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REPORT
ON
THE NEED FOR COMMUNITY GOALS

To the Board of Governors,
The City Club of Portland:

I. INTRODUCTION

In March, 1971, the City Club Project Planning Board proposed and the Board of Governors approved a special study on "The Need for Community Goals." The charge to the Committee stated:

During recent years, communities and governments have begun to realize there was little consistency in their planning and actions, because of a lack of stated goals and objectives for the community. In recent years, several of our own research projects (such as Planning for Transportation in the Portland Metropolitan Area and Sign Code Revision) have noted that the lack of community consensus on what we're trying to do makes satisfactory solutions hard to find.

Communities and institutions are becoming increasingly aware of the need for this kind of definition to underlie planning and development efforts. In the past several years, Dallas, Texas and Los Angeles, California, have tried to define goals for their communities. The State of Oregon budget is woven into "Goals for Oregon." Federal laws increasingly recognize the need for this type of planning. The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968 states: "A state must consider its plans and their consistency with the goals and objectives of such urban planning as has been promulgated by the community."

The task of the study was to investigate and report on the need for and possible use of community goals and objectives in the areas of environment and land use; health, human resources and housing; transportation, communications, and economic development; education; taxation and finance; governmental organization and procedures; and recreation and the arts. It was stressed that the Committee should not attempt to formulate goals but should seek to define the responsibility or process of goal formulation.

A. Work of the Committee

Your Committee was convened for the first time in October, 1971. It consisted of 15 City Club members representing a variety of backgrounds and experiences. During the ensuing months it has held more than seventy sessions during which it has interviewed public officials, planners, and other concerned individuals (see Appendix A), has evaluated pertinent publications, and has worked at the task of preparing this report. It has also maintained correspondence with agencies and individuals in other areas. In the course of its deliberations three members of the Committee resigned from the City Club and your Committee acknowledges their participation and contributions with gratitude. The Committee also was assisted by a research intern sponsored by the Portland City Club Foundation, Inc.¹

A substantial part of your Committee's efforts was initially spent in determining the nature of its mission and the problems that lay behind it. The self-educational task was a formidable one.

B. The Nature of Goals

Although the terms "goals" and "objectives" would seem to be relatively ordinary and easily understood, your Committee found this not to be the case. Much time was taken up in developing working definitions because each member saw the Committee's charge in the light of his own experiences and perceptions. Some initially viewed goals as more or less universal human values applicable to most

¹Wilbur Conder, graduate student, Portland State University.
places and times while others saw them as more specific directives which, might, say, define the alignment of a freeway. Ultimately the Committee adopted definitions presented to it by Vernon Rifer, a consultant to the State of Washington Department of Ecology and past chairman of the Oregon Environmental Council:

A goal represents an ideal expressed as a desired result. In this context goals remain essentially continuous over time, and may never be completely achieved. Objectives are specific interim steps leading toward the defined goals. They are dynamic in nature in that they may change as a result of changes in the social, economic, political, and physical environment, and as progress is realized toward achievement of the goals.

In your Committee's views, goals are comprehensive, significant, and continuing purposes, while objectives are more specific, subsidiary, and limited targets leading to the attainment of such goals. Taken together, goals and objectives represent a set of guidelines for the future in ends to be achieved and in environmental and human values to be preserved. A statement of goals and objectives would not, however, be a "plan" in the sense of a blueprint for the future community. Planning is really a continuing process that takes into account the constantly changing elements of the present situation in devising methods for achieving goals and objectives. Such planning includes not only the responsibilities of formally designated "planning commissions" but also policy and decision formulation in nearly all other aspects of government.

An example of a possible goal in the field of land use for the Portland Metropolitan Area might be "that a maximum of productive agricultural land should be preserved in the lower Willamette Valley," while a related objective could state that "priority for expansion of residential developments should be given to foothill and mountain regions adjacent to the urbanized area of Metropolitan Portland." Such a goal and objective could be reflected in zoning maps of planning agencies and in routes chosen for future water and sewer lines by public works departments.
II. METROPOLITAN GROWTH AND ITS PROBLEMS

In the Foreword to *The Conscience of a City: Fifty Years of City Club Service in Portland* (1916-1966) the following statement appears:

... the Portland metropolitan area faces in some degree all of the crucial problems that face all of our metropolitan areas: those of land, water and other resource protection and use; of production, transport, distribution and service; of housing and shelter; of community economic, social and cultural institutions and services; of parks and recreation; of education, health and welfare; of economic opportunity; of social justice; of community relationships and organization; of metropolitan shifts and dislocations and of urban and suburban renewal; of comprehensive planning and development; of governmental organization and coordination; of financing of capital improvements, services and operations. Transcending throughout are the imponderable matters of maintaining and enhancing the whole environment in the interest of human well being and the ineffable quality of livability.

In the same connection, the views of Lewis Mumford, who has written extensively on the city, its culture, architecture and planning, are relevant in the approach to goals for urban well-being and security. He also sees the need of reexamination of the modern city, its integration, and the use of its immense energies for betterment:

The final mission of the city is to further man's conscious participation in the cosmic and the historic process. Through its own complex and enduring structure, the city vastly augments man's ability to interpret these processes and take an active formative part in them. . . .

... Our cities have been going steadily from bad to worse; and many of the achievements that officialdom is wont to boast about . . . have only hastened the pace of metropolitan disintegration, random suburban dispersal, regional spoilage. . . . Today everyone at last realizes that our cities are in trouble. . . .

All of these vital conditions for social continuity and personal integrity have been breaking down in both the central metropolis and its outlying areas; and they have most completely broken down among the lowest-income groups. This unfortunate minority lacks regular work and the self-respect that comes from performing such work; their immediate neighborhood and city have undergone and are still undergoing abrupt structural changes for bad and good, that erase their familiar social patterns and destroy their sense of belonging, so that their own selves become so much scattered debris in the larger demolition process. . . .

The nature of the modern city needs to be reexamined; a new pattern of urban integration more capable of utilizing the immense activities that modern man now commands must be invented.

