addition, the results of the telephone survey of residents were presented, and the implications of the current zoning and Comprehensive Plan designations were reviewed to provide insight into possible future land use patterns.

After the presentations, those attending the workshop formed small groups. Using the Nominal Group Technique (described earlier in this section), the groups were asked "If you were to leave the neighborhood and come back in ten years, what changes and improvements would you like to see?" Each group's responses were listed on large sheets of paper, and several of the ideas were briefly discussed. The issues and ideas were then ranked by giving each person five stick-on dots to use in voting for what they considered the most important issues. Each was asked to place the dots in a manner that indicated how important they considered the issues they selected; all five dots could be placed by one issue, one dot could be placed by each of five issues, and so on. The array given below is the result of this voting procedure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE/IDEA</th>
<th>NUMBER OF DOTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moratorium on high-density development</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More crime patrols</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater resident involvement</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautify Broadway/Weidler</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycle garbage</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High density in 15th/Broadway</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to curbs/pavement</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema at Lloyd Center</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less traffic</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual improvement/trees</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divide area: west: as low-profile, east as high-profile</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood upkeep projects</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good bus service</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner air</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holladay Park remain the same</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

Several weeks before the neighborhood workshop, PG members began analyzing and integrating the information that had been collected on the neighborhood. Small groups formed a study several areas: development and change, public and recreational transportation, safety and security, space; and neighborhood organization. Each group was guided by the issues identified by the PG and the neighborhood workshop. Information
was integrated and inter-relationships sought out, both for problems and for solutions. Goals and objectives to address each area were developed, as were strategies to implement the goals.

On December 2, a small workshop was held with eight people from the neighborhood, representing the diversity of interests in Sullivan's Gulch: Scott Bailey, Caroline Bax, Martine Curl, Leonard Deklotz, Hilty Fast, Maureen Herndon, John Rumpakis, and Mike Schroedl.

The background information was briefly reviewed, and the preliminary work on development of strategies was presented. Comments and discussion by the neighborhood representatives and several faculty members attending the workshop served to guide the remainder of the analysis.
Sullivan’s Gulch celebrates success

Live music, food, and crafts were featured at the Tenth Annual Neighbor Day in the Sullivan’s Gulch neighborhood yesterday. “This year was special,” said Linda Spencer, a member of the Sullivan’s Gulch Neighborhood Association. “The neighborhood is celebrating 10 years of hard work. We now have a park, our Pedestrian Path, a Block Watch program, and a lot more, too.”

The Mayor and three City Commissioners were on hand to “kick off” the festivities. “This neighborhood has achieved a lot in the past 10 years,” said the Mayor. “Congratulations are in order for all of you—residents, businesses, property owners, and everybody—who have worked together to solve your problems and decide on your own future. You have made your neighborhood and your city a better place.”

Neighbor Day, started in 1983 as a neighborhood picnic, has grown each year—more than 3000 attended yesterday’s festivities. “Most of the neighborhood residents turned out, along with others concerned with the vitality of our neighborhood, and, of course, people who come just because it’s a lot of fun,” said Spencer.

Live music and dancing, along with booths offering food, crafts, and information, filled the recently completed “vest pocket” park as well as two streets that are part of the Pedestrian Path in the neighborhood.

A “Gift Catalogue” was used to raise money and materials for the small park, completed last month, and for beautification of the Pedestrian Path—a network of safe, pleasant streets to walk along. Items in the Catalogue, ranging from benches to grass seed, were donated or purchased with donated funds.

“The businesses and corporations in the area, along with private citizens, really pitched in to buy out the Catalogue,” said Spencer. Several annual events, including Neighbor Day, will raise funds for maintenance of the new park and the Pedestrian Path.

The new park and the Pedestrian Path are only two of the things this neighborhood has done in the past 10 years.

