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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This project provides a framework for guiding future public involvement in creating the City’s Concept Plan and the Park Place Neighborhood Plan. The public involvement process focused on identifying issues and opportunities associated with the possible development of an area adjacent to the neighborhood that, if annexed into the city, will become part of the neighborhood. This is the first neighborhood oriented public involvement process to take place in the city. Stakeholders were identified and interviewed, a Community Forum and follow-up meeting were held in the neighborhood, public involvement processes and techniques were reviewed, and existing neighborhood conditions were identified to form the basis of a Public Involvement Plan.

Methodology

The Oregon Trail Planners worked with the Park Place Neighborhood Association, in partnership with the City of Oregon City and Park Place Development to explore the possibilities for effective public involvement in the Concept Planning process. This was achieved by:

• Examining public involvement processes and techniques to inform the public outreach strategy used in this project;
• Organizing two community forums held in Park Place Neighborhood;
• Administering a questionnaire;
• Identifying and interviewing key stakeholders;
• Conducting an analyses of existing neighborhood conditions and demographics.

Key Findings

The outcome of this process revealed that:

• Citizens want to be involved in the Concept Planning process and are excited about the advent of community based planning in Oregon City. They are concerned, however, that their viewpoints will not affect the outcome;
• The involvement of the developer in the public involvement process increased the collaborative potential of the upcoming Concept Planning process;
• Many residents live or have moved to this area for the rural environment;
• Residents are concerned about high-density development, and increase in traffic, and the loss of wildlife and habitat in the area negatively impacting Park Place Neighborhood;
• Many residents feel that traffic and transportation issues should be addressed before new development occurs;
• Some residents feel that the City would be better served if new development were focused in the existing urban core of Oregon City rather than around Park Place Neighborhood.
Recommendations

The recommendations for “Envision Park Place Neighborhood” are to create a Public Involvement Plan and develop a process to address community design, transportation and traffic, and environmental protection. The goal of the Public Involvement Plan would be to ensure that the local and regional perspective will be articulated and adequately represented in the decision making process. The City, Park Place Neighborhood Association, and Park Place Development should continue to work together to develop participation opportunities that allow citizens to actively engage in the planning process and create a vision for future development. Many residents felt that any planning process considering development in the area should first address whether the development is appropriate for the area. A Public Involvement Plan could address resistance to development by neighbors that will be directly impacted by it.

The Public Involvement Plan should include:

- A description of what the public can expect from the process;
- Specific ways in which the public will be kept informed of the planning process on a continual basis;
- A time line of concrete steps for decision making and where and how the public will be involved;
- Continual feedback opportunities for the public and stakeholders at various stages in the planning process, including several opportunities such as community forums and design workshops to respond to and assist in the development of the design of the proposed development;
- Opportunities for the Neighborhood Association and the public to review the Public Involvement Plan and the level of public involvement opportunities needed;
- Several opportunities for a variety of public involvement processes, including workshops, design charrettes, surveys, and more formal participation structures representing state, regional, and local government agencies and constituents such as a Steering Committee;
- Committee structures that can build on the Park Place Neighborhood Association committees.

This project identified three key issues that the public involvement process should focus on: community design, transportation and traffic, and environmental protection. The Public Involvement Plan should focus public involvement opportunities at addressing these areas.
The need for this project began when Metro expanded the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) in 2002. Over 300 acres of the UGB were expanded around Park Place Neighborhood in Oregon City (see Map 1). This expansion opened up the possibility for the land to be annexed by Oregon City, developed, and added to the Park Place Neighborhood. In 2003 a local development firm, Park Place Development, proposed the largest single development in Oregon City’s history in one of the expansion areas and the Livesay Road Area adjacent to the neighborhood. Park Place Development moved forward to develop a plan for the proposed development, called Park Place Village, of over 600 housing units and a commercial center. Design charrettes were held in the community, but a broad public involvement process did not take place. The City must develop a Concept Plan for the expansion areas and wanted to bring the developer and the community together to address the issues and opportunities associated with development.

In early 2004 the Park Place Neighborhood Association (PPNA) applied to Metro’s Enhancement Grant Program for funding to write a Neighborhood Plan. In the grant, PPNA recognized that the neighborhood was growing quickly and that new development was being discussed in the UGB expansion areas. Unfortunately, this proposal was not funded. The Park Place Neighborhood Association then contacted Portland State University’s Planning Workshop class for assistance in creating their Neighborhood Plan. After realizing the time constraints of workshop groups, the Neighborhood Association proposed another project to respond to resident’s concerns about Park Place Development’s proposal. After conducting a meeting with the Neighborhood Association, Park Place Development, and Oregon City Planning staff, the Workshop students were presented with the opportunity to develop a framework for guiding future public involvement in the City’s Concept Planning process for the UGB expansion areas and the Livesay Road Area.

The Workshop students were excited about the possibility of working on a project that addressed Concept Planning in UGB expansion areas and afforded the opportunity to partner with a private developer, city agencies, and an active neighborhood association to address issues associated with possible development. The Workshop students formed a consulting team, the Oregon Trail Planners, and began to work with the Park Place Neighborhood Association to develop an initial public involvement process that could be carried over to the Neighborhood Association’s Neighborhood Plan and the City’s Concept Plan. The Oregon Trail Planners acknowledged that these two plans would cover much of the same territory and involve many of the same stakeholders.

Oregon Trail Planners developed the following project goal and objectives with the Neighborhood Association and the City:
**Project Goal**

- Provide the beginning of a framework for public involvement to guide new development in the Livesay Road Area and the recently expanded UGB.

**Objectives**

- Examine public participation mechanisms for the Concept Planning process;
- Develop and implement a public participation process to identify the initial opportunities and concerns associated with new development;
- Make recommendations to the Park Place Neighborhood Association, Oregon City, and Park Place Development to effectively engage residents and other stakeholders in the concept planning process building off of the results of the initial public outreach.

This project has several unique aspects. The first is the desire of a City, Neighborhood Association, and local developer to work together in a planning process. These organizations do not always have a collaborative relationship in planning processes. This project is also the first collaborative citizen involvement process in Oregon City’s history. Lastly, this is the first Concept Plan that Oregon City will write. Many of the processes that will take place will be new to those involved. The Concept Planning process for UGB expansion areas is fairly new. Two areas in the Portland Metropolitan Region, Pleasant Valley and Damascus, have started this process. The process is different for each area, adapted to fit the unique situations and concerns that it addresses. Concept Plans can provide an opportunity for communities to come together and define a vision for future. The Oregon Trail Planners realized that this project represents a unique opportunity to work with diverse partners, pave the way for citizen involvement, and start a planning process that will influence how the UGB expansion areas develop.

This report is organized into the following major sections:

- **Project Background and Project Area**: This section describes the UGB expansion process, selection of the Project Area, and the existing conditions in Park Place Neighborhood and Project Area.
- **Public Involvement Process**: This section describes the role and importance of public involvement in planning, and the public involvement conducted by the Oregon Trail Planners. The results of the initial public involvement are laid out along with lessons learned from the process.
- **Recommendations**: This section presents the recommendations for Park Place Neighborhood, Oregon City, and Park Place Development as they work together on the Concept Plan.
- **Next Steps**: This section suggests follow up steps for using the results and recommendations of this project.

This project is intended to serve as a model of public involvement for the Concept Plan. The importance of public involvement in the Concept Plan is summarized in the following quote from Ray Valone of Metro: “When annexation comes to a vote, the new development will comply with a plan that you helped create.” This emphasizes that citizen input does make a difference in the planning process. When this occurs, a city’s long term growth will conform to the vision of its citizens.
PROJECT BACKGROUND & PROJECT AREA

This section examines the UGB expansion process, relevance to other plans, Project Area, and existing conditions. Metro’s 2002 UGB expansion made this land available for annexation into Oregon City. The Project Area and the reasons for its selection are also covered. Lastly, the existing conditions of the Project Area and Park Place Neighborhood are described.

Urban Growth Boundary Expansion Process

The UGB was established as part of the statewide land use planning program in Oregon in the early 1970s. Under Oregon Law, all cities and metropolitan areas have UGBs. The UGB is a legal boundary that separates urban and rural land to protect farm lands and forests and to contain suburban sprawl. Other benefits of the UGB include efficient use of land, efficient provision of infrastructure, and support for a lively and active urban core. The Portland Metro area’s quality of urban life and containment of suburban sprawl is often referred to as a model of growth management (Abbott, 2002).

The UGB is not intended to be static. Metro, the Portland area’s elected regional government, makes urban growth reports based on residential and industrial land need analyses, and reviews the UGB every five years for its capacity to accommodate estimated housing and employment growth for the next 20 years. UGB expansion decisions are made in compliance with Oregon’s Statewide Planning Goals & Guidelines. The Land Conservation and Development Commission reviews and approves Metro’s decision. Metro’s 2040 Growth Concept guides how the UGB is managed to preserve community’s characteristics, enhance a balanced transportation system, and maintain access to nature.

In 2002, 18,638 acres were added to the UGB to accommodate growth and provide 38,657 housing units and 2,671 acres for additional jobs. The 2002 expansion brought 703 acres around the City of Oregon City into the UGB, including land near Park Place Neighborhood. This expansion opens the land to annexation by Oregon City.

Oregon City is required to develop a Concept Plan for the UGB expansion areas in compliance with Title 11 of Metro’s Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, which will become part of the Oregon City Comprehensive Plan. Title 11 aims to “promote the integration of new land added to the urban growth boundary into existing communities or provide for the establishment of new communities.” It provides planning requirements and guidelines for the conversion of new UGB land from rural to urban uses. Cities are usually required to complete a Concept Plan within two years from the UGB expansion, though Metro neither monitors the process strictly nor provides dedicated funding for Concept Plan development (O’Brien, 2005).
Public involvement is a critical aspect throughout the entire process from expansion of the UGB to implementation of the plans in expanded areas. As stated in the Goal 1 of Oregon Statewide Planning Goals, it is especially important that the public is involved in the planning process from an early stage to ensure the public voices are actually reflected in the decision making. Oregon City’s Comprehensive Plan calls for the adoption of neighborhood plans to make recommendations to City boards, commissions, or agencies regarding public improvements and land use decisions.

Concept Plans layout a vision for how specific UGB expansion areas will grow and develop. The results of the Concept Plan are incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. From there, implementing ordinances in the development code guide the development regulation, such as zoning, that are applied to that area. Other specific plans have been completed for the Project Area and Park Place Neighborhood. These plans should be considered as the Concept Planning moves forward. A list of some of these plans is listed in Appendix A.

Project Area

The City of Oregon City is an almost triangle-shaped city located in Clackamas County on the southern fringe of the Metro UGB. Park Place Neighborhood covers the northern corner of the triangle, consisting of approximately 1,184 acres, a fifth of Oregon City’s total acreage (see Map 1).

Metro’s expansion decision in 2002 added four UGB expansion areas (UGB 24, 25, 26, and 32) adjacent to Oregon City, three of which are near the Park Place Neighborhood UGB 24, 25, and 26). Among the three UGB expansion areas and adjacent lands, UGB 24 and the adjacent, unincorporated Livesay Road Area were selected as the Project Area due to the potential for the future development (see Map 2). UGB 25 and 26, which neighbor UGB 24, are not included because the potential for development is limited due to steep slopes, topography, and other environmental constraints. Oregon Trail Planners considered including these in the Project Area, but decided that these areas were dissimilar from UGB 24 and the Livesay Road Area. One important consideration is that a plan to annex and develop large parts of UGB 24 and the Livesay Road is underway. Development and annexation are not as imminent for UGB 25 and 26. A second consideration, mentioned by Oregon City staff, is that natural resources constrain development in UGB 25 and 26 to a greater degree. Metro’s analysis of UGB 25 and 26 shows that 65% and 50% of each area, respectively, is identified in Metro’s draft Goal 5 Fish and Wildlife Habitat inventory. It means that development of these areas could have a large impact on natural resources. These environmental factors and the lack of specific development proposals led Oregon Trail Planners to exclude UGB 25 and 26 from the Project Area. UGB 32 was also excluded as it is located farther south and development in this area will have much less influence on the Park Place Neighborhood.
Historic Context

One hundred and fifty years ago, thousands of emigrants traveling the Oregon Trail entered what is now the Park Place Neighborhood of Oregon City near the top of Holcomb Hill. Here, they rested and obtained supplies before heading out to claim their land in the Oregon Territory.