As the extensive bibliography appended to this report (Appendix B) indicates, much has been written from many points of view and over a long period of time, on the urban condition and on the general and specific nature of the problems involved. Although recognition of the need to deal with these problems has now become general on both national and local levels, finding long-term solutions has been elusive. Traditional governmental organization procedures have either failed to meet the developing crises or have treated them one by one as they appeared, more often than not with short-term remedies that have created as many problems as they have solved. Carl H. Madden, chief economist of the United States Chamber of Commerce, includes the following general observation in his broad study of the clash of forces in national development and change, including those of the city:

For too long a time, we as a nation have responded to problems in a reactive fashion, concentrating our time, money, and energy on treating them on an emergency basis, with consequences that could have been avoided if we had

---

2The City in History, 1961.
exercised more foresight. One of the central lessons of our present difficulties is that we must learn to anticipate both problems and opportunities—in a sustained and systematic way—in advance of their occurrence. To do so is in no way to turn our back on present concerns. We must simultaneously attend to what is urgent, and do our best to foresee and respond to what is imminent.

The Portland Metropolitan community in many different situations has failed “to foresee and respond to what is imminent” until the problem was at hand. A substantial part of this failure marks the lack of unity of purpose in governmental decision-making. A number of City Club studies have called attention to such a lack, including those dealing with problems of city government, port development, racial justice, ombudsman, urban redevelopment, the waterfront, and mass transit. The 1968 study of transportation planning in particular stated flatly that a wide consensus on what the future must be like was essential for effective comprehensive planning. Following its formal presentation to the City Club, the members of that committee in a joint letter to the Board of Governors urged the City Club to assume leadership in goal formulation. Following this the City Club Board of Governors and the Project Planning Board had discussions at length as to how the Club might be helpful in a community goal-setting effort. Several weekly Club meetings were devoted to questions of planning for the future and the community's need for goals, greater citizen involvement, and governmental outreach.

A. The Effect of Governmental Fragmentation

A basic problem in finding long-range approaches and solutions to the region's needs is fragmentation of governmental authority. No single body exists in the Portland metropolitan area with overall responsibility for the present needs and providing for the future. The structure of governmental decision-making in this area, as in nearly every other American metropolitan region, is dispersed among literally hundreds of legislative and executive bodies. They and their specialized bureaus, departments, and offices frequently operate in isolation from each other due to differences in topics handled, levels of government administered, and geographic areas served. Local government in the Portland metropolitan area alone includes five counties, three dozen incorporated municipalities, and more than 300 special districts. To these must be added the local field offices of two states and the federal government. It is illuminating to note that the Portland telephone directory in its opening pages lists more than 850 separate state and federal offices for the local area.

There are many benefits to be gained from such highly specialized organization of the governance of society. Competent personnel resolve specific problems easily and expertly; local concerns can be dealt with locally in most cases; scale economies can be achieved by the higher levels of organization. At the same time, however, there are critical problems in coordinating and harmonizing their disparate activities. Each agency, with few exceptions, sets about accomplishing its assigned tasks within its prescribed area of jurisdiction according to its own perceptions of problems and internal indicators of success. It usually lacks any precise guidelines from parent legislative bodies or constituencies and seldom has cross-contact with other agencies in allied fields and regions. Each agency thus has to establish its own parochial priorities and programs or, worse yet, it may meet its day-to-day problems and tasks without any future aims at all.

The result consists of sets of contradictory policies and programs that frequently

*The following reports in Portland City Club Bulletins:
Portland City Government, Vol. 41, No. 51, May 19, 1961
Port Management, Operation, and Development in the Metropolitan Portland and Columbia River Area, Vol. 45, No. 46, April 16, 1965
The Ombudsman (or Public Protector) Concept, And Grievance Handling and Citizens' Services in Oregon, Vol. 50, No. 52, May 29, 1970
Urban Renewal in Portland, Vol. 52, No. 12, August 13, 1971
Journal Building Site Use and Riverfront Development (interim report), Vol. 50, No. 10, August 8, 1969
negate each other and often depart substantially from the original intentions for promote balanced, orderly development of territory conflict with county budget establishing the agencies. Within this framework new developments in society evolve in less than optimum ways. A few examples may be cited: circumferential freeways constructed according to guidelines of the Bureau of Roads encourage a migration of manufacturing enterprises to cheaper lands on the suburban periphery while programs of other federal agencies seek to reduce mounting unemployment in the central city; some arms of state government encourage more industries and people to come to Oregon while other arms seek stabilization or reduction of population pressure on the region's resources; county planning offices striving to departments pressing for maximum increases of tax-producing new activities. At times even similar agencies pursue antagonistic aims, as is reflected in the current controversies between county sheriffs' offices and the Oregon State Police. Your Committee does not feel these contradictions are the result of poor intention or lack of commitment by those in government toward the best interests of the entire community. Rather, unhappiness with situations such as those cited come most often from the frustrated officials involved.

B. The Unity and Interdependence of Metropolitan Portland

The fragmentation of government stands out in contrast to the basic unity of the Portland metropolitan region as a whole. The region is a coherent geographic system in which persons residing in its many component jurisdictional parts are in constant interaction with persons and facilities located in the region's other governmental areas. Thus it is not unusual for residents of Vancouver to work in Beaverton and to shop in the Lloyd Center. Students from Oregon City and Aloha as well as Sellwood and Albina attend lectures at Portland State University. The substantial numbers of City Club members living in Lake Oswego, Gresham, and other suburban communities is testimony to the commonality of interests and activities of people in the region.

Moreover, as in any system, problems occurring in one part ultimately have their effects on all other parts. Air pollution from Camas is evident in Troutdale and Maywood Park. A public health problem west of the Willamette soon appears on the east side. A deterioration of the central city is felt by school enrollment pressures in the suburbs. Likewise, developments occurring in one facet of community life have consequences in other facets. The building of a freeway system has inevitable impact upon land use, the quality of life and even the identity of the neighborhoods through which it passes. An abrupt change in a federal or state program for the needy has repercussions in local taxes, business activities, and the crime rate.

C. Efforts Toward Governmental Coordination

Awareness of the problems brought about by governmental fragmentation is evident at national, state, and local levels. The federal government has attempted to coordinate its multitude of funded projects in metropolitan areas by requiring review of proposals by local government councils. Thus the Columbia Region Association of Governments (CRAG) was created for the Portland area by local officials in 1965 largely to meet federal demands. More recently Governor McCall has sought to harmonize and coordinate the arms of state government by concentrating their field offices in fourteen regionally dominant towns and cities, including Portland.