A mini-park linking the Pedestrian Path with Lloyd Center is part of a residential complex on NE 16th and Wasco. Design guidelines developed by the neighborhood association and negotiation with the developer were the keys to obtaining the land for public use, said Spencer. The same process—using adopted design guidelines and negotiation with developers—has given the neighborhood a great deal of new development that blends in well with the older, single-family houses in the area. “We’ve had a lot of change here, and all these new apartment buildings and shops could have just ruined the character we’ve got in the neighborhood. Instead, we’ve still been able to have all the new things, but they fit in, and even make our neighborhood better,” said Spencer.

Other signs of change are also visible in Sullivan’s Gulch, according to Spencer. “More pedestrians use the streets now, and there’s a lot less traffic roaring through the area.” She attributes the improvements to increased residential development, both multi-family and row houses, and traffic diverters and chokers, which narrow streets to discourage traffic.

Crime was the first problem tackled by the “energized and expanded” neighborhood association in 1983, said Spencer. Community education sessions are held each month. Projects such as PLOT (Porch Lights On Tonight) and tree trimming to increase street lighting efficiency have been effective in making the streets brighter and safer at night. The Block Watch program has expanded throughout the neighborhood, spurred by the success of the program—crime rates have continued to drop as more blocks participate in the program.

Teenagers distribute newsletters about the projects and operate an escort service for elderly residents apprehensive about walking alone in the neighborhood. Teenagers also serve on the neighborhood association’s committee on juvenile activities.

“During the past 10 years, the Sullivan’s Gulch Neighborhood Association has gradually acquired the skills and support we needed to achieve our goals,” said Spencer. “We started with small things, and each of the small successes gave us fuel for the next challenge.”
Hyster said dropping Portland plant

By DONALD J. SORENSEN
of The Oregonian staff

A union official reported Thursday that Hyster Co. plans to phase out its Portland manufacturing plant, resulting in the loss of more than 200 jobs, but a company executive said negotiations with the union still were under way.

Union leaders were informed of the decision Thursday afternoon, the Associated Press reported.

Hyster issued a news release earlier, saying it "is not prepared to make any statements regarding the discussions currently under way at the Portland plant."

Later, Hyster President William J. Fronk said, "I don't want to get involved where the content of a union negotiation session is coming out in the press. I understand there will be another meeting" Friday morning.

Roger Rimer, president of the United Shop and Service Employees Union, said the company's announcement to phase out the plant came after Hyster sought unsuccessfully to obtain concessions from the union, the AP reported.

The company, according to the union official, proposed reducing the number of union employees to 93 and announced the closure when union officials rejected that proposal.

Rimer said the decision affects 218 employees, all of whom are union members, who work in the manufacturing plant and in a related tool and die shop, both part of the company's industrial truck division. He said Hyster normally would have 400 employees, but earlier layoffs have cut the number to 218.

This does not include salaried workers.

Rimer said he did not know when the closure would take place. He did not return telephone calls to provide additional details.

In its statement, Hyster noted that it has been involved in extensive evaluation of all of its operations. "This study is likely to lead to the closure or downsizing of certain Hyster plants worldwide. The Portland facility is one of 16 such plants."

Hyster, one of the leading lift truck producers in the United States, has been suffering along with the rest of the industry from "significantly depressed demand levels," the release said.

Because of this, Hyster and others "are experiencing excess manufacturing capacity, a situation we do not expect to be reversed in the near term."

Hyster plant closure looms as company seeks help

By DONALD J. SORENSEN
of The Oregonian staff

The future of Hyster Co.'s manufacturing plant in Portland was in the air Friday after a union official said it would be closed by next June and a company executive hedged on the outlook.

"The closure is only going to be a probability if we don't get support from the state and the city and concessions from the employees like we have achieved in all other plants where we are dealing with restructuring," said Hyster board Chairman William H. Kilkenney.

His comment came in response to a news release earlier Friday from the United Shop and Service Employees union that said the plant will be phased into extinction by June 1, 1983. At this point all of our jobs are lost.

Kilkenney, however, said, "That was not stated by anyone on our side."