Oregon City, which lies at the end of the Oregon Trail, was established in 1844. After the turn of the century residential neighborhoods shifted away from the city center, while the commercial core remained in the downtown business center. Park Place Neighborhood was forcibly annexed into Oregon City in the 1980s because of failing septic systems.

“Preserve the historical significance of the pioneer history.”

Map 1: Oregon City and the Park Place Neighborhood

The Project Area, consisting of UGB 24 and Livesay Road Area, is located just south of the neighborhood and outside the city limits (Map 2). The area is bordered by Redland Road, UGB 24, and the border of the Park Place. The area includes approximately 180 acres in total. UGB 24 covers 82.3 acres and the Livesay Road Area covers approximately 97 acres. Oregon City is currently conducting a wildlife study to identify environmentally-protected areas and developable areas within all UGB expansion areas.
Existing Conditions

This section shows basic existing conditions data for Park Place Neighborhood and Oregon City. It is the first step of concept planning process to inventory base conditions. This section is intended to be both part of the inventory and supporting information for the public involvement efforts. Data are shown for both the Park Place Neighborhood and Oregon City to make them comparable as reference. Additional demographic data is found in Appendix B.

Land Use

Single family residential is the major type of residence found in the Park Place Neighborhood and the Project Area. The eastern half of Park Place Neighborhood is mostly residential, while the western half contains more commercial and industrial areas. The residential area contains commercial services, such as Steve’s Market, Pioneer Pizza and Plaid Pantry. The Project Area has a mix of forest, agricultural, and single family uses (see Map 3). The Project Area has a larger average tax lot size compared to Park Place Neighborhood. The median size of tax lots in the Project Area is 42,273 square feet, while the median lot size in Park Place is 11,588 square feet (Metro RLIS, 2004).

Park Place Neighborhood has a seen large amount of development in recent years. Most of the development has been new single family homes near the eastern edge of the Park Place Neighborhood. Between 2000 and 2004, there were approximately 165 building permits issued for new single family residences within the Park Place Neighborhood. (see Map 4). The Project Area has seen almost no recent development. Overall, Park Place Neighborhood has relatively newer buildings than the Project Area. The median total assessed value of the tax lots, which includes land and structure value, is fairly similar for Park Place Neighborhood and the Project Area. Park Place Neighborhood lots have a median total assessed value of $167,896, while Project Area lots have a median total assessed value of $168,392 (Metro RLIS, 2004).

Park Place Neighborhood has about 7.4 percent of the total housing units in Oregon City. As Park Place Neighborhood and Oregon City are rapidly growing, number of housing units may be much larger than the Census 2000 data in 2005. Relative to the ratio of population, the ratio of housing units in Park Place Neighborhood to the entire city is small, which indicate a slightly larger household size in Park Place Neighborhood. Vacancy rate is low in both areas, which could be even lower in 2005 (Table 1). Between 56 and 58 percent of housing units are owned by residents in both areas. The homeownership rate is slightly higher in Park Place Neighborhood compared with the entire city. There are two low-income units adjacent to Holcomb Boulevard. Clackamas Heights and Oregon City View Manor each have approximately 100 subsidized housing units.
Table 1: Housing Units, Occupancy Status, and Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PPN</th>
<th>Oregon City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>10,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>9,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>5,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter occupied</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>3,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Census 2000, STF 1, H1, H3, & H4
** Denominators for the percentage are the sums of each category.

Environment

The Project Area and Park Place Neighborhood have a varied topography. The eastern part of Park Place Neighborhood is near the Willamette River and has a low elevation. The land rises to the north and east, reaching elevations of about 500 feet. Parts of the area have steep slopes over 25%. The boundary between the Project Area and Park Place Neighborhood just south of Holcomb Boulevard is a notable area of steep slopes. Livesay Creek also runs along this boundary. Much of the Project Area has vegetative cover and tree canopies. By comparison, Park Place Neighborhood has relatively little vegetative cover and tree canopy (see Map 5).
“Population (enrollment) is declining. Right now, we have two classrooms that are not being used and a 360-375. We have about 300 students for 360-375 capacity of the school.”

“One of the problems is that there are a lot of rural roads used at an urban level.”

Map 4: Development Age in Park Place Neighborhood and Project Area

Map 5: Environmental Features of Park Place Neighborhood and Project Area
Transportation and Services

The road network in the area is centered on Holcomb Boulevard. Holcomb Boulevard connects with Redland Road in the southwest corner of Park Place Neighborhood. Holcomb is classified as an arterial road. Most of Park Place Neighborhood is accessible by neighborhood roads that feed on to Holcomb Boulevard. The neighborhood roads generally do not connect to form a grid. One bus line, bus 34, services Holcomb Road during the peak morning and afternoon commutes. The Project Area is accessible only by Livesay Road. This road is accessible only from Redland Road, and is not directly connected to Park Place Neighborhood.

There are few civic services in the area. Park Place Neighborhood includes Park Place and Holcomb Elementary Schools. Clackamette Park and Park Place Parks are City parks in the eastern part of Park Place Neighborhood. Clackamas County Fire District #1 maintains a fire station in the Oregon City View Manor.

Population

As shown in Table 2, Park Place Neighborhood has about 7.7 percent of the population in the Oregon City as of 2000. About 90 percent of the population is Non-Hispanic White. Park Place has slightly higher percentage of Hispanic population, but the ethnic and racial compositions are almost the same in both areas. In terms of racial and ethnic composition, both Park Place Neighborhood and Oregon City are relatively homogeneous. According to the information that we heard from Park Place Neighborhood Association, Oregon City and other stakeholders, there are Hispanic and Russian/Ukrainian communities. These ethnic/racial groups and population living in the low-income housing projects (see Land Use section) are potential underrepresented parties in the public involvement process.

Table 3 shows the age structure of Park Place Neighborhood and Oregon City. The age structure of Park Place Neighborhood and Oregon City are both relatively young. Park Place Neighborhood has large population younger than 15 years old. The proportion of population under 5 years old is especially large in Park Place Neighborhood, which indicates potential demand for a larger school capacity in the near future. The elderly population is currently small. However, the cohort in age groups 50-59 is pretty large, which will reach elderly in the coming decade.
Table 2: Total Population and Population by Race and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PPN</th>
<th>Oregon City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>1,974</td>
<td>25,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>23,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Census 2000, STF 1, P1 & P4
** Data for races (White, Black, American Indian, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islanders, and other) are for Non-Hispanic population.

Table 3: Population by Age Groups

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PPN</td>
<td>Oregon City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>2,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>2,801</td>
<td>2,721</td>
<td>5,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 34</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>6,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 59</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>4,337</td>
<td>4,376</td>
<td>8,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td>3,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>1,974</td>
<td>12,670</td>
<td>13,084</td>
<td>25,754</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Census 2000, STF 1, P12
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENTPROCESS

The main purpose of this project was to explore the possibilities of public involvement for the Concept Planning process. Entering into the process it was not clear how informed the public was about planning or what the level of interest there was for participating in the Concept Planning process. After holding two community forums, distributing a questionnaire, receiving feedback on a slide show of development/design examples, and interviewing professional and resident stakeholders it was apparent that residents are knowledgeable about planning issues, would like to be kept informed and included in the planning process, and would like to take an active role in determining the future of their community. The forum participants were excited that community based planning was getting started in Oregon City.

The focus of this initial public involvement process was to share information with the public, receive input regarding possible development and gain citizen support for the Concept Planning process. The information presented at the community forums focused on the UGB expansion process and history, the elements of the Concept Plan and process, community design, the existing conditions of Park Place Neighborhood, and the importance of citizen involvement.

Participation by a wide variety of community stakeholders in the planning process is essential for several reasons. True public involvement takes time and extra effort, however it can save a controversial project. A report by the Center for Livable Communities titled “Participation Tools for Better Land Use Planning” states that public involvement in the planning process can:

- Ensure that good plans remain intact over time;
- Reduce the likelihood of contentious battles before councils and planning commissions because problems are worked out in the process;
- Speed the development process and reduce the cost of good projects by identifying creative ways to approach problems;
- Increase the quality of planning;
- Enhance the general sense of community and trust in government.

Park Place Neighborhood Public Involvement Process

This section provides an overview of the public participation process held in Park Place Neighborhood. The public participation methods employed were a Community Forum and follow-up meeting, a two-page questionnaire, comment cards, and professional and public stakeholder interviews.

The public involvement strategy for this project was developed after a review of collaborative planning and citizen participation methods and the recent public involvement
process in Pleasant Valley (see Appendix C). The Public Comment Reports of the Pleasant Valley Community Forums provided examples of ways to present information to the public and answer questions. An evaluation of the Pleasant Valley Concept Plan Project by Adler and Ozawa (2002) provided valuable information on what worked and did not work in that process. Literature examining the benefits of density and the importance of integrating new development into existing neighborhoods was reviewed to support the content discussed in the community forums (see Appendix D).

The Oregon Trail Planners developed its outreach strategy through a series of steps. Initially the Oregon Trail Planners met with representatives of the Park Place Neighborhood Association, Park Place Development, a resident opposed to development in the Project Area, and Oregon City planners to identify the basic issues and context of the proposed development. During this process potential stakeholders for interviewing were identified. Several different public participation possibilities were developed and brought back to the client. It was decided that a public forum format would be best because that format had worked well for the community during the Holcomb Boulevard Pedestrian Enhancement Planning process. After some hesitation it was decided that small group discussion would be used because it allowed more viewpoints to be heard in a short period of time. A small group discussion format had not been used before in the neighborhood, and there was some uncertainty about whether participants would feel comfortable using this method. The outcome was positive and participants in the forum expressed that the format worked well. A questionnaire was developed to supplement the discussions at the community forums. Participants were also encouraged to write down additional comments on blank comment cards and to include contact information if they wanted to actively participate in the Concept Planning process. This contact information was given to the Park Place Neighborhood Association and the Oregon City Community Development Department.

Results from the questionnaire are included as tables in this section to support the description of the forum. Due to rounding, totals may not add up to 100%.

**Questionnaire Response: What did you like or not like about the forum?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Response</th>
<th>% Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Discussion</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Display</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Overview</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrap up</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In late March the Oregon Trail Planners attended a Park Place Neighborhood Association general meeting to inform the neighborhood about the project and to receive questions and comments to guide the process. Oregon Trail Planners met every two weeks with the client, Oregon City and Park Place Development to discuss the public involve-
ment strategy and identify potential issues that were likely to come up at the community forums.

