

Community Involvement Committee

Meeting Minutes

July 21, 2010

Committee Members Present: Paula Amato, Judy BlueHorse Skelton, Judith Gonzalez Plascencia, Jason Long, Shirley Nacoste, Linda Nettekoven, Stanley Penkin, Peter Stark, Alison Stoll

Absent: Howard Shapiro, Liz Gatti, Anyeley Hallova, Brian Heron, Lai-Lani Ovalles, Rahul Rastogi, Ryan Schera

Staff (BPS): Debbie Bischoff, Eden Dabbs, Eric Engstrom, Clay Neal, Deborah Stein, Marty Stockton, Jared Freiermuth, Sumitra Chhetri, Josh Merino

Visitors: Amalia Alarcon Morris, Elizabeth Moreno, Lisa Bates and Julia Meier

Welcome and Announcements – Stanley Penkin

Stan Penkin (acting as chair in Howard’s absence) welcomed everybody. Because of the number of new faces in the room, Stan invited visitors and new staff to introduce themselves.

Stan noted a lack of a quorum, so the minutes from previous meetings could not be approved. Recognizing how difficult it is to have strong attendance during the summer, the group agreed to skip the August meeting and reconvene in September.

Paula asked whether it was okay for the CIC to approve meeting minutes via email. Marty suggested that this would be a great idea to promote transparency to the public, since there is currently a backlog of unapproved minutes and the public is missing an opportunity to view the work of the CIC online. The group agreed that they would “vote” by email to approve previous meetings’ minutes.

Eric announced that the Planning Commission endorsed the recommended amendments to the Periodic Review work plan, including amendments to the Community Involvement program. There was no public testimony.

Marty announced 3 big events coming up:

1. Division/Clinton Street Fair, co-hosted by HAND (Saturday, July 24, 10:00-5:00)
2. Portland Plan Arts Town Hall (Tuesday, July 27, 6:00-8:00 at the Armory)
3. Native American Housing to Homeownership Fair, sponsored by NAYA (Saturday, July 31, 10:00-3:00 at NAYA Family Center)

Central City 2035 – Steve Iwata

Steve introduced himself as the Central City 2035 project manager, and presented an overview of the project and process. Central City 2035 is an update to the 1988 Central City Plan, and will include a land use map, an urban design diagram, and a set of policies and goals. This is a focused district plan under the umbrella of the citywide Portland Plan. The public involvement plan for this effort is still a work in progress. TheCC2035 Plan will include four quadrant plans: each will have its own public involvement element. The quadrant plans will be produced in succession, starting with the N/NE Quadrant, which includes Lloyd Subdistrict and Lower Albina Subdistrict.



The project area for the Central City 2035 Plan is the entire Central City, as defined in the 1988 plan, but also includes a larger study area that encompasses “edge” areas that will be considered as possible expansion areas for the Central City: the N/NE study area includes portions of the Eliot neighborhood (Vancouver/Williams/Russell corridor) and areas in Sullivan’s Gulch; the NW study area includes the Slabtown/Con-way property (the subject of PDC’s urban renewal analysis); the SW study area includes the South Portland area because of the transportation issues; and the SE study area includes the Milwaukie Light Rail - Clinton station area and the area east of NE 12th to NE 20th and between NE Sandy and I-84.

Steve anticipates having the CC20235 Concept Plan by the end of June 2011. The overall timeline is 2010 through 2013 to complete all four quadrant plans. An 18-member advisory group began meeting in June, and is synching up with the Portland Plan. This group is looking at the big picture rather than at quadrant-specific issues.

The Central City 2035 team is coordinating with the Portland Bureau of Transportation to update the Central City Transportation Management Plan, and is coordinating with the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability’s River Plan team to update the Willamette Greenway policies and regulations in the central reach of the river.

In describing the relationship between different plans, Steve stated that the Portland Plan has a citywide focus and is at the 30,000 foot level of detail; the CC2035 Plan is geographically focused and is at the 20,000 foot level; and each quadrant plan will implement the direction of the Portland Plan and CC2035 Plan at a much finer grain of detail. There will be a clear feedback loop among the three to make sure that each informs the other.

Stan asked if there can be any coordination between the CIC and the Central City 2035 Advisory Group? Eric replied yes. Stan suggested that they could share presentations to inform each other and highlight the interplay between the efforts.

Peter asked how decisions were made about what areas were and weren’t included in the quadrant plan study areas. Steve replied that potential Central City expansion areas include areas under study through other concurrent planning efforts (e.g., PDC’s consideration of urban renewal expansion areas on the Westside and North/Northeast; PDC’s work on the Rose Quarter, TriMet’s station area planning for Milwaukie Light Rail extension; etc.). By doing this, Planning staff can piggyback on the related public processes led by other agencies.

Steve mentioned that Peter has provided help and guidance for a Central Eastside business census that is now underway.

Eric stated that the CIC can play an important role by learning what public involvement approaches work well in a citywide effort like the Portland Plan, and applying these at the district level. This feedback will be very instructive as the City takes on planning for other districts through the Comprehensive Plan update.

Linda expressed concerns about the makeup of the advisory group, observing that most members are from the Westside. She is troubled by the fact that there is no one looking at the interface between residential areas and the Central Eastside Industrial District. Allison voiced her agreement. Steve replied that the intent is to keep the advisory group small, while making sure they represent diverse interests. Allison countered that this missing perspective is important enough to prompt us to expand the size of the group.

Hearing a lot of agreement around the table, Stan stated that it would be appropriate for the CIC to forward its concerns to bureau leadership and the Mayor's office. Eric and Steve acknowledged the concerns and will discuss with bureau leadership.