Although laudable in their aims and often noteworthy in achievements, neither of these programs has provided the essential unity of governmental action necessary to meet the long-run needs of the metropolitan region. Each falls short of enlisting all of the governments in the area and has other limitations that seem not likely to be resolved. The mosaic of tiny self-governing units and the multitude of higher-level field agencies appear likely to be as permanent features of the local landscape as the Willamette River or Mount Tabor.
D. Isolation of Administration from the Citizen

The many governments in the Portland area suffer from another kind of handicap. They are not only operating in isolation from each other but also in isolation from the public. As government administration has developed into ever more specialized sub-units, it has suffered from lack of input from the citizenry for the establishment of policy and plans. Although formal hearings may be held on proposed projects, they usually come in the later stages of development rather than involving the public at their inception. Most day-to-day decisions are reached without any public consultation at all, and often are made by technical experts with a minimal frame of community reference. It is part of the American tradition that government is to exist of, by, and for the people, yet the collective desires of the people in the development of their locality in fact have little or no reflection in much of what is done. To be sure, the situation proceeds from a general lack of the expertise necessary to grasp the complexities of contemporary problems (health, welfare, land use, etc.) coupled with an ingrained citizen passivity towards local government affairs. Those who do present their views and complaints in public hearings more often than not represent highly personal interests and not the community's views as a whole. Too often such individuals have prevailed in their special pleading in the absence of evidence of any community consensus to the contrary. The problem often indicates a lack of commitment on the part of public leadership to the concept of citizen participation which in turn evidences a lack of skills necessary to get participation and to make it effective.
III. THE PLACE OF GOALS IN MEETING METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS

The Portland metropolitan area needs a process by which the problems of the region are treated as part of a whole and the public's concerns are brought into all aspects of governmental actions. Your Committee believes that a metropolitan-wide program of formulating goals can meet these needs and in addition will have a number of other beneficial results in educating the public on the nature of the planning process and securing greater citizen involvement in civic affairs.

A publicly developed and endorsed statement of goals would obviously not be a panacea for all the problems of local government. However, a goals program would provide a common purpose for the multitude of agencies presenting guidelines for weighing alternatives and otherwise reaching decisions. It would serve as a yardstick against which the performance of officials and administrators could be measured. It would permit the private sector of the economy to anticipate the nature and direction of future change. But, above all, it would allow the machinery of government to know what the public wants for its own future. At present the operation of our local government is like building a house without a plan or, rather, with a multitude of plans, almost none of which represent what the customer really wants.

A. Problems of Implementation

It can be argued, of course, that establishment of a set of goals and objectives would be an interesting but futile endeavor, since any government body or agency would be free either to accept or to ignore the final product. It would certainly be unrealistic to believe that every unit of government would be in agreement with all points in such a statement or would feel bound to implement them. However, any dissenting body would be put in the position of having to defend its differences in goals and objectives from those arrived at by community consensus. In the presence of concerned citizens groups and the mass communications media it could not simply take actions that would contradict or negate goals without facing the risk of public censure. At present such monitoring bodies have little to appeal to except their own defined "public interests" when contesting decisions of local government which they find harmful. Your Committee believes, however, that most public officials would in fact welcome the guidance afforded by such a program rather than rejecting it as a subversion of their prerogatives. It would provide a means of resistance against the pressures of special interest groups. Moreover, the problems of conflicting policies and programs are more the result of an absence of any community goals and objectives than of rivalries inherent in the different activities government performs. There is also every reason to believe that both federal and state levels of government would be likely to adopt such a community effort in total as guidelines for all of their respective agencies.

B. Efforts Toward Establishment of Goals

Indeed, the need for goals to guide government has been acknowledged in recent times at all levels of administration. In 1960, the report of President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals, Goals for Americans, asked that solutions be sought for haphazard urban growth and that provision be made for equitable sharing of services between central cities and suburbs. In 1969, President Nixon established a National Goals Research Staff whose report, Towards Balanced Growth: Quantity with Quality, stressed the need for anticipatory decision-making. It called for the definition of national goals and the development in both public and private institutions of specific policies and programs to move the country towards them. Governor McCall commissioned the study Goals for A Livable Oregon—An Action Partnership for the '70s. The Governor also encouraged local governments to form voluntary associations and to establish citizen committees for the purpose of defining local problems and setting local goals. State agencies were directed to join with local governments, councils of government, federal bureaus, and interested citizens, in the identification of problems that will have to be overcome if we are to achieve "goals for a livable Oregon."
achieving goals were to be ranked in order of relative importance and be reflected in budgetary requests. The program was aimed at improving Oregon through the achievement of better decisions.

Alternative directions for land development in the Willamette Valley have been identified by Lawrence Halprin and Associates in (Project Foresight), Willamette Valley: Choice for the Future, prepared for the Willamette Valley Councils of Government (including CRAG). Two “scenarios” were offered. One projected current land use, population growth, and transportation trends of the Willamette Valley to their likely consequence in the year 2000; the second depicted a more livable environment based on adopting policies now to counter negative trends currently in effect.

The staff of the Columbia Region Association of Governments (CRAG), with the help of a select committee, has proposed a tentative set of goals for the metropolitan area. The recently completed Portland Downtown Plan was based on a statement of goals for the district prepared by a Citizen's Advisory Committee appointed by the Mayor.

C. Shortcomings of Goal-Setting Efforts

Your Committee commends the efforts expended in these endeavors but it must conclude that none meets the needs of the Portland region. The City Club's 1968 report on transportation planning noted that planning efforts must be (1) comprehensive, (2) embrace the entire metropolitan area, (3) be suitable for implementation, and (4) enjoy the confidence and support of the public.

A basic need for any set of goals for the Portland metropolitan area is that it be "comprehensive" in the sense that goals are developed with consideration of all aspects of the area's human and physical environment. The approach of several of the studies cited above has been to consider problems in isolation from each other. When considering goals for transportation and land use, reference must be made not only to such economic considerations as the maintenance of property values and the maximization of efficiency in providing services, but also to vital social concerns such as the preservation and enhancement of existing neighborhood communities, the fostering of full employment, and the minimization of air and water pollution. While pursuing these considerations, an effort should be made to find the community's philosophy in regard to the balance among growth patterns, economics, ecology, profit, livability, science, and the arts. At present the public mind is not clearly evident in these and related issues. A goals formulation process can and should elicit both from inference and direct appeal this public ethos.

In its consideration of such shortcomings and needs, your Committee's research and discussions led repeatedly to the trends and impacts of metropolitan growth, but to the conclusion that this metropolitan area need not necessarily follow the trend. As Albert Mayer has put it in his The Urgent Future, "trend is not destiny."

It is essential that a statement of goals be established for the entire metropolitan area of Portland and not just for a part of it, such as Multnomah County or the City of Portland. This is not to say that goals are not needed for lesser sections. They must decidedly are, and it is particularly important that citizens participate in setting goals for neighborhood planning. However, local goals must be developed within the context of the agreed-upon needs of the metropolitan community as a whole. It is to be regretted, for instance, that the Downtown Plan, with all its merits, was formulated in the absence of an area-wide consensus on the role the central business district should play in the overall metropolitan region.