**Questionnaire Response: Which part of the Community Forum do you think could be improved?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Response</th>
<th>% Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Overview</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Discussion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Display</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrap up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reaching as many residents as possible in Park Place Neighborhood and the surrounding area was an important element of the public involvement process. Informing the residents about the upcoming Concept Planning process and the possibility of potential development in the Project Area was acknowledged as being a core responsibility of the Oregon Trail planners. For an effective public involvement process to be initiated the residents needed to be aware of the process and the importance of their involvement. A variety of methods were used to get the word out to the public (see Appendix E for a detailed list of methods used, and Appendix F, G and H for the May 2 Flyer, May 16 Flyer, and a project brochure, respectively). An informational flyer inviting residents to the community forums was mailed and posted around the neighborhood. A special effort was made to contact Oregon City View Manor and Clackamas Heights, the two low-income communities in the neighborhood. Announcements were made at the Neighborhood Association general meeting and included in the Park Place Neighborhood Association Newsletter. Announcements were sent to the Park Place Neighborhood Association email list. An informational brochure describing the project was posted on the Oregon City website and emailed to individual stakeholders. The community forums were listed in the *Oregonian* community calendar. The second Community Forum was shown on Willamette Falls TV, the public access station for Clackamas County. The Oregon Trail Planners set up website with forum information and results.

**Questionnaire Response: How did you here about this forum?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Response</th>
<th>% Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flyer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPNA Newsletter</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon City Website</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Forums and Meetings

First Community Forum

A Community Forum was held on May 2 from 7:00 to 9:00 PM at a local church. The purpose of this Community Forum was to bring together a wide variety of participants to identify the opportunities and issues associated with the possible development of the Project Area. Over sixty people attended the forum.

Questionnaire Response: In what area do you live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th># Response</th>
<th>% Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Livesay Rd</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the PPN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Holcomb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Holcomb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S of Holcomb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the UGB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to residents of Park Place and the Livesay Road Area, a staff planner, Oregon City’s Public Relations Manager, the developer, and various professional stakeholders attended the forum. The meeting format was designed to allow participants to learn more about the Concept Plan process and to provide written and oral comments on the proposed development through small group discussions. The forum began with a 30 minute open house that allowed participants to review exiting conditions maps and display boards highlighting the urban growth boundary expansion and the Concept Plan processes. The open house was followed by a presentation by Oregon Trail Planners on the purpose and necessity of public involvement, the Concept Planning process, and why public involvement is important to the process.

After the presentation, participants formed into four groups to discuss a series of questions. An Oregon Trail Planner facilitated the discussion at each table and took notes. Prompting questions were used to get participants to give specific examples about what they were saying. Creative thinking was encouraged. Facilitators encouraged everyone at the table to express their views. The questions focused on identifying opportunities for building a strong community and issues associated with growth and development in the area centered around the following themes:

- Rural Area/Character;
- Transportation and Pedestrian/Bicycle Safety;
Participants also discussed ways to continue involving the public in the Concept Planning process by identifying types of participation mechanisms, past public involvement experiences that were fruitful, best places to hold community forums, and ways to keep the public informed (see Appendix I for the small group questions and discussion outline). A majority of the participants indicated that they wanted to be involved in the upcoming Concept Planning process.

**Questionnaire Response: Do you want to be involved in the Concept Planning process?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Response</th>
<th>% Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After an hour of small group discussion the group reconvened to hear from each table and discuss the results. The table facilitators reported back, checking in with the table to make sure everything had been recorded properly. An Oregon Trail Planner recorded additional comments on a flip chart. Participants added to the flip-chart list and commented on what was being said. This discussion lasted half an hour.

**Second Community Forum: Follow-Up Meeting**

Oregon Trail Planners presented the issues and opportunities that were identified at the May 2 Community Forum on May 16 from 7:00 to 9:00 PM at the Park Place Neighborhood general meeting. Over 35 people attended this meeting. Many of the participants had participated in the May 2 Community Forum. The presentation was structured as a dialogue with participants responding during the presentation and their comments recorded on a flip chart. The results of the discussion groups and the questionnaire were presented by theme. The issues and opportunities were not ranked in terms of the importance. Several issues were clarified and new issues and opportunities were identified.

A slide show of neighborhood design and medium density examples was presented in an effort to identify what type of design residents would like to see in the proposed development and to understand what participants meant by “connectivity” and “good design”. Images of commercial centers, a variety of housing types, developments with 10 units per developable acres, parks and green spaces, and community centers were used in the presentation. Participants responded to the images and discussed what they did and did not like. A lively discussion ensued. Most of the participants did not like the “New Urbanism” design that had a strong urban feel or development with at least 10 units per net
developable acre. There was a positive response to images with trees and trails. One image of a commercial center that had a rural “country” feel had some positive reactions.

**Questionnaire**

A questionnaire was created to obtain additional input at the first Community Forum. The major purpose of the questionnaire was to obtain quantitative data on the specific concerns and opportunities regarding the future development of the Project Area and to determine the level of interest in involvement in the Concept Planning process. Questions were asked mainly about the participants concerns and desires about the proposed development, basic demographics, and the desire to be involved in the concept planning process. All but one question was multiple-choice, to make it easier for respondents to answer, and to get a higher response rate. The questions were designed to flow in a logical sequence. Forty-five out of sixty participants answered the questionnaire. Four additional residents who did not attend the forum filled out the questionnaire and sent responses to the Oregon Trail Planners by email. Considering the size of the Project Area and the neighborhood, forty-nine responses is a good response rate. The results of the questionnaire are summarized below in the Results section (see Appendix J for the questionnaire and Appendix K for Questionnaire Results).

We did not originally plan to get survey responses after the Community Forum. However, some residents could not come to the forum due to the delay in mailing of the flyers. To give every interested resident a chance to bring input, we extended the period to receive questionnaire responses and accepted them by email, fax, and mail. The decision to extend the survey period was a fair one for those who are interested in the project, but it also created a dilemma for the Oregon Trail Planners.

All the responses are included in this report for two reasons: 1) our major purpose of the project is to get as many residents and stakeholders involved and start the active communication; and 2) we promised to include everyone’s input in our report. But ideally, it would be better to have a separate way to gather input for the forum attendees and the other interested stakeholders who bring input in different occasions. See Table 4 on pages 22-23 for Key Public Involvement Results (full results from the May 2 and 16 Forums are in Appendix M).

Both the response rate and the number of responses that we got from the first Community Forum survey was a big success for the Oregon Trail Planners. It enabled us to quantify the information that we have heard through the lively forum discussions. Moreover, it was a good indicator of strength of their interest in the future of their community to see how excited people were to bring their input and answer all questions. Following is lessons that we learned from designing and conducting the survey questionnaire.

- When designing a questionnaire, it is critical to consider the number and range of choices for each question that can be analyzed in the available amount of time.
- We can use both sides of a paper, but the questions should fit in one sheet of paper.
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- Use large fonts and design the formats that are easy to read for printed material.
- Multiple-choice questions encourage more people to fill out questionnaires.
- Questionnaire should be conducted on the same occasion. For example, forum questionnaire should be limited for those who actually attend the forum.
- It is better to have a separate means to collect input in different occasions.
- Reminder for attendees to fill out the questionnaire is important.
- Before creating a questionnaire, have clear purposes as to how we want to use the information obtained from it.
- It is good to have at least one open-ended question, where respondents can write their input more freely.
- Highly visible and accessible place to collect the responses would help people to hand it in.

Stakeholder Interviews

Stakeholder interviews were crucial in obtaining individual perspectives on potential future growth and development in the Project Area. The information obtained from the interviews enriched the findings from the community forums and questionnaires. Key stakeholders at the local and regional level were identified through discussions with the Park Place Neighborhood Association, City planning staff, Park Place Development, and residents of the neighborhood. The stakeholders identified and those that were interviewed are listed in the tables to the left.

Interviews took place between April and May 2005 and were conducted by phone, email, and in person. The interview questions were based on the Pleasant Valley Public Involvement stakeholder interview questions and were tailored to this project through discussions with the Project client and Oregon City staff. The main goal of the interviews was to identify public involvement opportunities and visions of the future of the community (see Appendix L for the interview questions and methodology).

The stakeholders were asked to give their opinion about the character of the area, its future as they see it if the proposed development occurs, and also the conservation or preservation issues and effective communication process for the residents of the area. The results of the interviews are summarized in Table 4 on page 22-23.

Results of the Public Involvement Process

Means to obtain information

While many people commented about the convenience of receiving information by email or website, a majority of the participants indicated they were informed of the forum by either flyers or the PPNA newsletter. Email or website is the most convenient way to inform people of planning processes. However, it is possible that people actually pay more attention to what they receive in hard-copies rather than electronic data.
Concerns and Opportunities

The results from the questionnaire were similar to those from the forum discussions regarding concerns and opportunities associated with the possible development. Top concerns include traffic, high-density housing, environmental degradation, community design (aesthetics), and pedestrian/bicycle safety. As many as 70% of the respondents selected traffic as one of their concerns. While many people expressed concerns about environmental degradation in their community. More than half respondents mentioned environmental protection. Many respondents also mentioned good community design, park facilities, better street network, and public safety.

Demographics

Many of the forum participants are native to the area or to the state. Almost half of them have lived in the Oregon City area for more than ten years, and 87% of the respondents lived somewhere in Oregon State before moving into this area. A large majority of the participants mentioned that they moved to the area for its rural characteristics. Many people also indicated reasonable housing price as the reason for moving to the area. Most of the participants are homeowners, live in family households, and are often concerned about the impact of different types of development on the property values.

Community Forum and Future Involvement

Most of the participants felt that the Community Forum was useful or somewhat useful. Some people left comments such as “waiting to see” and “do not know yet.” People want to see whether their input will be reflected in the outcomes of the planning process. Over 75% of the participants expressed a desire to be involved in the concept planning process.

Questionnaire Response: What are your top 3 concerns regarding possible development of the Project Area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th># Response</th>
<th>% Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-density Housing</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Degradation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Design (Aesthetics)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian / Bicycle Safety</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of School Facilities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Park Facilities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Community Services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Commercial Area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire Response: What are the 3 most important things that you desire the Project Area to have if it would be developed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Response</th>
<th>% Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Community Design</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Facilities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Street Network</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Facilities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle Path</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in Housing Types</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Types of Commercial Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 is a summary of the issues and opportunities identified during the public involvement process. The range of responses to possible development in the area is broad. Many of the residents and stakeholders viewed possible development and the concept planning process to address neighborhood issues such as lack of park facilities. Others were very concerned the proposed development is not appropriate for the area, and that the City should focus new development in existing urban areas. The community forums, questionnaire and stakeholder interviews were organized around a set of development themes, listed in Table 4.

The results of this initial public involvement indicates that the concept planning process would benefit from the City and Park Place Neighborhood creating a public involvement strategy and fostering public involvement in creating the Concept Plan. The results of the community forums and questionnaire show that some residents question whether development should occur in the Project Area. The time and energy required of public involvement are substantial. Residents can be skeptical that their contribution to the planning process will be anything more than token representation. The results of this initial public involvement process can form the basis for the public involvement plan.

Why Prepare a Public Involvement Plan?