The two positions came amid developments that found the union issuing charges, the company denying them and the state, the city of Portland and the Portland Development Commission all getting into the act.

At stake is the Hyster plant at 2002 N.E. Clackamas St., where the company was started in 1929. Once employing about 700 workers, it has dwindled to 218 union workers (or "recession cutbacks").

Negotiations have been held between the company and the union for additional concessions, but the union is balking. The latest development, according to Roger Rimer, president of the union, was to cut back the work force to 93 — a request the union turned down.

At the impromptu news conference staged by the union in the plant Friday morning, union spokesman John Bailey read a statement saying, "We have agreed with the company to continue any dialogue at any place and at any time."

The company, in a short news release, said, "Discussions were recessed and it is anticipated that a further meeting will be scheduled."

Portland Mayor Frank Ivancic expressed concern over the situation. Kilkenney said a group representing Gov. Vic Atiyeh and the mayor would meet with him Monday to discuss the situation.

"We want to keep a hotline going with the company," Ivancic said. "We meet Monday to see what we can do about keeping the plant open. It would be a sad day to lose the Hyster plant. We might lose their corporate headquarters next. We will put out all the stops to help them."

For several months, Hyster executives have been holding talks with various government entities, including the state, in an effort to continue operations.

In a number of places these talks have been productive, according to Hyster executives.

However, John Bailey, the union spokesman at the press conference, said Hyster Senior Vice President James Rose "has advised us that Oregon's response has been completely negative" and that the governor's office "has not been responsive."

That was denied by Kilkenney.

Douglas Carter, director of the Department of Economic Development, said, "I think we have repeatedly stepped forward to offer all assistance that the state and the governor's office can, but it's possible we don't have the authority to offer them what they want."

"Kilkenney said the union has not quoted the facts. "We have been working with the city and the state and we expect a positive response," he said.

"We have achieved significant concessions," said representatives of other plants and financial support from cities and states," Kilkenney said. "His comments included "many millions of dollars, the bulk of it in support grants," the company has received in the Midwest where it has plants.

"When you add up the wages and fringe benefits, the highest point of our operations in the world is in the Portland plant," he said.

Rimer said the union has "Willing to explore any option" including such things as pay cuts, shorter work weeks and less vacation. He said the company needs to save $1.5 million at the Portland plant.

"Ted Johnson, an assistant for communications for Irv Hanes, said Hyster had not raised any warning flag in a survey by the Portland Development Commission on the state of business of various companies in Portland. This was taken a year ago to provide an early warning so the city could act when companies were having economic problems.

"Hyster did not reveal through that barometer, as far as I know, any difficulty of the kind that is going on," Johnson said.

This was echoed by Jan Burress, public information officer for the commission. "Hyster responded that they had no special operational changes in mind and that they did not require any special kind of city assistance," she said.

"Obviously, in this case, the early warning system didn't provide the early warning," Kilkenney said the survey form was filled out by the public relations department, that executives did not see it and that "conditions have changed."
C. SITES OF POSSIBLE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

The sites listed below have been identified by the Sullivan's Gulch Neighborhood Association and the City of Portland as being of possible historical significance.

HOUSES

1825 NE Clackamas
2114 NE Clackamas
2173 NE Clackamas
2316-2320 NE Clackamas (This is the oldest house in the neighborhood. Built circa 1887 as a farmhouse, it was originally on the northwest corner of NE Broadway and 21st.)
2324 NE Clackamas
2329 NE Clackamas
2332 NE Clackamas (Originally in the Finley family.)
2404 NE Clackamas
2445 NE Clackamas
2544 NE Clackamas
2152 NE Wasco
2164 NE Wasco
2406 NE Wasco
2432 NE Wasco
2534 NE Wasco
2607 NE Wasco
2170 NE Halsey
2406 NE Halsey (The marker used to palt the area is on this site.)
2416 NE Halsey
2426 NE Halsey
2432 NE Halsey
2444 NE Halsey
2450 NE Halsey
2454 NE Halsey
2506 NE Halsey
2514 NE Halsey
2524 NE Halsey
2608 NE Halsey
2616 NE Halsey
2173 NE Multnomah
2425 NE Multnomah
2532 NE Multnomah
1936 NE Weidler
2111 NE Weidler