Goals need to be realistic statements of policy that can be achieved, rather than a recitation of trite generalities or unattainable promises. They must be meaningful and realizable within the community's resources to implement them.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, an essential part of a successful goals-forming process is the participation of the public. The very concept of goals implies the determination of what the people want for their future. To be successful, a statement of goals needs to enjoy the confidence of the public, and experience has shown that such confidence is best achieved when there is a sense of participation from the very inception of a program. Unfortunately, most of the goals cited above have been formulated largely by technical experts with limited citizen input.
IV. GOALS PROGRAMS IN DALLAS AND LOS ANGELES

Part of your Committee’s charge was to examine processes of goals formulation attempted in other cities. Two of the most notable efforts have occurred in Dallas, Texas, and Los Angeles, California. Fortunately for our study, substantial materials were available concerning the programs in both cities, including a particularly useful appraisal of the Los Angeles program based on interviews with its participants and critics.

A. The Dallas Experience

The Dallas goals program was initiated in late 1965 by its Mayor who invited a group of 26 community leaders to form a planning committee for establishment of goals for the city. After determining its role, the committee commissioned local writers to prepare a set of twelve essays on a number of different aspects of the Dallas scene. The completed essays then served as the basis for an intensive three-day conference of the committee, which had co-opted sixty more members to gain a broader representation of the community. From the conference emerged a draft program, Goals for Dallas: Submitted for Consideration of Dallas Citizens, published in paperback form. The book served as the basis for scores of discussion meetings organized by churches, clubs, local chambers of commerce, parent-teacher associations, and other groups. It was estimated that more than 6,000 persons then participated in 33 special district meetings sponsored by the committee to evaluate the goals. Verbatim transcripts of comments were kept and used to prepare a 260-page summary report, Goals for Dallas: Mutual Aims of Its Citizens, used as the basis for discussion at a second intensive conference of the committee. At this meeting the revised goals were elaborated into more specific objectives, including policies, costs and timetables for priorities. These were again presented to the public through neighborhood meetings that drew more than 50 thousand participants. The results of these further discussions were then reviewed by twelve “task forces” of 25 members each tackling different subject areas with the aim of recommending programs for implementing the goals. The task forces were assisted by staff members loaned on a part-time basis by business and educational institutions. The task force proposals were published in a third volume, Goals for Dallas: Proposals for Achieving the Goals. A series of “town hall meetings” was directed to evaluation of the priorities and organizational structures proposed, and after a review of discussions, a final operational plan identifying goals and measures to attain them was published as Goals for Dallas: Achieving the Goals. The program is now being implemented by planning and administrative offices.

The implementation schedule calls for a review every three years. The first of these is to be held in 1973 with as widespread citizen participation as possible. The review is to assure that the goals reflect new needs and changes and that new insights as to what Dallas should be like are taken into account.

The Planning Committee realized that no set of goals would be accomplished solely by being stated. Each requires constant, dedicated attention. With this thought in mind, the Planning Committee set up 12 achievement committees to correspond to each of the 12 sets of goals. The Committee’s purpose is to encourage two things necessary for goals achievement: Education of action agencies and citizen support of the action agencies’ work. These committees meet annually and make in-depth reviews of progress and detailed reports to the community. This is not a “crash” effort, but rather a long term undertaking. Time is needed to tell people about the program to get them to understand it, to become interested, and then to take part.

In summation, the Dallas program was clearly derived from and controlled by a blue-ribbon committee working closely with existing governmental agencies. The staffs of agencies provided substantial support based on their experience with ongoing programs. Overall, the program appears well organized and executed with a viable set of realistic, usable goals as an end product.

B. Efforts in Los Angeles

In Los Angeles a goals program was attempted with a far greater emphasis on citizen participation to the virtual exclusion of local government. Its initiative came
in 1964 from the city's newly-appointed planning director. The planning department had been charged with completing a master plan by 1970, and the director believed that it should be developed through a maximum of citizen input. To achieve this he sought the assistance of religious, professional, and social groups in the community. He proposed a four-phased program: (1) inviting interested organizations to prepare position papers on what the future Los Angeles should be like; (2) holding general public discussions on the position papers; (3) having a special committee evaluate the inputs from the public and draft a report for submission to elected officials and government agencies; (4) commissioning the planning department to translate the goals into concepts for the master plan.

Nearly all the invited community groups favored the proposal and it was set in motion. The local chapter of the American Institute of Architects accepted responsibility for forming an "Environmental Goals Committee" composed of planners, architects, engineers, designers, and representatives from environmental beautification groups. A "Technology Goals Committee" was similarly formed by scientists and worked toward development of goals in communication, adult education, health, transportation, and housing. The Los Angeles County Psychological Association set up a "Behavioral Science Committee" to develop human and social goals. A special "South Central Intergroup Goals Committee" was formed from citizens' and service organizations in the predominantly black Watts area. The most active group by far was an "Inter-Religious Committee" formed with funding and staff assistance from the New York headquarters of the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches.

A number of reports emerged from the various committees and were published. To foster public discussion a series of "Centers of Choice" were established in churches, parks, and colleges. Originally visualized as some 600 "New England Town Meeting"-type centers, their number was scaled down to 75, and ultimately only 32 were opened. The League of Women Voters cooperated in creating a "Viewpointers" program in which some 120 trained volunteers went to Rotary Clubs, parent-teacher associations, churches, and other civic organizations to present the goals program and to solicit citizen involvement. As part of the public participation process some 600 thousand questionnaires were distributed by various means, including enclosure with monthly telephone bills. About 50 thousand were received back.

In September, 1967, a "Goals Council" of 52 members named by the City Council and participant bodies, began deliberating the public input. It prepared its report in early 1969 and many of its recommendations were incorporated in the city planning commission's General Plan Concept report of November of that year.