There are several reasons why a public involvement plan should be prepared for the Concept Planning process. One of the main benefits is that the preparation of the plan provides an opportunity for discussing and negotiating issues regarding the effectiveness of public participation and what would work best for the neighborhood. If stakeholders have confidence in the public involvement plan they will have confidence that their involvement in the planning process will be meaningful. The six following points (continued on page 24)
Table 4: Key Public Involvement Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Themes</th>
<th>Community Forum</th>
<th>Stakeholder Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| RURAL AREA/CHARACTER                | -Integrate rural features into new development  
-Encourage development in existing developed areas in the core of the city, including the downtown before developing in new areas  
-Patchwork development: transition from rural to urban can degrade rural and natural areas; develop new communities next to existing.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| TRANSPORTATION AND PEDESTRIAN/  
BICYCLE SAFETY                        | -New development and growth generates more traffic  
-Non-motorized opportunities/connectivity needed in neighborhood  
-Address high traffic areas and congestion before addition of new roads  
-Safe pedestrian walkways are needed along Holcomb  
-Consider building a major road through new development to connect Redland and Holcomb; benefits and drawbacks expressed  
-Regional connectivity needed between Oregon City/Park Place and Metro Region  
-Congestion at the intersection of Redland and Holcomb adversely affects business                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| ENVIRONMENT                          | -Identify protected wildlife and natural areas before development starts  
-Reserve natural areas and incorporate into new developments  
-Environmental impacts and assessments identified and included in Park Place Neighborhood Plan and Concept Plan  
-New development provides opportunities to develop erosion control plans to prevent flooding and create best building practices for steep slopes                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Themes</th>
<th>Community Forum</th>
<th>Stakeholder Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARKS AND RECREATION</td>
<td>-Lack of recreation areas and amenities: more community parks needed</td>
<td>-Parks and other recreation amenities that are centrally located and walkable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Community-oriented services (i.e., community center)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING CHOICES AND DESIGN</td>
<td>-Variety of housing stock needed to accommodate homeowner and renter needs</td>
<td>-Housing prices affected by removal of adjacent natural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Incorporate historic elements into community and housing designs</td>
<td>-Need for mid to high end housing units to provide solid tax base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Identify and preserve historical landmarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>-Keep residents updated and involved in planning processes by using emails, flyers, mailings, newsletters and City website</td>
<td>-Emailing, faxing, websites, newspapers, utility bills and office mailings to keep informed and involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Make sure all communication reaches all residents in Park Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL AREAS AND SERVICES</td>
<td>-A commercial center in a new development could make services available to residents via all modes of transportation</td>
<td>-Additional commercial retail in new development means less natural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Develop unique types of business appropriate for new development</td>
<td>-Keep new commercial at edge of new development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Encourage more infill development along Holcomb Boulevard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOLS</td>
<td>-Recognize that student attendance levels vary: elementary schools attendance low, middle schools high</td>
<td>-School attendance: projections needed to plan accordingly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Have we developed all options in rehabilitating older areas before we expand and create “new” infrastructure problems?”
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are derived from “Involving Citizens in Community Decision Making: A Guidebook” (Creighton, 2003):

1. Preparing a public involvement plan ensures that a careful analysis will be made of how public participation fits into the planning and decision-making process, who will be involved, and what type of involvement will be most effective. Decision-making powers can be determined.
2. Appropriate methods for informing
3. Preparing a plan is the first step towards integrating public participation into the decision-making process, an important characteristic of effective public involvement.
4. A public involvement plan coordinates the actions of those involved in the process, clarifying who needs to do what and when. The preparation of the plan provides an opportunity for the different parties involved to discuss their expectations as to what kind of public involvement is needed.
5. Giving interested parties and individuals the opportunity to review the public involvement plan gives credibility to the decision-making process. It also establishes the willingness of the City to work with the public cooperatively.
6. If there are challenges to the adequacy of public involvement in the planning process the existence of a documented plan shows the rationale for the level and type of public participation that was employed.

What Does Public Involvement Bring to the Planning Process?

Concept planning can be defined as multi-agency, inter-jurisdictional planning that integrates land use and infrastructure planning to meet the community’s needs while addressing economic development, environmental protection and equity. Public involvement is an integral element of concept planning. Public involvement can ensure that development meets the vision and needs of the residents locally and of the region. The following set of principles based on a report of the National Charrette Institute offer illustrate what public involvement brings to the planning process (Cross Disciplinary Public Involvement Report, March 2004).

- An involved public, working collaboratively with the City and the Neighborhood Association will help to create a long-lasting Concept Plan that is based on each individual’s unique contributions. An inclusive approach to planning in which all stakeholders are involved from the beginning of the process makes a stronger plan.
- In order to build trust and broad-based ownership in the Concept Planning process, it must be open and transparent. Public involvement allows participants to “own” the process by influencing its design. Clear roles within the process are necessary. It is important for each individual to understand his/her own role and responsibilities and how decision-making will occur. It is critical that decision-making roles are defined and identified from the beginning in a Public Involvement Plan. An example of a decision-making role would be a citizen serving on a Steering Committee that has decision-making authority in the Concept Plan process.
- Regular opportunities for stakeholders to comment on the planning process helps build trust in the process and foster true understanding and support of
the outcomes. To make informed contributions all relevant data, experts and points of view must be available.

- Lasting agreement is based on a fully informed dialogue. Public involvement allows for a fully informed dialogue with a variety of perspectives.

“We would encourage individual homeowners to take the time to go and listen and talk about these issues in the concept planning process.”
RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations will serve as a guide for creating a public involvement process that will successfully develop the vision, goals, and policies of the Concept Plan for the Livesay Road and Urban Growth Boundary area 24 adjacent to Park Place Neighborhood. Though a Public Involvement Plan is not necessary for the Park Place Neighborhood Plan, the following recommendations can be used as a guide for the public involvement that will take place in that planning process. These recommendations are based on the major results from the community forums, questionnaire, stakeholder interviews, and research of public involvement mechanisms. A Concept Plan centers on a unique sense of place and community cohesiveness. The focus of these recommendations is on public involvement and how land should be used and protected to create a more complete and livable community. Park Place Neighborhood, Oregon City Planning staff, and Park Place Development can continue working together on implementing these recommendations.

Create a Public Involvement Plan

The purpose of a Public Involvement Plan is to ensure that local and regional perspectives will be articulated and adequately represented in the decision making process. While there is no single best technique to involve the public and stakeholders in the Concept Planning process, the key is to establish open, transparent communication and inclusive participation procedures with all members of the community. This project identified major issues and opportunities, key stakeholders, and the level of interest of the community in participating in the planning process. This information provides the foundation for the development of a Public Involvement Plan.

A Public Involvement Plan should include:

- A description of what the public can expect from the process;
- A time line of concrete steps for decision making and where and how the public will be involved;
- Continual feedback opportunities for the public and stakeholders at various stages in the planning process, including several opportunities such as community forums and design workshops to respond to and assist in the development of the design of the proposed development;
- Opportunities for the PPNA and the City to review the Public Involvement Plan and the level of public involvement opportunities needed;
- A review for adequacy and fairness by the individuals and groups most likely to participate in the planning process, including underrepresented populations;
- Clearly defined communication and leadership roles for participants.

“When they expand the community out, they need to think about creating a self-sustaining community that increases neighborhood interaction.”
**Public Involvement Mechanisms**

The following public involvement mechanisms could be used to promote information exchanges between interested stakeholders and build consensus in the concept planning process. For this project community forums with small group discussions, questionnaires, and stakeholder interviews were utilized. These mechanisms were appropriate to facilitate a simple information exchange. The visioning process that Concept and Neighborhood Planning processes undertake require more active and dedicated public participation.

- **Steering Committee:** A steering committee can function as a decision making body during the Concept Planning process, giving authority to a diverse set of voices. Steering committees are comprised of representatives of all groups and individuals that have a stake in the outcome of the Concept Plan. Steering committees are often comprised of residents, property owners, neighborhood association representatives and planning committees, Oregon City agency staff, county planning commissions, Metro, area businesses, school district representatives, and watershed and environmental organizations.

- **Functional Work Teams:** Functional work teams focus on a specific area of the Concept Plan, such as transportation, and provide detailed analyses on specific issues. The expertise of the existing Park Place Neighborhood Association committees could be utilized to provide local and expert knowledge about the issues facing the Concept Plan areas. Provides for detailed analyses. Participants can gain an understanding of other perspectives, leading toward consensus.

- **Community Forums:** Community forums provide the opportunity for the general public to give input and respond to the planning process. These can be held regularly throughout the planning process as a means to inform and to hear back from the public. Publicizing the forums gives the City the opportunity to update the public about what is happening.

- **Information Sharing:** Information sharing, in the form of newsletters, special notices, community forums and a project website is a passive, but very important aspect of public involvement.

- **Design Charrettes:** A charrette is a short, intensive design or planning workshop. Design charrettes work when the community has accepted and is ready to work towards a new development.

- **Public Surveys and Questionnaires:** Surveys and questionnaires serve two primary purposes. They provide information to the City on what citizens think about particular issues, and they can help to educate the public about the tradeoffs inherent in any land use decision.

**Key Issues for Public Involvement**

The public involvement process of this project identified three key issues that the public involvement process could focus on: Community Design, Transportation and Traffic, and Environmental Protection.
**Environmental Protection**

Protecting natural features and retaining tree coverage were identified as concerns for possible development. The Public Involvement Plan can address the concerns of residents by providing information on:

- Environmental protection measures the city will enforce;
- How density protects the environment and prevents sprawl;
- Ways to protect trees and existing important natural features such as streams, aquifer, natural springs, wild life, and habitat;
- Preserving open space to create parks, active/passive recreation and special gathering places, and pedestrian trails;
- Opportunities to develop erosion control plans to prevent flooding and best building practices for steep slopes.

**Community Design**

Park Place Neighborhood and Livesay Road Area residents expressed concern over wanting to preserve the small town, rural atmosphere, and historic sense of the community for future generations to enjoy and treasure. The following points are a summary of these concerns and hopes:

- Recognize and preserve history;
- Emphasize quality design and construction;
- New development should be compatible with the rural character and existing design;
- Locate new development near existing development to preserve open space;
- Plan for the best places for new development, focusing on revitalization and infill development before pursuing new development;
- Create a mix of housing options, transportation choices, and working, shopping, recreational, civic, and educational opportunities in the neighborhood;
- Consider placing artistic materials and sculptures upholding the unique history of the area and sense of belonging;
- Create a community park for special gathering places.

**Transportation and Traffic**

In Park Place Neighborhood transportation and traffic are major concerns of current residents. The automobile is the most common form of transportation used in Park Place, followed by limited bus services. Pedestrian sidewalks and bicycle routes are incomplete and in poor condition. The current transportation mobility, accessibility, and infrastructure needs should be addressed before new development occurs. The area needs to have a safe and efficient transportation network that connects and balances the needs of the neighborhood both on a local and regional level.

The public involvement process focus should consider ways to:

- Address traffic issues such as improving traffic calming strategies through enforcement, education, and engineering to restore the residential integrity of the area;
• Support pedestrian oriented sidewalks, bicycling options, streetscape, lighting, and human scale improvements;
• Explore connectivity to other land use types such as to a commercial shopping area, community center, school, and special gathering place;
• Provide adequate capacity for future growth in and around the neighborhood, and ensuring emergency access during natural disasters, especially during times of floods.
The existing conditions analyses and outreach efforts complete the preliminary framework for creating the City’s Concept Plan and the Park Place Neighborhood Plan. Park Place, Oregon City Planning staff, Clackamas County, and developers should prioritize the major results and recommendations as time, energy, and resources allow. Once the City and/or developer hire a consultant team to develop the Concept Plan, future planning steps should consider:

- Forming cooperation agreements for completing a Concept Plan for future governance and urbanization of Livesay Road and UGB expansion areas 24, 25, and 26;
- Establishing project goals and a common vision anchored in the landscape and community values that make these areas a unique place to live, work, learn, and play; and
- Conducting a further analysis of the existing conditions presented in this project, such as an inventory and projections of land use, transportation, natural resources, public facilities, schools, infrastructure, and funding needs. The inventory and projections analyses should be coordinated among the city, county, school district, and other service districts. These analyses will be useful in future committee meetings and community forums.

In addition to these steps, the recommendations of this project can be furthered by:

- Posting this document on Oregon City’s web site;
- Making an electronic copy available to residents and covering the main points in a future PPNA Newsletter; and
- Including the work and recommendations as support in seeking funding for the concept planning process.