OTHER BUILDINGS

2424-38 NE Broadway
1525 NE 24th (Old Banbury Cross Apartments)
1231 NE 26th
1644 NE 24th (Metropolitan Community Church)
Dornbecker Factory (with original water towers and large smokestack)
BUILDING SURVEY INSTRUMENT

AD - ADDRESS
NU - NUMBER OF UNITS
O - OCCUPANCY
BM - BUILDING MATERIAL
BC - BUILDING CONDITION
LU - LAND USE
P - OFF-STREET PARKING

AD  NU  O  BM  BC  LU  P

AD  NU  O  BM  BC  LU  P

AD  NU  O  BM  BC  LU  P
INSTRUCTIONS TO INTERVIEWERS ARE IN CAPITALS. "THINGS TO SAY ARE IN QUOTES."

"HELLO. MY NAME IS ________________________ I'M FROM PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY AND WE'RE DOING A SURVEY OF YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD. COULD YOU TAKE THE TIME TO ANSWER A FEW QUESTIONS? YOUR RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL."!

IF THEY SAY NO: "THANK YOU very much," AND TERMINATE INTERVIEW! IF THEY SAY YES: PROCEED

"ARE YOU OVER 18 YEARS OLD?"
IF NO: "THANK YOU very much" AND TERMINATE INTERVIEW
IF YES: PROCEED

1. How long have you lived in the Sullivan's Gulch neighborhood?
   1a. IF THEY RECOGNIZE NAME OF NEIGHBORHOOD, CODE A 1.
      IF THEY DON'T, CODE A 2 AND SAY "THE NEIGHBORHOOD STRETCHES FROM NE 15TH TO 33RD AND FROM BROADWAY TO THE BANFIELD FREEWAY!"
   1b. CODE IN LENGTH OF RESIDENCE. CODE MONTHS IN DECIMALS, YEARS AS WHOLE NUMBERS, E.G., 12½ YRS = 12.5; 14 MONTHS = 1.16.
      1 mo = .08
      2 mo = .16
      3 mo = .22
      4 mo = .27
      5 mo = .33
      6 mo = .50
      7 mo = .58
      8 mo = .66
      9 mo = .75
      10 mo = .83
      11 mo = .92
      12 mo = 1.00

2. What are the three things you like the most about your neighborhood?
   WRITE IN FIRST THREE RESPONSES

3. What are the three things you dislike the most about your neighborhood?
   WRITE IN FIRST THREE RESPONSES

4. On a scale of 1 to 5, how much do you like living in the Sullivan's Gulch neighborhood, with 1 meaning you like it very much and 5 meaning you dislike it very much.
   5
   like neutral dislike
   very much very much
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5. Why do you live in this area?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DO NOT READ LIST. 1= MENTIONED</th>
<th>2= NOT MENTIONED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.01 convenience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.02 close to everything</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.03 close to work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.04 close to friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.05 close to shopping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.06 transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DON'T HAVE/WANT CAR; CLOSE TO TRANSIT, ETC.  

| 5.07 cost of housing            |                  |
| 5.08 like it here               |                  |
| 5.09 like housing unit          |                  |
| 5.10 long-time ties             |                  |

LIVED THERE A LONG TIME, ETC.  

| 5.11 no choice                  |                  |
| 5.12 other                      |                  |
| 5.13 other                      |                  |
| 5.14 other                      |                  |

5.14 long-time ties              

WRITE IN RESPONSE IF OTHER      

5.14 long-time ties              

6. Does your household own a car?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1= YES</th>
<th>2= NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IF YES, GO TO 7</td>
<td>IF NO, GO TO 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How many cars?  