A goals program for Los Angeles was thus accomplished within its scheduled five-year period. It does not appear to have been an unqualified success, however. It was beset by a number of internal and external difficulties that left even its most ardent advocates and participants discouraged. It was estimated that only some 70 thousand of the community's 7 million residents were involved in even the slightest degree of participation. The following critique of the program is based primarily on an evaluation report prepared by the Inter-Religious Committee

Inadequacies have been generally blamed on weak leadership and funding. There was no structured organization for the program nor a director having the authority to set deadlines, insure accomplishments, and resolve disputes among the many participating bodies. Anticipated contributions from private sources were generally not forthcoming and all the committees came to depend on the nationally-funded Inter-Religious Committee. Because of its adequate staff and resources it became the de facto leader of the program. However, its aims and pursuits tended to alienate other potential sources of support. Thus it consciously sought a "pure" citizen participation, untainted by direction from local government. The City Council became steadily alienated from the effort, removed funding and staff support that originally had been extended, and finally opposed the program openly. Even the Goals Council only reluctantly accepted money from the Inter-Religious Committee for publishing its final report, and then on the condition that no mention would be made in the report itself concerning the Inter-Religious Committee donation.
The program tried too much with too little preparation and resources. It was overoptimistic concerning potential citizen response and involvement. Volunteers willing to work consistently on a rigid time schedule simply were not forthcoming. There was also no focus of the program. Goals to remedy all aspects of the community’s physical and social ills were considered together, and often at rather abstract and formal levels. Publications of the program tended to be rather ponderous and did not generate public enthusiasm. There was also an excessive time lag between the discussion of goals and any action taken upon them, making it difficult to sustain public interest. The Los Angeles experience can be the source of many lessons that should be carefully studied in the launching of a goal-setting program. The candor with which it was viewed and reported by those who participated is commendable and will be helpful in future efforts by other metropolitan areas.5

C. Goals-Related Activities in Other Cities

The Committee gave more limited consideration to goals-related programs in other cities, as indicated by references in Part I of the Bibliography, Appendix B. It suggests that more extensive review of experiences in this field, including those of Minnesota’s Twin Cities, Denver, Colorado, Eugene, Oregon, and of Puget Sound cities, would be desirable in the ongoing process in the Portland area.

V. A POSSIBLE GOALS PROGRAM FOR THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA

Your Committee finds itself reluctant to specify a single "best" procedure for formulating a statement of goals for the Portland Metropolitan Area. Many ways are possible, and several have been employed in other communities, with mixed results. Developing a goals program is a task requiring careful professional planning and properly should be done by whatever group accepts the challenge and responsibility for achieving this end. However, in response to its charge, your Committee offers the following as a program it believes has merit.

A. A Short Campaign Focused on a Critical Set of Problems

It is the consensus of your Committee that a continuing process of goal formulation is necessary, but that it should begin with a massive effort focused on a limited set of objectives. One of the most pressing and recognizable needs of the Metropolitan Area now is a policy on land use and it is suggested that this be the focus in the initial stage of goals development. All the areas identified in the Committee's original charge would benefit from a metropolitan-wide set of goals and are worthy of eventual consideration and action. However, land use presents the greatest challenge because the results of the present uncoordinated expansion of the metropolitan area are too often irreversible.

In addition to being one of the most critical fields needing metropolitan goals immediately, an initial focus on land use has some practical advantages for successful inauguration of a continuing and broader goal-forming process. A community-wide consensus on meaningful land use goals seems particularly likely of achievement. Concern for problems of land use in Oregon is evident from all sides of the political spectrum, as citizens have witnessed the steady erosion of livability. Because of the tangible qualities of changes in land use, alternatives can be more easily visualized and weighed by the public in comparison with less visible community concerns. Land use goals also have a significant strategic value, since so many other problem areas, including public transportation and employment, have such a direct dependence on the spatial pattern of the community. The formulation of land use goals provides an avenue by which the economic, cultural and social problems of the community can be most readily attacked.

Although your Committee believes it is essential to inaugurate a goal-setting program with a brief campaign, it must be realized that the setting of goals cannot be seen only as a one-time operation comparable to the drafting of a set of blueprints by an architect. Society and its technology are constantly changing, with new needs emerging and past concerns fading away. Goals and the decision-making based on them must be continuously updated and improved. A long-term review must also be institutionalized.

B. The Need for Careful Planning and Direction

The campaign itself must be carefully planned, professionally directed, and broadly supported. It should begin with an informational and educational phase, to be followed by a solicitation of public views and choices among alternatives that are open. There should be an awareness that much of the citizenry is unaccustomed and hesitant to participate in public affairs at either the neighborhood or city levels, let alone in metropolitan-wide matters. Special effort needs to be made through the mass media and other agencies to overcome passivity and to encourage participation. The possibilities of door-to-door informational programs, neighborhood opinion surveys, PTA presentations, telethons, conferences, seminars, etc., should be considered. The aims and needs of those in our community who are disadvantaged, for whatever reasons, cannot be overlooked. The process must seek to develop a sense of identity with the whole metropolitan community by all of its citizens.

A rigid time schedule appears particularly necessary. A short, dynamic campaign is preferable to a long, drawn-out one. Programs with indefinite time spans have tended to dissipate the interest and involvement of both volunteer personnel and the public at large. An overall program of 18 months or less appears reasonable, with intensive public participation perhaps confined to a six-week period of promotionally integrated activities.

C. Leadership, Executive, and Staffing Needs

The mounting of such a campaign requires broad-based community leader-
ship, top-flight executive management, a substantial full-time staff, and adequate facilities. Although the costs of such a program might seem high, it would be far less than what now is spent each year for the present relatively uncoordinated and goal-less planning process in the metropolitan area. It is quite possible that substantial assistance could be received from federal sources, though strong argument could be made that the community itself should underwrite the total cost.

Leadership has proven to be a critical problem in the experience of other cities that have undertaken to establish goals. Although governmental bodies and their officials have the advantages of established authority and facilities, their association with specific jurisdictional areas is a handicapping factor for directing a program requiring metropolitan unity. This is not to say that the active support and cooperation of local officials is not essential for success. The experience of Los Angeles and Dallas demonstrates the need for close association with local governments. Still, the general failure throughout the country by public officials participating in regional councils of government to initiate and carry through similar programs suggests the need for less parochially-identified leadership. Some possible alternatives include church groups, civic clubs, or ad hoc "blue ribbon" commissions.

Your Committee believes that the most effective body to initiate and coordinate a comprehensive program of goal setting for the Portland Metropolitan Area would be a citizens' coalition drawn from such civic bodies as The City Club of Portland, the League of Women Voters, Chambers of Commerce, Model Cities Planning Board, service clubs, labor, business, professional and farm organizations, and the Portland Council of Churches. It should be recognized that the success of such a leadership coalition will rest on the efforts and skills of the individual chosen to head the organization.

It is of vital importance that such leadership approach the task of goal formulation with a vision that embodies a bright future for the entire community. Your Committee assumes that this leadership consists of all those in the Portland Metropolitan community, in and out of government, who believe that something needs to be done to enhance its livability for all citizens and are willing to lend a hand for its accomplishment.