While Client discussions have varied on completing the Concept Plan in the next six months to the end of 2006, this project has overwhelmingly provided a forum for citizen participation and emergence of partnerships among the community, government, and other stakeholders. Park Place Neighborhood should continue to build a sustainable and cohesive neighborhood that values quality of life, environment, and equitable development, thereby maximizing efficiency in the development of a Concept Plan. As future generations look back on this process, they will recognize the collective efforts that went into creating a complete neighborhood celebrating the diversity of people in ages, income, ethnic, and cultural heritage.
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A number of regional and local plans influence urban development in the Project Area. This policy framework should direct the planning process and product of the Concept Plan for Livesay Road and UGB 24, 25, and 26. The following list of planning documents should be used as a reference guide for land use, transportation, recreational, and environmental planning. The goals, objectives, and policies in these planning documents should be reviewed and applied for local and regional context. When the concept planning process commences, we recommend further analysis of State Goals, Revised Statues, and Administrative Rules consistent with a level of planning for urban areas.

**Metro Plans**

- 2040 Growth Concept
- Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, Title 11
- Regional Transportation Plan
- Metropolitan Greenspaces Master Plan
- Livable New Communities

**Clackamas County Plans**

- Comprehensive Plan
- Green Corridors Plan
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan
- Complete Communities

**Oregon City Plans**

- Comprehensive Plan (updated 2004)
- Transportation System Plan
- Trails Master Plan
- Holcomb Boulevard Pedestrian Enhancement Concept
- Future School District Plans for Facility Planning
APPENDIX B: BASIC DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD

Method used to derive the values:

Basic data in this section are obtained from US Census 2000. Because the US Census Bureau does not provide data for neighborhoods, data for the Park Place Neighborhood are estimates for the year 2000 made by the Oregon Trail Planners. Data for the Oregon City are directly obtained from Census 2000.

Blocks and block groups that reside in the neighborhood are identified from RLIS Lite 2004 by overlaying the census block/block group shapefiles with neighborhood shapefile in ArcGIS 9.0. In order to derive the block group level data, allocation coefficient tables are created by calculating the percentage of population in census blocks that are within each block group for different populations.

Population in Park Place Neighborhood and Oregon City:

Population

Table 1: Total population and population by race and ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PPN</th>
<th></th>
<th>Oregon City</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>1,974</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>25,754</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>23,212</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Census 2000, STF 1, P1 & P4
** Data for races (White, Black, American Indian, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islanders, and other) are for Non-Hispanic population

As shown in Table 1, Park Place Neighborhood (Park Place) has about 7.7 percent of the population in the Oregon City as of 2000. About 90 percent of the population is Non-Hispanic White. Park Place has slightly higher percentage of Hispanic population, but the ethnic and racial compositions are almost the same in both areas. With the 2000 racial/ethnic composition, it is probably safe to assume fertility rate in the Project Area is similar to the State rate.
Table 2: Population by age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>PPN</th>
<th>Oregon City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 34</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>1,016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Census 2000, STF 1, P12

Table 2 shows the age structure of Park Place Neighborhood and Oregon City. The age structure of Park Place Neighborhood and Oregon City are both relatively young. Park Place Neighborhood has large population younger than 15 years old and in age groups 35--54. As this area is a neighborhood with a long history, the residents who moved into the area long time ago mostly have children who have already grown up, possibly finished schools, and have jobs in the area or elsewhere. Decrease in population ages 20-29 indicates that young adults may tend to move out of the area for college education or jobs. The proportion of population under 5 years old is large in Park Place Neighborhood, which indicates potential demand for a larger school capacity in the near future. The relatively large female populations in child-bearing age (30-45) in Oregon City indicates the number of young children could possibly keep slightly increasing for another decade. However, as population in their twentieth is small, increase in children will slow down pretty soon.

Table 3: Language spoken at home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Type</th>
<th>PPN</th>
<th>Oregon City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population 5 years and over</td>
<td>1,818</td>
<td>23,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only English</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>21,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-European Languages</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Island Language</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Languages</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Census 2000, STF 1, P1 & P4

Majority of the residents in both Park Place Neighborhood and Oregon City speak English at home, as shown in Table 3. There are small fractions of population that speak other languages at home. Among those who speak languages other than English at home, there are smaller fractions of population that do not speak English well or at all though the data are not in the table. Outreach strategy might be sought to involve these populations in the concept planning process.
Migration

Table 4: Place of residence 5 years ago for population 5+ years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PPN</th>
<th>Oregon City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same House</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>9,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different House</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>13,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the US</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>13,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same County</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>7,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different County</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>6,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same State</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>3,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different State</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Country or at Sea</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Census 2000, STF 3, P24

About 67 percent of the population in Park Place Neighborhood lived in the same house in 5 years ago, while it was 40 percent in Oregon City. The percentage of population who moved from outside the Oregon State is 3.8 percent in Park Place Neighborhood and 9.9 percent in Oregon City. The data indicates that residents in Park Place Neighborhood tend to stay at the same place for longer time period. This may support our findings from the Community Forum discussions and survey questionnaire that residents in the neighborhood have a strong attachment to the rural character of the community and plan to live in the area for a long time.

Commuting

Table 5: Place of work for workers 16+ years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PPN</th>
<th>Oregon City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of residence</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>12,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of residence</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>7,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside county of residence</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>4,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside state of residence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Census 2000, STF 3, P26 & P27

The proportions of the population who work in or outside the county of residence and outside the state are about the same in both areas. Higher than 60 percent of population works in Clackamas County. Despite of our expectation that larger fraction of people commute to Portland area, those who commute to outside the county are less than 40 percent.
Table 6: Travel time to work for workers 16+ years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PPN</th>
<th>Oregon City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 min.</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44 min.</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59 min.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or more min.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Census 2000, STF 3, P32

Table 6 shows travel time to work for workers 16 years and older, and travel mode they use. The percentage of population who uses public transportation is minimal in both areas (about 1-2 percent). Majority of population spends less than half an hour to commute to work. Only 4.3 percent of Park Place residents and 8.4 percent of Oregon City residents spend more than an hour to commute. Population in Park Place Neighborhood tends to spend slightly less time on commuting relative to total population of Oregon City. This may be because slightly more people work closer to their home (inside the county or state of residence) among Park Place residents (Table 7).

Schools and Education

Table 7: School enrollment for population 3+ years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PPN</th>
<th>Oregon City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1-4</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5-8</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9-12</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad or professional school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enrolled in school</td>
<td>1,366</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Census 2000, STF 3, P36

As shown in Figure 1, there are relatively large school-age populations in Park Place Neighborhood and Oregon City. The population enrolled in elementary, middle or high schools is larger in younger cohort. This indicates a possible further increase in school-age population in these areas in the near future. It is safe to expect at least a slight increase in school enrollment in the coming decade. It seems that persons who are enrolled in college or higher educational institutions tend to move out the area, which results in small population enrolled in colleges in the area.
Table 8: Educational attainment for population 25+ years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PPN</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Oregon City</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No schooling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery to grade 12: no diploma</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>4,444</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college no degree</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>5,312</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate/Bachelor’s</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>3,252</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s/Professional/Doctorate</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Census 2000, STF 3, P37

Higher than 75 percent of the population 25 years old or over has at least high school diploma in both areas. More than half of the population has attended college, and more than half of the populations who attended some college have college degrees.

Poverty Status

Table 9: Poverty Status for those whom poverty status is determined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PPN</th>
<th>Oregon City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population for whom poverty status is determined</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>24,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population below poverty level</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>2,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population above poverty level</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>22,362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Census 2000, STF 3, P87

Poverty status data is based on federal government’s official poverty definition, and determined for all people except institutionalized people, people in military group quarters, people in college dormitories, and unrelated individuals under 15 years old. Percentages of population who live below poverty level are 15 percent in Park Place Neighborhood and 9 percent in Oregon City. Park Place Neighborhood appears to be have higher poverty rate compared with the entire city.

Housing in Park Place Neighborhood and Oregon City:

Housing Units

Table 10: Housing Units, Occupancy Status, and Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PPN</th>
<th>Oregon City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>10,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>9,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>5,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter occupied</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>3,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Census 2000, STF 1, H1, H3, & H4

** Denominators for the percentage are the sums of each category.
Park Place Neighborhood has about 7.4 percent of the total housing units in Oregon City. As Park Place Neighborhood and Oregon City are rapidly growing, number of housing units may be much larger than the Census 2000 data in 2005. Vacancy rate is low in both areas, which could be currently even lower. Between 56 and 58 percent of housing units are owned by residents in both areas. Homeownership rate is slightly higher in Park Place Neighborhood compared with the entire city. This may partially explain the Park Place residents’ strong attachment to the area.

*Housing Structures*

**Table 11: Housing Structure Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PPN</th>
<th>Oregon City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family Residential**</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other***</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Unit</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Census 2000, STF 3, H30
** Multi family residential includes one-unit attached structures.
*** Other includes mobile home, boat, RV, van, etc.

Park Place Neighborhood has much higher ratio of single family residential structures to the other housing structure types compared with the entire city. It reflects the role of the Downtown Oregon City designated as a town center by Metro’s 2040 Growth Concept, and more suburban characteristics of Park Place. While percentage of multi family residential structures is 34 percent in Oregon City, it is only 18 percent in Park Place Neighborhood. As many single family housing structures have been constructed after the census year (2000), the percentage of multi family residential structures must be even lower in Park Place Neighborhood as of 2005.

**Table 12: Year Housing Structure Built**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PPN</th>
<th>Oregon City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Built 1990 to March 2000</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 1980 to 1989</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 1970 to 1979</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 1950 to 1969</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built before 1950</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Census 2000, STF 3, H34

Interestingly, ages of housing structures are not necessarily younger in Park Place Neighborhood compared with in the entire city, as shown in Table 12. There have been a considerable amount of housing constructions in the past decade in Oregon City. About 280 building permits are issued per year between 2002 and 2004. Though addition of new housing units per year in Oregon City may be slowing down compared with the pace in 1990s as the area gets built out, the demand and construction of housing does not seem to be slowing down over all.
APPENDIX C: CONCEPT PLAN PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
TECHNIQUES

In order to inform our public outreach efforts, we examined public involvement techniques in Metro’s Livable New Communities Handbook (2002) and Pleasant Valley’s recent concept planning process. While we do not evaluate the effectiveness of the participation techniques, these resources provided invaluable information on how to conduct extensive outreach efforts. The Handbook, for example, is intended to present a model process of how the Pleasant Valley community created a Concept Plan for developing and providing urban services in newly expanded UGB land. The Concept Plan provides the foundation for future Comprehensive Plan amendments and creating zoning code regulations before annexation and development occurs. In the beginning of the concept planning process, the Handbook indicates that the key for successful public involvement is to tailor the process to the situation and conduct inclusive public meetings, design charrettes, ongoing information sharing, and feedback opportunities for participants. While the Handbook depicts the important elements of a public involvement process, it falls short in outlining the necessary steps and tools of implementing such a process. Therefore, we closely examined the public involvement methods in the Pleasant Valley concept planning process.

In 1998 Metro brought approximately 3,500 acres in to Portland’s metropolitan Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). Of the 3,500 acre expansion, 1,532 acres were in the Pleasant Valley community, located east of Portland and southwest of Gresham. In the beginning phase of Pleasant Valley’s concept planning process, a Public Involvement Plan (PIP) was created for the purposes of effectively engaging residents and constituents in developing the goals and visions for the project. The PIP developed strategies to solicit community input, create information sharing and feedback opportunities, and develop formal participation committee structures that included community members and organizations, and local, regional, and state stakeholders. Participation opportunities included forums, town hall meetings, focus and discussion groups, design and planning workshops, stakeholder interviews, mailing lists, portable displays, press releases, and surveys. In addition, participation techniques included a Steering Committee and functional work teams. The Steering Committee served as the primary decision making body for the project and represented the government agencies, livability organizations, developer interests and community interests. The functional work teams addressed the key elements of Metro’s Title 11, including transportation, land use, and natural resources elements of the concept planning process.