CODE IN ACTUAL NUMBER  

8. Do you have trouble finding a parking place near your home in the day, evening, or night?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DO NOT READ LIST. MAY HAVE TO PROBE TO GET TIMES.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAY= 7am-5pm; EVENING=5pm-10pm; NIGHT=10pm-7am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= always (day, evening &amp; night)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2= never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3= day only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4= evening only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5= night only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6= day &amp; evening only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7= day &amp; night only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8= evening &amp; night only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9= have private space/driveway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0= do response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Of the following, which new recreational facilities would you use in the neighborhood?  

READ LIST. PROBE FOR OTHERS. WRITE IN RESPONSE IF OTHER.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2= I DO NOT OR WOULD NOT USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1= I USE OR WOULD USE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01. parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02. places to sit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03. bike paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04. swimming pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05. place to do arts and crafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06. place to jog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07. community drop-in center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08. other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09. other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT HOW SAFE YOU FEEL IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD."

10. How safe do you feel walking alone in your neighborhood during the day?  

READ LIST OF POSSIBLE ANSWERS  

| 4= unsafe                      | 6= don't go out |
| 3= very unsafe                 | 5= very unsafe  |
| 2= safe                        | 0= no response  |
| 1= very safe                   | 6= don't go out |
| 2= safe                        | 0= no response  |
| 3= somewhat safe               | 6= don't go out |
| 4= unsafe                      | 0= no response  |
| 5= very unsafe                 | 0= no response  |
| 6= don't go out                | 0= no response  |
11. How about walking alone after dark?
   READ LIST OF POSSIBLE ANSWERS
   SAME AS LIST FOR #10

12. Would you feel more safe walking with a companion?
   1= yes
   2= no
   3= don't know
   0= no response

13. How much crime do you feel there is in this neighborhood?
   READ LIST OF POSSIBLE ANSWERS
   1= a great deal
   2= about the same as other neighborhoods
   3= not much at all
   4= don't know
   0= no response

14. Does noise bother you when you are in your home?
   IF YES, GO TO 15. IF NO, OR NO RESPONSE, GO TO 16
   1= YES
   2= NO
   0= NO RESPONSE

15. Where does this noise come from?
   DO NOT READ LIST
   1= MENTIONED
   2= NOT MENTIONED
   15.1 street traffic
   15.2 people on streets
   15.3 other tenants in bldg.
   15.4 nearby buildings
   15.5 other
   15.6 other

WRITE IN RESPONSE IF OTHER

"I HAVE A FEW MORE QUESTIONS I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU FOR
STATISTICAL PURPOSES ONLY. ALL YOUR ANSWERS WILL BE CONFIDENTIAL."

16. Do you own or rent your home?
   1= RENT
   2= OWN
   3= OTHER
   0= NO RESPONSE

17. Is your residence a single-family house or an apartment?
   IF SINGLE-FAMILY, CODE A 1 AND GO TO #18
   IF NOT, ASK:
   How many units are in your building?
   CODE ACTUAL NUMBER OF UNITS

18. How many people are there in your household?
   1 to 8 PEOPLE, RECORD ACTUAL AMOUNT
   9 OR MORE, RECORD 9
   0= NO RESPONSE
19. In what age category would you place yourself? READ LIST. CODE IN NUMBER OF CATEGORY.

1 = 18-24 years old
2 = 25-34
3 = 35-44
4 = 45-54
5 = 55-64
6 = 65-74
7 = 75 or over
0 = no response

20. SEX OF RESPONDENT. DO NOT ASK!!

1 = Male  2 = Female

"ONE LAST QUESTION."

21. Based on what you see happening in your neighborhood now, do you think the neighborhood will be a better place, a worse place, or about the same kind of place to live five years from now? DO NOT READ LIST

1 = BETTER
2 = WORSE
3 = ABOUT THE SAME
4 = DON'T KNOW

"THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR PARTICIPATING IN OUR STUDY."
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