The necessary resources, human, physical, technological, etc., exist. They must not be allowed to dissipate because of conflict and lack of direction. It will require all the innovation and wisdom that can be mustered if the citizens of this area are to arrive at a reasonable consensus as to how development and growth should take place.

The leadership of the program must be supported by an adequate and sophisticated staff. A special organization might be created, such as the former Metropolitan Study Commission which was so successful in gaining the establishment of CRAG and the Metropolitan Boundary Commission. Other possibilities include contracting for use of the present staff and facilities of the Port of Portland or the Urban Studies Center at Portland State University. Your Committee, however, suggests that the staff of the Columbia Region Association of Governments would be a fitting choice. Not only does CRAG have excellent personnel already concerned with the basic problems involved in goal formulation, but it also represents a direct linkage to the officials of local governments in the metropolitan area.

While your Committee believes that a Citizens Coalition is the best means for enlisting metropolitan-wide support and involvement of the public in formulating goals, it recognizes equally that elected officials as representatives of the people must be vital parts of the goal-forming process to assure its success. Every effort must be made by the program's leadership to seek the advice, support, and assistance of officials of all the governments in the metropolitan area.

D. Initial Action

As a first step in organizing the leadership of the program, your Committee believes that an organizing committee should be formed as soon as possible by representatives of civic organizations. This body should be charged with formulating the composition and organization of the Citizens Coalition which, when established, would set about the tasks of planning the program, soliciting the required financial support, and securing the services of an executive director and staff.
VI. CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of its investigation and deliberation your Committee concludes that it is both feasible and essential for the Portland metropolitan community to embark upon a program for formulating a set of goals. Such goals should speak directly to issues of the region. They should be seen neither as a carefully detailed comprehensive blueprint for future development nor as a series of very general statements applicable to all times and all places. Your Committee envisions a collection of policy statements expressing a metropolitan-wide consensus of values and priorities of things to be accomplished and amenities to be preserved. Examples of possible goals that might be produced are:

"To design future water supply and sewage facilities to support measured, contiguous expansion of the urbanized area and to discourage isolated suburban housing development in the open countryside."

"To assure that, where practical, welfare benefits be oriented to—or administered in cooperation with—family units, rather than individuals."

"To bring the Portland International Airport to its fullest potential as a regional and international air center. To develop more private aircraft and short-hop commercial facilities."

Such goals are necessary (1) to give direction to planning, to establish priorities for action, and to serve as guidelines for future decision-making; (2) to provide a standard by which accomplishments and progress can be measured; and (3) to promote a sense of common identity and community that will unite and strengthen the people to maintain and improve the livability of the area.

Your Committee believes that the conditions for the formulation of community goals require the following:

(1) Strong, sensitive, and skilled leadership. A committed group of civic leaders is necessary to establish policy and a full-time director with acknowledged authority and an adequate staff is required to carry it out.

(2) Adequate financing. From the very beginning there must be assurance of adequate financing of the entire program, including staff expenses, presentation needs, and publications costs. The director cannot be bogged down in constant solicitation efforts nor be forced to “make-do” with half measures because of weak funding.

A major role must be played by members of the business community in securing the required funds. Opportunities for government support from all levels must be explored.

(3) Broad-based public involvement. It is assumed that a great number of citizens, public officials and organizations in this metropolitan area would welcome the opportunity to participate in a goal-setting effort that is challenging and meaningful. A wide variety of proven techniques must be utilized to assure public awareness and participation from the program’s inception, including planned media campaigns, organized discussion groups, and even door-to-door canvassing. The support of the area’s newspapers, television channels, and radio stations is essential for success. Moreover, the program cannot succeed without the active endorsement and participation of CRAG and the region’s county and city governments.

(4) Professional assistance. Local government officials, planners, architects, engineers, social scientists and others have to be drawn upon in formulation of issues and identification of the implications of varied alternatives proposed.

Your Committee believes that a continuing process of goals formulation is necessary but that it should begin with a massive effort focused on a limited set of objectives. One of the most pressing needs of the metropolitan area now is a policy on land use and it is suggested that this take priority in goals development.

Lack of a proven process for formulating goals appears to be one reason why few communities have adopted goals or shown interest in them. Limited experience in other metropolitan areas is available to be drawn upon for guidance. This is the reason for suggesting the process outlined in this report.

To set a goals program in motion a civic coalition composed of representatives of citizens’ groups, business, government and the professions needs to be convened. It should carefully examine the experiences of those cities which have mounted goals-forming campaigns, in order to frame a workable program for the Portland Metropolitan Area.
VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Your Committee recommends:
(1) that an aggressive program of goal formulation be undertaken by the people of Metropolitan Portland;
(2) That a Citizens Committee be created as soon as possible to organize a broadly-based civic coalition to:
   (a) develop an action program of goal formulation,
   (b) provide adequate funding for the program, and
   (c) secure the services of a director and staff.

Respectfully submitted,
Arnold N. Bodtker, Chairman
Roy F. Bessey
Robert L. Furniss
Stanley A. Goodell
Lee Irwin
Eugene H. Kindschuh
Geo. S. Larimer
Charles S. Politz
Thomas M. Poulsen
James R. Sitzman
Francis A. Staten
Harold C. Williams

Approved by the Research Board May 30, 1973 for transmittal to the Board of Governors.
Accepted by the Board of Governors on June 4, 1973 and ordered published for presentation to the membership on June 29, 1973.
APPENDIX A

INTERVIEWS AND MEETINGS

Your Committee interviewed or consulted the following persons:
Lloyd E. Anderson, Commissioner, City of Portland
Lyle Balderson, Planner, Columbia Region Association of Governments
Robert S. Baldwin, Director, Multnomah County Planning Commission
Ogden Beeman, Marine Manager, Port of Portland, and then Chairman, Project Planning Board, The City Club of Portland
Homer C. Chandler, then Director, Columbia Region Association of Governments
Donald E. Clark, Commissioner, Multnomah County
William S. Dirker, Transportation Coordinator, City of Portland
Neil Goldschmidt, then Commissioner, City of Portland
Carl Halvorsen, then President, Portland Chamber of Commerce
Don Johnson, Bureau of Governmental Research and Services, University of Oregon
Lloyd T. Keele, then Director, Planning Commission, City of Portland
Marc Kelley, then on the staff of Portland Development Commission
John B. Kenward, Executive Director, Portland Development Commission
John Lobdell, then Director, Local Government Relations Division, State of Oregon
A. McKay Rich, Assistant Director, Columbia Region Association of Governments
Vernon L. Rifer, then Chairman, Oregon Environmental Council
Estes Snedecor, Jr., then Member, Mayor Schrunk's Citizens Advisory Committee
Nohad A. Toulan, Director, Urban Studies Ph.D. Program, Portland State University
Connie Veek, then Executive Director, District Planning Organization Task Force, City of Portland

Your Committee met with the following groups:
Portland Chapter, American Institute of Planners (meeting on goals)
Model Cities Group: Charles Jordan, then Director; Mr. and Mrs. Ben Bernhard, Brenda Green, James Loving, Joe Nunn, Clara Peeples, and Opal Strong
APPENDIX B

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Introduction. In view (1) of the broad scope of the Committee's assignment and (2) of the Committee’s proposal for continuing study of goals in depth, the appending of a relatively extended, diverse, two-part bibliography was considered desirable. The Committee’s examination of references noted was necessarily limited in extent and degree.