After the Pleasant Valley Concept Plan was completed, Portland State University Professors Drs. Connie Ozawa and Sy Adler produced a report called “An Evaluation of the Pleasant Valley Concept Plan Project.” In their assessment of the public involvement process they remarked that, “the extent of the community outreach [was] impressive.” They noted that the community forums were highly interactive and inclusive for residents to express concerns and raise questions about possible new development. Consequently, they found that additions from the original goals resulted from the public involvement. They also affirm that, “Key to increasing coordination, cooperation and collaboration is not only notifying the participants but also providing mechanisms for two-way communication and opportunities form meaningful involvement. That is, the work of participants must be evident at some point in the process to the participants themselves.” Indeed, the Pleasant Valley public involvement strategies exemplify how coordination and collaboration are important factors for developing a Concept Plan. More importantly, however, the use of collaborative planning techniques can effectively demonstrate how community stakeholders collectively shape a common vision for their place.
This section explores the value of density in general and the connection between density and the successful integration of new development into existing neighborhoods. Density is generally defined as the amount of residential development permitted on a given parcel of land. It is typically measured in dwelling units per acre; the larger the number of units permitted per acre, the higher the density. Connections have been drawn between design and higher density development successfully integrating with existing land uses (Creating Great Neighborhoods, 2003).

Title 11 of Metro’s Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, Planning for New Urban Areas, lays forth the requirements for new development in urban growth boundary expansion areas. This set of codes forms the legal basis for concept planning. The code requirements define the elements that new development must address. A density requirement of at least 10 dwelling units per net developable acre is one of these elements (3.07.1120, B, Urban growth Boundary Amendment Urban reserve Plan Requirements). Providing for higher density within the Urban Growth Boundary preserves rural and agricultural lands outside the UGB.

Benefits of Density

The benefits of higher-density development enable smart growth goals to be reached. The following examples of benefits that density provides are derived from “A Case for Smart Growth” (Curran, 2003).

- Density Helps Create Great Neighborhoods: One of the hallmarks of great neighborhoods are destinations to travel to within the neighborhood. These include markets, cafes, restaurants, corner stores, schools, parks and other neighborhood commercial uses. Because of the proximity of these destinations, dense neighborhoods usually invite walking and street level interaction amongst neighbors. The economic viability of a corner store depends on neighborhood densities of 10 per acre. A supermarket requires 18 per acre. Higher density can give residents the opportunity to work and conduct business near their homes (Pleasant Valley Public Comment Report 1 2003).
- Density Helps Improve Safety: A welcoming pedestrian environment and more residents in an area increases social interaction and thus safety on the street. Building design also influences safety as porches, housing close to the street and windows facing out to the street allow for surveillance of neighborhood activities and greater interaction amongst neighbors. Housing diversity, and thus diversity in the age and activities of residents, means more people are present in the neighborhood at different times rather than the entire neighborhood leaving in the morning and returning at night.
- Density Supports Housing Affordability and Choice: Density encourages diversity in housing where residents can choose to stay in the same neighborhood to meet their changing housing needs. This means providing a range of housing options in terms of family size and income. Including a balance of low, medium and high-density options in a neighborhood accommodates a wider range of lifestyles and incomes. Higher densities also put more units on less land, which lowers per unit infrastructure and development costs.
- Density Increases Transportation Choices: When destinations, including employment, are close to residences, transportation choices increase because it is enjoyable and effective to walk or bicycle. Higher densities also generate enough riders to make bus and train service viable and efficient.
• Density Protects the Environment: Concentrating development means that towns and cities do not have to sprawl onto farmland and ecologically significant areas, even within the development area. Land consumption per person is decreased, while increasing transportation options improves air quality.

• Density Costs Less for Municipalities: Municipalities can make better use of existing infrastructure by increasing densities in built areas. Increasing densities in new areas reduces the cost of each unit per acre of infrastructure, and the cost is less than for low-density developments.

Challenges

Density is a fundamental component of smart growth and preserving rural areas, and density requirements attempt to address both local and regional needs. However, designing for density can be challenging in areas where residents prefer low-density development. Density can be perceived as undesirable when a previously low-density area is targeted for higher density development. Challenges to transforming rural areas into neighborhoods and commercial centers and of integrating new development into existing neighborhoods arise when this is the case. Local residents might question why they must bear the burden of new development to satisfy regional needs. The Metro area is facing these challenges and questions in areas where the urban growth boundary has expanded and new developments are being planned for. The planning process can address these challenges, and public involvement in the process is at the core of a successful outcome.

Early Citizen Involvement in the Planning Process

Involving citizens early and often in the planning process has been identified as a key element to successful development.

Edges and Transitions

Planning needs to involve an awareness of edges and transitional areas between neighborhoods, urban and rural areas, and high and low-density areas to lead to successful integration. Green corridors and a well-connected transportation infrastructure can aid in integration that maintains the integrity of uniquely different areas while achieving high-density development. One integral factor for integrating successful density increases into or near existing communities is designing additional development to blend into the existing neighborhood (Local Government Commission and U.S. EPA 2003).

Character Area Plans

The City of Scottsdale, Arizona has addressed the issue of annexing lands and integrating new land uses into distinct, existing communities through the Character Area Planning process. The purpose of a Character Area Plan is “to preserve and enhance a unique area of the City while balancing the needs of future citizens” (City of Scottsdale Planning Division, 2005).

A City of Villages

The City of Auburn, Alabama has developed a “City of Villages” Village Centers Strategic Development Concept that focuses new development in a pattern of compact of Village and Neighborhood Centers supported by adjacent existing residential neighborhoods. The Development Concept states that successful integration of new development and adjacent existing neighborhoods depends on good design. “Design makes the difference. The details of how a place is put together help determine how well it works (City of Auburn, Alabama, 2005).
APPENDIX E: FORUM NOTIFICATION PROCESS

The May 2 Park Place Community Forum was announced in several ways.

PPNA General Meeting, March 21, 2005: Four members of the OTP attended this meeting and gave a brief presentation about the project and announced that a Community Forum would be held May 3, 2005. The date was changed to May 2, 2005 due to the availability of meeting space.

Clackamas Review: A brief write-up appeared in the Clackamas Review community newspaper.

The Oregonian: The forum events were posted in the Community Calendar.

Posted Flyers: A one page flyer was posted at several locations April 26 and 27th. The flyers were posted at Steve’s Market, Jack & Jan’s, City hall, Oregon City Baptist Church, Evangelical Church, Pioneer Pizza, HUD Affordable Housing Office, Holcomb and Park Place Elementary Schools, Ogden Middle School, Oregon City High School, and the Phillip’s 76 Gas Station on Highway 213.

Email: The project brochure and a tri-fold flyer were emailed the week before the forum. Ralph Kiefer emailed these items to the list of about 70 email addresses for the PPNA. These items were also sent to the email list maintained by the Trailview Homeowners Association.

City of Oregon City website: A link to the project brochure was placed on the City of Oregon City website (www.orcity.org). The link was posted the week before the forum and remained on the site through the time of this writing.

Mailed Flyers: A tri-fold brochure was sent to all addresses in the Park Place Neighborhood and to some surrounding areas. OTP worked with The Penny Post in Oregon City to mail the flyers. David Knoll, GIS Coordinator at the City of Oregon City provided addresses for the mailing. The addresses were for every tax lot within the official Park Place Neighborhood boundary. Tax lots adjacent to Park Place Neighborhood and within the UGB were also included. In all 1,349 addresses had flyers mailed to them.

The effectiveness of the mailing was probably limited because it did not arrive until the day of the forum. Due to a series of errors, the mailing did not go to the post office until April 25, 2005. The flyer was mailed as bulk mail, which arrives five to nine days after it reaches the post office. Errors included not understanding the time frame for bulk mailing, a mix-up of paper selection, and not understanding that The Penny Post does not send items to the post office until payment is received. Had OTP known of these factors, the flyer would have been sent out earlier and reached residents in a more timely manner.

Hand-delivered Flyers: Once OTP realized that the mailed flyers would not reach residents until very near the date of the forum, flyers were delivered to certain areas of Park Place Neighborhood by hand on April 29. About 240 flyers were placed in newspaper boxes. Newspaper boxes were used because placing non-mailed items in mail
boxes is illegal and because using newspaper boxes allows a broader area to be covered in a shorter amount of time. Flyers were delivered to all boxes along Livesay Road and to areas in the eastern and southern portion of the Park Place Neighborhood, near the Project Area. These areas were chosen because the residents probably have a higher level of interest due to the Project Area’s proximity.

The May 16th Follow Up Forum was announced through the following methods:

May 2005 PPNA Newsletter: This was sent to all addresses in Park Place and arrived in early May. This meeting was a featured item on the front page agenda and received a brief write-up on the inside pages.

Email: An email with a one page flyer was sent on May 11 to the PPNA email list, Trailview list, city employees list, and to email addresses received at the first forum. Another email was sent on May 15 that had draft results of the first forum.

Mailed Flyers: Flyers were mailed on May 12 to 37 addresses of attendees of the first forum and to every address on Livesay Road. In all, about 90 mailings were sent via first class mail.

Posted Flyers: A one page flyer was posted at several locations on May 11. The flyers were posted at Steve’s Market, Jack & Jan’s, Oregon City Baptist Church, Pioneer Pizza, HUD Affordable Housing Office, Holcomb and Park Place Elementary Schools, and the Phillip’s 76 Gas Station on Highway 213.
APPENDIX F: MAY 2 COMMUNITY FORUM FLYER

We want to hear from you about...

Traffic
Housing
Commercial Areas
Schools
Parks and Natural Areas

... and other issues in areas that may be annexed into Oregon City near the Park Place Neighborhood. Come to the Park Place Neighborhood Community Forum and be heard!

Who: You, residents and citizens that care about the future of the Park Place Neighborhood.

What: A community forum to give citizens a chance to voice your thoughts about future development near the Park Place Neighborhood.

When: 7 - 9 PM, Monday, May 2, 2005

Where: Oregon City Baptist Church, 16363 Swan Ave., Oregon City, OR 97045, just off of Holcomb Blvd.

Why: The thoughts and issues voiced at this forum will help the Park Place Neighborhood Association and the City of Oregon City in guiding development on lands that are annexed into Oregon City. This is a chance to be heard early and influence the plans for possible new development before it occurs?

About the Forum Organizers

This forum is organized by the Park Place Neighborhood Association and the Oregon Trail Planners. The Oregon Trail Planners is a group of graduate students in Portland State University’s Masters of Urban and Regional Planning Program.

If you have questions or comments about this event, please contact Christina Robertson-Gardiner at (503) 496-1564, or the Oregon Trail Planners at rwm@pdx.edu.

Background

In 2002, Metro expanded the Urban Growth Boundary to include land near the Park Place Neighborhood. This expansion allows the City of Oregon City to annex these lands and allow development on them. This forum focuses on the Livesay Road Area and UGB 24, shown in the map to the left.

Before these lands can be developed, Oregon City is required to write a Concept Plan that addresses housing, land use, transportation, and other planning issues for the area. The May 3rd community forum will lay the groundwork for this concept planning process.

A follow up meeting will be held at the May 16 Park Place Neighborhood Association general meeting to discuss the results of this forum. Look for details in the May 2005 Park Place Neighborhood Association Newsletter...
APPENDIX G: MAY 16 COMMUNITY FORUM: FOLLOW-UP MEETING FLYER

Park Place Community Forum:
Follow-Up Meeting

Part of the Park Place Neighborhood General Membership Meeting

Monday, May 16, 2005, 7 - 9 PM
Oregon City Baptist Church, 16363 Swan Ave.

PPNA General Membership Meeting
Agenda
Monday May 16, 2005,
7:00 pm – 9:00 pm

I. Welcome, call to order and Introductions

II. Reading and approval of minutes

III. Non Agenda Items– for consideration under new business

IV. Old Business
1. Current land use applications in the neighborhood.

V. New Business
1. PPNA Bylaw Change Discussion and vote.
2. New Officers– Nominations accepted for officers up to and including nominations from the floor, followed by the voting.
3. Discussion & Vote to create a Fund Raising Committee for PPNA Gateway Sign.

VI. Speaker: Portland State University Students will hold a Park Place Neighborhood Community Forum Report and Discussion

Steering Committee meeting: Date of next scheduled Steering Committee meeting is August 15, 2005. All Steering Committee meetings are held at South Fork Water Facility, 15962 Hunter Road., at 7:00 pm. Please call Chair for confirmation of dates and times before arriving.

Schedule of General Membership meetings: On the third Monday of the months of Sept. & Nov. 2005: Jan., March, May 2006: 7:00 pm, Oregon City View Manor Community Building (unless otherwise announced in the newsletter).

VI. Adjourn

On May 2, 2005, close to 60 people came to share their views about potential development near the Park Place Neighborhood. Through small group discussions, questionnaires, and note cards, people expressed their hopes and concerns for development that occurs near Park Place. At this follow-up meeting, the results of that forum will be presented to you. We will also have time for a large group discussion to answer your questions about the concept planning process and rules and regulations that apply to the area.

This meeting will immediately follow the PPNA Meeting. Please attend the whole meeting to see what else is occurring in your neighborhood.

Areas that may be added to the neighborhood.

About the Forum Organizers
This forum is organized by the Park Place Neighborhood Association and the Oregon Trail Planners. The Oregon Trail Planners is a group of graduate students in Portland State University’s Master of Urban and Regional Planning Program.

What’s next?
The final report will be presented to PPNA in early June. Print and electronic copies will be made available at this time.
Park Place Neighborhood Community Forum
Stakeholder Involvement Strategy

Background
In 2002 Metro expanded the Urban Growth Boundary, including land near the Park Place Neighborhood in Oregon City. This expansion opens the land to annexation by Oregon City and possible development. A local development firm has proposed in this area the largest single development in Oregon City’s history. Before any development may occur Oregon City must develop a vision and guide for future planning. Once this Concept Plan is adopted and approved, Oregon City could propose annexation of this land. If this land is annexed, it will be included in the Park Place Neighborhood. Oregon City will begin to develop a Concept Plan for all of its UGB Expansion areas in the summer of 2005.

Who We Are
We are the Oregon Trail Planners, a group of graduate students in the Urban and Regional Planning Program at Portland State University. Our team is working with the Park Place Neighborhood Association (PPNA) to assist residents and other interested stakeholders in identifying issues and opportunities associated with the possible development of the newly expanded UGB areas. We will hold two community forums to introduce basic information and planning concepts to residents, and to gather input and feedback from the residents and other stakeholders attending the forums. We will also interview and work with professional stakeholders in the project area to obtain local knowledge and information.

Project Goal
This project will provide the beginning of a framework to guide new development in the recently expanded area. The project team will design a public involvement process to identify opportunities and concerns about future development in the area.

The Planning Components to achieve this goal are:

- Examine case studies of successful integration of new development into existing neighborhoods.
- Develop and implement a participatory process for residents and other stakeholders to identify opportunities and concerns.
- Make recommendations to the neighborhood association and the city to effectively engage residents and other stakeholders in the concept planning process for project area.

How to Get Involved!!
Please contact Park Place Neighborhood Association to be included in an e-mail list for community forum notices and newsletter updates.
PPNA: 503-772-7142
Lois Kiefer, Chair of PPNA: rskiefer@aol.com

Community Forum 1:
May 2, 2005, 7 – 9 pm at Oregon City Baptist Church
This is an opportunity for all residents to voice their thoughts about possible development near the Park Place Neighborhood. It will lay the groundwork for city’s concept planning process.

Community Forum 2:
May 16, 2005, 7 – 9 pm (after PPNA General Meeting) at Oregon City Baptist Church
This forum covers the findings from the first Community Forum on opportunities and issues about possible development. Look for details in the May 2005 PPNA Newsletter.
APPENDIX I: MAY 2 COMMUNITY FORUM DISCUSSION
LEADER QUESTIONS

7:30-8:30: Individual Discussion Groups - Opportunities and Issues Identification

7:30-7:35: If you have not already done so introduce yourself and ask everyone at the table to briefly introduce themselves. Ask the first question of the group. Ask each person to come up with as many responses as they can; write down each participant’s response. Stress creativity and brainstorming. Encourage discussion, but do not debate the issues. Encourage participants to think creatively. Ask one participant to report back to the whole forum.

7:35-7:50 Question #1: What are the top three issues associated with growth and development in this area that most concern you?

(Encourage participants to address as many of the “issue areas” below as possible. For instance, if the discussion has focused on traffic problems for five minutes bring up housing stock and ask the group to identify some issues. Encourage participants to be specific and give examples).

Areas to Address:
Housing Issues: Availability/Options/Affordability
Transportation Options/ Pedestrian Safety
Parks
Schools
Environmental Protection
Traffic

7:50-8:05 Question #2: What opportunities for building a stronger community do you think potential development in the area could provide? (e.g., More options for walking, connectivity, additional services and shops, a new community gathering place)

8:05-8:20 Summary and Reflection: Ask the table to decide on the top 3 or 4 issues and the main opportunities that were identified. Write them down.

8:20-8:30 Question #3: Oregon City will be continuing with a public participation process for the Concept Plan for this area. In terms of getting your voice heard, what types of participation mechanisms would work best for you? What has been the best public involvement experience that you have had? Write down responses.

8:30-8:40: Break. Invite participants to have some refreshments. Ask them to fill out the questionnaire before they leave and to put it in the drop box or hand it to one of us. The questionnaire asks for contact information.

8:40-9:00 Wrap up - Issues and Opportunities Summation
Report back on the Issues and Opportunities that your group came up with

Prompting Questions:

If new development were to occur, what type of housing mix do you think should be provided? (e.g., Detached single family housing on large lots, attached housing, apartments, senior living)

What infrastructure or public facilities do you think should be in place before development can occur? (e.g., like parks, schools, community centers and roads).

If commercial development were to occur what type of services and stores would you like to see? What opportunities and issues do you think are associated with potential commercial development of the area?

If development were to occur what type of transportation options do you think it should included? (e.g., bike lanes, bus stops, sidewalks, country roads, more roads, less roads)
APPENDIX J: MAY 2 COMMUNITY FORUM QUESTIONNAIRE

Park Place Neighborhood Community Forum Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions. The information will be kept confidential.
Please hand in before you leave.

Q-1 How did you hear about this community forum?
☐ Community Forum Flyer  ☐ Oregon City Website
☐ PPNA Newsletter  ☐ Other (please specify) ______________

Q-2 What are your top 3 concerns regarding possible development of the Project Area?
☐ Community Design (Aesthetics)  ☐ High-density Housing
☐ Environmental Degradation  ☐ Impact of Commercial Area
☐ Lack of Commercial Services  ☐ Lack of Park Facilities
☐ Lack of School Facilities  ☐ Traffic
☐ Pedestrian / Bicycle Safety  ☐ Other (please specify) ______________

Q-3 What are the 3 most important things that you desire the Project Area to have if it would be developed?
☐ Good Community Design  ☐ Diversity in Housing Types
☐ Affordable Housing  ☐ Environmental Protection
☐ Different Types of Commercial Services  ☐ Public Safety
☐ School Facilities  ☐ Public Transportation
☐ Pedestrian and Bicycle Path  ☐ Other (please specify) ______________
☐ Better Street Network  ☐ Other (please specify) ______________

Q-4 In what area do you live?
☐ N of Holcomb (Clackamette Place, Dalles, Ives Estates, Rose View Terrace, Swan Acre)
☐ Off Holcomb (Oregon City View Manor, Clackamas Heights)
☐ S of Holcomb (Holcomb Hill, Holcomb Hill No. 2)
☐ Mid S (Holcomb Ridge, Jennifer Estates, Wayne Ann Estates, Witke Estates)
☐ W of Swan (Noble Crest, Sonja Rose, Wheeler Estates)
☐ SE (Tracey Heights, Trailview, Wasco Acres)  ☐ Outside the PP Neighborhood
☐ NE (Barlow Crest, Barlow Crest No. 2)  ☐ Outside the UGB
☐ Other (please specify) ______________

Q-5 How long have you lived in this area?
☐ Less than 1 year  ☐ 4 – 10 years
☐ 1 – 3 years  ☐ More than 10 years

Q-6 Before moving into this area, where did you live?
City________________________ State__________ Country________________________

Q-7 What is the major reason that you moved into this area? (please check one)
☐ Better School  ☐ Reasonable Housing Price
☐ Job Opportunity  ☐ Rural Landscape
☐ Family/Relatives  ☐ Other (please specify) ______________

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this survey. Your input is important to the Park Place Neighborhood Association, Oregon City, and the Oregon Trail Planners.

May 2, 2005

Oregon Trail Planners
APPENDIX K: MAY 2 COMMUNITY FORUM QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Total of forty-nine people answered the questionnaire. Forty-five out of about sixty attendees to the Community Forum answered the questionnaire. Four people who were not at the Community Forum responded by email. Not all respondents answered all questions. The percentage of response is the ratio of the number of valid responses to the number of respondents to the question.

Forum Questionnaire Results

Q-1 How did you hear about this Community Forum?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Response</th>
<th>% Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flyer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPNA Newsletter</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon City Website</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Among fifteen respondents who checked “other,” six received information by email, six by word of mouth, and four by newspaper.

Q-2 What are your top 3 concerns regarding possible development of the Project Area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Response</th>
<th>% Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-density Housing</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Degradation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Design (Aesthetics)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian / Bicycle Safety</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of School Facilities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Park Facilities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Community Services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Commercial Area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Respondents who checked “Other” indicated concerns about historic preservation (3), safety (2), quality of living (1), wildlife (1), community center (1), and other (2).
Q-3  What are the 3 most important things that you desire the Project Area to have if it would be developed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Response</th>
<th>% Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Community Design</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Facilities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Street Network</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Facilities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle Path</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in Housing Types</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Types of Commercial Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q-4  In what area do you live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Response</th>
<th>% Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Livesay Rd</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the PPN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Holcomb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Holcomb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S of Holcomb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the UGB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* “Livesay Rd” is added when summarizing the results as many of the respondents who checked “Other” indicated it.