Part 1. Material Directly Related to and Drawn upon in Writing the Report (Available in City Club library)

a. CITY CLUB OF PORTLAND PUBLICATIONS

b. LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS PUBLICATIONS OR PAPERS
   A Tale of Three Counties—One Metropolitan Area, 1960.
   Land Use, Chaos, Conflict or Coordination, 1972.

c. GOALS AND PLANNING PUBLICATIONS
   (1) Local
      Willamette Valley Steering Committee, The Willamette Valley Environmental Protection and Development Plan—A Program Design.
      City of Portland, Goals and Objectives.
      Metropolitan Planning Commission, A Consideration of Man, and of Man and Community, 1968.
   (2) National
      The President's Commission on National Goals, Goals for Americans, 1960.

d. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PUBLICATIONS AND PAPERS
   The Ombudsman (or Public Protector) Concept, and Grievance Handling and Citizens' Services in Oregon, BULLETIN, Vol. 50, No. 52, May 29, 1970.
   Vernon L. Rifer, an address to Pacific Northwest River Basins Commission, Macro-Scale Planning with the Public, 1971.
   (Special issue), Citizen Action In Model Cities and CAP Programs: Case Studies and Evaluation, 1972.

e. EXPERIENCE OF OTHER CITIES
   DALLAS, TEXAS
   Southwest Center for Advanced Studies, Dallas, Goals for Dallas (four vols.):
   (1) Submitted for Consideration by Dallas Citizens, 1966.
(3) Proposals for Achieving the Goals, 1969.

Goals for Dallas


LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA


MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA

Dennis W. Dunne, Metropolitan Council, New Regionalism; The Minnesota Experiment; HUD CHALLENGE, 1971.


Twin Cities Citizens League Articles of Incorporation, Resumes, etc.

DENVER, COLORADO


Part 2. Supplemental Material Considered Useful for Further Study (Material indicated by asterisk available in CITY CLUB library)

a. INTRODUCTION

The Committee study involved the examination of much published material and the consideration of many viewpoints which could not be given adequate treatment in the report itself. The essentials to support the conclusions and recommendations are clearly stated or strongly implied so that those who read can reflect and act in accordance with their own experiences and outlook. However, inasmuch as this study explores an area of increasing community concern your Committee believes there should be opportunity for more general access to sources of study. Following is an outline, with comments, of additional material considered informative and useful.

b. BACKGROUND IN CITY CLUB

It is worth noting that the decision by The City Club to launch a study on Community Goals was a long time being born and much could be gained by a more extensive exposure to the background that led to the Committee's charge. Therefore, attention is invited to the following:

(1) City Club reports (in addition to those mentioned in Part I):

Report of the City Club Action Committee, Vol. 50, No. 23, Nov. 7, 1969. (Reflecting desirability of forward steps by the Club in the direction of community action in which it might engage.)

(2) City Club Addresses—


(3) City Club papers on goals study—(How We Came to a Study on Community Goals).

A compilation of articles and memoranda leading to decision by Board of Governors to launch a study of community goals.

c. THE URBAN CONDITION

(1) Introduction

The problems and situations dealt with in these materials include such subjects as the development and growth of urban areas on relation to the wise use of land and open space; population increase and the migration of people (the rural poor to the cities and the more affluent in the city to the countryside and suburbia); and the change, and sometimes decay, that takes place in the core city. A hopeful promise is that public learning and understanding demands that development, growth and progress be analyzed and appraised on the basis of how well it evidences concern and interest in the humaneness of our society; the protection of our natural environment and the stimulation and preservation of a sense of community among our citizens. What is taking place in the Portland Metropolitan Area varies only in degree from the condition of urban areas throughout the land. In this connection your Committee recommends examination of the following:

*Some Citations on the Urban Condition, selected and assembled by Roy F. Bessey. An extensive compilation of excerpts from books, periodicals, studies, etc., reflecting concerns, feelings and ideas as to the livability of the modern urban society. Includes material from City Club studies, reports of national commissions and books by economists, social
scientists, professional planners, government officials, etc. A potentially useful compendium for those who would sample some of the writing on metropolitan conditions and problems.

(2) Books

E. Banfield and J. Wilson, City Politics, 1963.
Konstatinos A. Doxiades, Ethics, 1968.
Victor Forliss, Technological Man—the Myth and the Reality.
Webb S. Fisher, Mastery of the Metropolis, 1952.
George B. Galloway and Associates, Planning for America, 1941.
James M. Gavin, Crisis Now, 1966.
Scott Greer, et al., The New Urbanization.
Ebenzer Howard, Garden Cities of Tomorrow, 1902, 1965.
International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences. (City, Region, Planning, Central Places, Ecology, Human Ecology, etc.)
Daniel Moynihan, Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding, 1969.
. . ., The Urban Prospect, 1968.
. . ., Population: A Problem for Democracy, 1940.
Harvey Perloff, Education for Planning, City, State, and Regions, 1957.
Mel Scott, American City Planning, 1969.
Clarence Stein, Toward New Towns for America, 1951.
. . ., An Urban Planet.
Barbara Ward, Rene Dubos, Only One Earth, 1972.
Clarence Walton, Man in the City of the Future, 1968.
Lowden Wingo, Cities and Space, 1962.