** The areas include the following subdivisions: N of Holcomb (Clackamette Place, Dalles, Ives Estates, Rose View Terrace, Swan Acre), Off Holcomb (Oregon City View Manor, Clackamas Heights), S of Holcomb (Holcomb Hill, Holcomb Hill No. 2), Mid S (Holcomb Ridge, Jennifer Estates, Wayne Ann Estates, Wittke Estates), W of Swan (Noble Crest, Sonja Rose, Wheeler Estates), SE (Tracey Heights, Trailview, Wasco Acres), and NE (Barlow Crest, Barlow Crest No. 2).
Q-5  How long have you lived in this area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Response</th>
<th>% Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q-6  Before moving into this area, where did you live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon City</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q-7  What is the major reason that you moved into this area? (Please check one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th># Response</th>
<th>% Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Landscape</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable Housing Price</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Opportunity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Relatives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q-8  Which of the following best describes your household?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Household</th>
<th># Response</th>
<th>% Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family with Children</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family without Children</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household with Unrelated Persons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Alone</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th># Response</th>
<th>% Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q-9  What language do you speak at home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Response</th>
<th>% Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q-10  Was this Community Forum useful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Response</th>
<th>% Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Useful</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Useful</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Useful</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Several respondents indicated “do not know yet” or “waiting to see.”

** Three out of five respondents who answered “No Opinion” did not attend the forum.

Q-11  Which part of the Community Forum did you like most? (please check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Response</th>
<th>% Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Discussion</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Display</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Overview</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrap up</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q-12  Which part of the Community Forum do you think could be improved? (please check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Response</th>
<th>% Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Overview</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Discussion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Display</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrap up</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Four respondents indicated that the room was too noisy. One wanted to hear what other people said at other tables. One indicated that earlier notification would help.
Q-13  Would you like to be involved in the concept planning process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Response</th>
<th>% Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q-14  Is there anything else you would like to tell us about possible development of this area? (Comments are summarized and categorized based on the topics.)

*Community Design / Environment and Rural Character / Historical Assets*

- Preserve the rural character and historical significance of the end of the Oregon Trail and pioneer history.

- Protecting the natural setting, wildlife habitat, and historic preservation (is important).

- This area is so historically rich, it would be a real crime to ignore that.

- Concerns with being able to keep livestock in a suburb

- Let us keep the rural atmosphere as much as possible.

- Package your plan to include current livability as well as long term re-sale value. A “nicer” plan will keep the personality of Park Place in the long run.

- Moved here for rural feel of community – don’t want to see this changed.

- Must remain sensitive to rural historical setting of Oregon City area. No wild west development. Roads infrastructure must be improved.

- Keeping older trees and a large number of new plantings would maintain the community’s appearance.

*Location and Process of Development*

- Development should first occur in current developable land in Oregon City.

- Growth is inevitable, especially considering how close Livesay is to I-205. Managing the growth is critical.

- Have we developed all options in rehabilitating older areas before we expand and create “new” infrastructure problems?

- Is it needed (now)? What areas of Oregon City need to be improved?
- Hope it doesn’t happen until I’m dead.

**Housing**

- Large-scale housing would have a significant negative impact on the uniqueness of the area, and exacerbate traffic congestion, pedestrian safety, and the livability of the neighborhood.

- Would only like to know about what types and density of new homes – no apartments.

- Limit additional low-income housing. Development taking into consideration existing neighborhoods in adjacent lands to UGB. i.e. parks, green space, buffer. Thank you for your time.

- Would like to see additional home-site development to feature single dwelling homes with minimum lot sizes of 12,000 sq. feet. It will bring more quality homes and additional taxes, and limit traffic increase. No more low-income or multiple dwelling homes.

- The development should be lot sizes of at least 10,000 sq. feet per single family home. Adding multifamily housing, or apartments or condominiums would decrease our home values, add to traffic congestion, and decrease the resources of an already stressed school system, and our police and sheriff departments.

- Holcomb Blvd. has many affordable housing areas, as well as public assistance areas. These areas have high density of population that requires a considerable amount of attention from our public safety officers.

- I strongly oppose high density / low income housing in the new area. There is enough low-income housing with the county’s housing projects.

- I would strongly oppose to any multi-dwellings, retirement communities, and low-income housing.

**Transportation / Infrastructure**

- Incorporate the “Holcomb Road Plan” into this planning process.

- Very concerned about traffic increase in Holcomb area & noise

- (Development) would create a transportation nightmare & degrade environment. Developers need to pay for transportation issues, schools, sidewalk down length of Holcomb.

- Development of Park Place Village should be dependent upon improvement / re-design of traffic infrastructure involving 213/Holcomb/Redland intersection. Annexation should not go forward until this process is funded.

- Maintain livability. Coordination of $ of services. Community center, school, roads, parks etc.

- Pedestrian/Bicycle access through the neighborhoods and to the shopping areas should be included in the plan. Attractive walkways, plantings and cement paths (for strollers and younger children on bicycles) will attract families to the area that will create a sense of community.
- Making sure the area has accessible, highly visible walkways would also encourage families to use the shopping areas, and help keep them safe.

- There has got to be an alternate route to reduce the traffic on Holcomb which has increased in the last 2 years that I have lived in the area.

Commercial Development

- Some convenient shopping without becoming a mega-complex. Something like groceries, coffee, pub!

- No major grocery store (Safeway, Fred Meyer). Keep it small.

- Develop commercial area first in Oregon City.

- For the commercial areas, an area like the “Gresham Station” (newer shopping area in Gresham) or the Millennium Plaza (newer shopping area in Lake Oswego) should be created.

Schools / Parks and Open Spaces

- My main concern is the impact on the schools. The current teacher to student ratio is way too high for children to get a solid education.

- I would like to see a nice park where the children can play. There is not one in the area besides the school and they limit the access. We have gone there several times to play just to find the gates locked.

- If this happens I would like to see a pedestrian cross-walk light so the children at Barlow Crest can cross without getting hit by someone speeding down the hill.

- The area should include a park for all to enjoy. If there are issues with park maintenance – the planner could consider a park/seating areas similar to the new park on Main Ave in Downtown Oregon City. Made from mostly cement, the upkeep would be minimal. However, keeping vegetation and plants would be better for the environment.

Public Involvement Process

- PPNA should be at the table with developers and City staff from step one of the process.

- In general, I feel we all need to “simplify.”

- I have concerns that our input will actually be considered by the City. I also have concerns that the influence of developer(s) has greater impact than the concerns of current residents.
APPENDIX L: STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Purpose of the Park Place Neighborhood Outreach Strategy:

This project will provide the beginning of a framework to guide new development in the recently expanded Project Area. We are designing a public involvement process of community forums and stakeholder interviews to identify opportunities and concerns regarding new development and annexation.

Purpose of the Interviews:

The purpose of the interviews is to gain the expert insight of professionals and citizens of Oregon City that have a stake in the future development of Park Place Neighborhood.

What we will be doing with the Interviews:

The expert information gathered in the interviews will be used in the final report. Quotes will be used in the final report. The information will also frame and support recommendations made to the Park Place Neighborhood Association and to Oregon City.

1. What are the most important issues facing the Park Place Neighborhood area as new development is proposed?

2. What are some of the special features or places that should be preserved or enhanced as the area grows?

3. What should the future Park Place Neighborhood look like (including look of the community, transportation, environment, parks and open spaces, commercial areas, public facilities, housing choices – this question is tailored to the area of interest for the stakeholder).? What would make a complete community?

Now we would like to get your input on the planning process itself.

4. What is the best way to keep you informed of the progress of the process? (ex. Newsletters, website, newspaper articles, direct mail notices) How would you like to be involved?

5. Are there community-gathering places and community newsletters or notices where we can post information?

6. Where is the best place to hold public meetings? (ex. school, churches, other places)

7. Any other issues that you would like to discuss at this time?
APPENDIX M: MAY 2 AND 16 COMMUNITY FORUM RESULTS

These are the results of both the small and large group discussions of the May 2 and 16 Park Place Community Forums. They are presented as topic areas in the categories of Concerns, Opportunities, and Public Participation Mechanisms. The topic areas and bullet points are not ranked in any order.

Concerns

Rural Area/Character

- Residents value the Park Place Neighborhood and the Project Area for its rural character. Many of them moved to the area for the rural feel. This includes its proximity to rural areas and low-density land use. New development in Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) 24 and the Livesay Road Area (the Project Area) could alter this character.
- Some residents also expressed that they moved to the neighborhood because it is a stable area with homeowners that are invested in the area. They also want to be long-term residents and establish roots in the area and they feel that new development, more traffic and apartment buildings could alter the character of the neighborhood.
- The placement of developed areas is a concern. Some residents prefer that new development be placed near existing development to create a smoother transition between urban and rural areas.

Transportation

- The impact (increased traffic) of a new development on the following roads and intersections was a frequently expressed concern:
  - Redland Road
  - Holcomb Blvd.
  - The I-205 interchange at Highway 213
- Residents stated that they would like to see existing traffic problems addressed before additional development occurs.
- The lack of connector streets in the Project Area is a concern for residents. This impedes their ability to access areas within Park Place.
- Several safety issues were mentioned. These include poor traffic enforcement, lack of sidewalks and bike lanes, and high vehicle speeds.
- The poor accessibility of the area for non-motorized transportation is a concern.

Environmental Protection

- The possibility of losing wildlife in the Project Area is a concern.
- Residents are concerned about the preservation of trees, Livesay Creek, and the Livesay Canyon.
- Planning for flooding and access during flooding in the Livesay Road Area is a concern. Flooding could cut off access to the area, including fire and safety services.
- There is concern about development occurring over an aquifer (an abandoned water tank).
Parks

- Some residents expressed a concern about the lack of active and passive recreation space.

History/Historic Design

- Residents are concerned that the history of the Project Area is not recognized or honored.
- There is concern that historical resources will be destroyed if development occurs.
- Residents are concerned that the history of the area will not be reflected in development that occurs in the Project Area.

Schools

- Overcrowding of the schools is a concern. Some residents stated that the Middle School is particularly overcrowded.
- Lack of funding for teachers is another concern.

Housing Type

- The placement of dissimilar housing types (apartments, low income housing, single family) near each other is a concern.
- A lack of diversity in housing types in Park Place was seen as a concern.
- There are concerns about the starting price range (i.e., >$250,000) of new housing and the lack of starter homes.
- The presence of apartments in new developments is a concern because of possible problems of noise, crime, and lack of ownership associated with apartments.

Community Design Aesthetics

- There is concern about the potential for low-density strip mall-style development in a commercial center.
- The placement and concentration of potential retail areas is a concern. Residents are concerned that the commercial center will not be walkable.
- The type of services that might be offered is a concern. Some residents stated that they want basic commercial services and do not need high-end retail. Some also want stores that are unique to the area.
- Residents do not want ‘cookie cutter’ designs that look the same. They suggested that they want high quality development if the area is developed.

Opportunities

Environmental Protection

- There are natural resources in the area that could be preserved in their current state. These include the Livesay Canyon and Creek, and a natural springs.

Transportation

- Development could add sidewalks and bike lanes, and make the area more accessible. A connector road through the Project Area could help traffic circulation.
**Historic Design**

- An opportunity exists to recognize and preserve the history of the area. For example, there should be historic street light fixtures and bench structures.

**Services**

- Commercial areas could make basic services more accessible to residents via all modes of transportation.

**Parks**

- The preservation of natural resources in the area provides an opportunity for passive recreational uses and trails. A new development could include a park, even a regional park.

**Citizen Involvement**

- Develop a community public involvement model that keeps citizens informed and involved in writing a Concept Plan.

**Public Participation Mechanisms**

- Create an email list for communication.
- Have various representatives from PPNA present at Concept Planning meetings.
- There is a lack of meeting spaces in the neighborhood. Some suggested meeting places are schools and the community center.
- Small group discussions are preferred as a way to allow as many citizens as possible to contribute ideas at meetings.
- Group discussions are difficult to hold in small meeting spaces because of noise.
- Preferred notification for project updates are emails and websites.
- Notifications, such as emails and flyers, should arrive earlier than they did for this forum.
- Using the community cable access TV to tape and broadcast meetings might allow more citizens to witness public meetings.