(3) Periodicals, Professional Journals, Pamphlets
*American Academy of Political and Social Science, ANNALS: Symposia—
  Metropolis in ferment, Nov. 1957.
  Urban Revival, Goals and Standards, March 1964.
  Intergovernmental Relations in the U.S., May 1965.
  Social Goals and Indicators of the American Society, 1967. ("Urban Conditions" included.)
American Institute of Planners, JOURNAL: Articles:
  The Role of Metropolitan Planning, Sept. 1965.
American Law Institute, Model Land Development Code.
*American Society for Public Administration, PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW,
*JOURNAL OF URBAN LAW:
LIBRARY QUARTERLY, John C. Bollens, Local Government Linkages in the Metropolis.
METROPOLITAN FUND, National Goals Setting.
National Urban Coalition, Twenty-One Cities: A National Perspective on Center City Transportation, Sept. 1970.
Royal Town Planning Institute, JOURNAL, Articles:
  Andreas Faludi, Problems with Problem-Solving, Nov. 1971.
TECHNOLOGICAL FORECASTING AND SOCIAL CHANGE, Vol. 4, No. 1, 1972
  Harold A. Linstone, Four American Futures: Reflections on the Role of Planning.
The Urban Institute, Urban Processes As Viewed By the Social Sciences.

(4) Public Reports, Papers, Documents
*Columbia Region Association of Governments:
  Housing Survey of the Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Area, 1969.
  The Urban Outdoors, 1971.
  Board Goals for Conservation and Development for Five-County Area, 1972.
Metropolitan Study Commission: The Dilemma of Local Governments in Urban Areas with Special Reference to the Portland Metropolitan Area, 1968.
Legislative Interim Committee on Local Government, Metropolitan and Local Area Problems in Oregon, 1963.
Department of Environmental Quality, The Quiet Revolution in Land Use Control.
*U.S. National Resources Committee, Our Cities: Their Role in the National Economy, 1937. (See U.S.H.R., Quality of Urban Life, below.)
U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, reports:
- Alternative Approaches to Governmental Reorganization in Metropolitan Areas, 1962.
- The Effectiveness of Metropolitan Planning, 1964.
- Metropolitan America, Challenge to Federation, 1966.
- U.S. National Advisory Committee on Rural Poverty, The People Left Behind, 1967.
- U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Governmental Operations, Committee Print, Government in Metropolitan Areas, 1962.
- *Committee on Banking and Currency, Subcommittee on Urban Growth, Hearings, The Quality of Urban Life, 1969-70. (Includes reprint, National Resources Committee, Our Cities.)
- U.S. Congressional Record, July 8, 1972, Testimony of the American Institute of Planners on Regional Planning Issues.
- U.S. Legislation:
  - *National Housing and Urban Development Act, including Title VII, Urban Growth and New Community Development, P.L. 91-609.

**CITIZEN PARTICIPATION**

The City Club has recognized a widespread concern for a more effective governmental outreach and citizen response and involvement—notably in the Racial Justice and Ombudsman reports already listed herein.

Listed below are some references in addition to those included above (see section 1-d):

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, The Citizen's Role in Decision Making (Don't Leave It All to the Experts), 1972.
- Portland District Planning Organization Task Force, Organization and Operation.

**STUDY COMMITTEE WORKING FILE**

Your Committee's working file contains much material developed during the course of the study preparatory to the actual writing of the report. Selections from this file are catalogued and available for the use of those who will be engaged in a goals formulation program. They include the following:

1. Copies of the complete charge to the Committee.
2. Reports of Committee interviews.
3. Statements by individual members, considered by your Committee as background and/or complementary to the report.
4. Copies of newspaper clippings collected during the course of the study.
ELECTED TO MEMBERSHIP

Edmund L. Bolin, Manager, Land and Claims Department, Northwest Natural Gas Company. Sponsored by Marc Kelley.


PROGRAM JULY 6:

Dr Clifford M. Drury, eminent historian, on “Marcus and Narcissa Whitman: The Opening of Old Oregon.”

MEMBERS’ RESPONSE WARM TO BOARD PLEA FOR FOUNDATION SUPPORT

Response from the Board of Governors’ recent letter to the City Club membership, contained in the dues mailing and urging their monetary support of the Portland City Club Foundation early in June, has been heart-warming.

To date, 90 members have advanced to “Sustaining” dues by contributing a minimum of $10.00 or more each, although many donations were far more than the minimum. Total donated by “new” Sustaining members so far is $1305.00. Fourteen members, already Sustaining, increased their contributions by a total of $189.00, and seven others donated a total of $33.00. Two members who found it necessary to resign contributed $50.00 and $20.00 respectively.

Total “new” money to the Foundation so far is $1579.00.

Money of the Foundation are used for assisting civic research, mainly for the production costs for publishing eligible long-range reports of the City Club, and providing student internships to qualified college students from educational institutions in the Portland area to assist various research committees with detailed assignment. Ordinarily such internships are geared to the students’ curriculum, sometimes for added credit, but summer interns are apt to be selected from any discipline, if their personal interests relate to the committee’s task. A committee of liaison faculty members from most colleges in the metropolitan area assists with the location and selection of appropriate students for internships.

KAY DURHAM SELECTED TO BE ARTS STUDY INTERN FOR SUMMER

Kay Durham, a student at Northwestern University School of Law, has been selected by the committee studying “Public Support for the Arts in Portland” as its intern, Ronald Ragen, Arts Committee chairman, announced this week.

The assignment to the intern by the committee is to obtain a comparison between Portland and various other cities on methods of financing local arts commissions, including fund drives, amount of public monies available, etc. These data are to be obtained from several cities and worked into a comparison chart.

Miss Durham, one of several applicants applying for the internship, graduated from Lewis and Clark College with a degree in political science. In addition she has done special independent off-campus study projects in the Washington, D.C. area both on Model Cities and on the police. She entered Lewis and Clark after graduating from high school in Fairfax, Virginia while her father, an Air Force Officer, was on duty with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. She received her elementary and secondary education at various schools on three continents. Kay will enter her second year of law school next fall.

Internships for eligible City Club study projects are provided by the Portland City Foundation, Inc.

RADIO BROADCASTS CONTINUE THROUGH SUMMER: SLIGHT TIME CHANGE

The City Club’s Friday luncheon programs will continue to be broadcast throughout the summer, with one small change. The KOAP-FM live broadcast will be more like an instant replay. Ordinarily scheduled for 12:40-1:30, “live,” the KOAP airing will now begin at 1:30 p.m. each Friday for the remainder of the summer schedule.

However, the Friday evening broadcast by KOIN-FM as a public service will still occur at approximately 10:15 p.m., and the regular KBPS-AM broadcast will be scheduled at its 7:00 p.m. Tuesday time. In addition, KOAC-AM, Corvallis, broadcasts simultaneously with KOAP at the 1:30 p.m. Friday time immediately following the actual program.