Steve stated that at the quadrant plan level, the relationship between the Central City and the adjacent residential neighborhoods will be addressed. The NE quadrant includes a number of interrelated issues affecting the Boise and Eliot neighborhoods (e.g., Rose Quarter plans, the N/NE economic initiative, the Oregon Convention Center Urban Renewal expiration in 2013, and proposed improvements to the freeway between I-84 and the Fremont Bridge being studied by ODOT). For the latter, ODOT has a 30-member committee including bike/pedestrian/freight advocates and environmental justice advocates. Lessons learned from the Columbia River Crossing project will inform this work moving forward.

The NE quadrant plan will be a 12-18 month process and will forward recommendations regarding the freeway to ODOT and City. Peter stated that the Central Eastside Industrial Council has a strong interest in what happens with the I-5/I-84 freeway interchange. Steve acknowledged this and stated that Wayne Kingsley of the CEIC will be on the advisory group.

Linda reiterated that the elephant in the room is that there is a conflicting vision of the Central Eastside – will it continue to be a job generator or will it transform into a high end district? Judy asked what organization would be most appropriate to fill in the missing eastside neighborhood perspective. Linda believes that Southeast Uplift (SEUL) could be a good convener; but not necessarily appoint someone to the Central City 2035 Advisory Group, since ¼ of lands within its neighborhoods are industrial, and SEUL has a strong understanding of the industrial as well as neighborhood goals. Judith stated that it's helpful to have a specific recommendation like this from the CIC. She believes that it's important to understand what is most likely to change through the plan to understand which interests and perspectives are most important to include in the planning process.

Planning Coordination Matrix – Eden Dabbs

Eden introduced this item, recalling that the CIC had asked early on for more clarity about all the different plans and efforts going on right now – how do they relate, and how does one navigate through so many similar and overlapping efforts? Staff had prepared a giant matrix awhile ago to display the relationships among different city projects. Marty said she'd send this draft out to the group, and – because this is clearly a source of continuing confusion and frustration for the group, we would continue to work on communicating this in a more understandable way.

Peter appreciates that staff continues to work on this, and reiterated that the CIC's role is to make sure that these messages are simple and clear for the general public. Linda suggested that we link ongoing plans to each relevant action area as a way to display the relationships. Paula reminded everyone of Howard's earlier proposal to sponsor a series of brownbags to provide information/exposure to a variety of interrelated city efforts. Marty suggested instead that we invite guest speakers to each CIC meeting to provide a brief overview (similar to Steve's presentation today about Central City 2035). The group agreed.

Phase 2 Survey Results – Marty Stockton

Marty presented a summary report tallying responses to the Phase 2 survey received to date and categorized by self-reported ethnicity and income level. This analysis was prompted by the Equity TAG, which has advocated for broadening the reach of the survey to ensure that the demographics of respondents match the demographics of the city. To date, we have received approximately 500

surveys from people identifying as being from communities of color, or approximately 10% of the overall city population (far less than the 26% figure that represents Portland’s communities of color). To rectify this gap, staff and partners are actively pursuing opportunities to enlist communities of color to fill out the survey (and to accommodate this, we have extended the survey deadline from July 1 to August 15). We have contacted a number of organizations and places of worship, and have participated at a variety of tabling events to help distribute the surveys to Portlanders who have been underrepresented in survey efforts to date.

Jason challenged the construction of the summary report. He expressed some concerns how some of the conclusions are framed, and was particularly concerned that some readers may be guided away from some results to focus on others. He listed a number of questions and places where more clarity or rewording is needed.

Debbie noted that the geographic distribution of survey respondents was fairly representative, with the exception that East Portland is significantly underrepresented. Marty noted that the East Portland XPO and Sunday Parkways events are where we anticipate getting more responses from East Portlanders.

Peter asked about the status of the business survey. Marty responded that the survey is closed and that we will be posting the results on the website shortly.

Summer Events Video – Clay Neal

Clay presented a collage of video clips showing various Portlanders playing the “game” at different summer fairs and events. Staff reported that people have been enthusiastic about the exercise, and many have participated who previously had not heard of the Portland Plan. When asked whether we have captured the demographics of participants, Marty responded no – there hasn’t been a way to capture this information and we don’t want to make assumptions based on people’s appearance.

Judith thought that this game could work well in a coffee shop setting while waiting for a table, and would contact a friend to see if there would be interest.

A number of suggestions were made about the video itself to make it more effective if posted on the website or used in other ways.

Shirley suggested that this game would be a great way to engage teens. Jason added that it could be a great way to work with students through social studies curriculum. Students could take this home as a homework assignment, and then enlist other family members as a way to broaden participation.

Equity, Civic Engagement and Quality of Life Technical Action Group – Amalia Alarcon Morris, Elizabeth Moreno, Lisa Bates and Julia Meier

Amalia Alarcon Morris, Director of the Office of Neighborhood Involvement and chair of the Equity, Civic Engagement and Quality of Life Technical Action Group (“the Equity TAG”), introduced a few members of the TAG: Elizabeth Moreno, Lisa Bates and Julia Meier. Amalia stated that she joined the TAG a few months ago, shortly after the publication of the Coalition of Communities of Color’s report: *Communities of Color in Multnomah County: an Unsettling Profile*

<http://coalitioncommunitiescolor.org/docs/AN%20UNSETTLING%20PROFILE.pdf>

The TAG has taken on the questions “what does equity look like?”, and “is equity a stand alone issue or is it instead a thread that weaves through every topic?” The group has asserted the latter, and the

group feels the need to connect with the other technical action groups to ensure that equity is indeed addressed in discussions of transportation, housing, health, etc.

The group noted the changing demographics of the city over time. The TAG believes that ideally, we should be *oversampling* communities of color so that surveys could reflect the profile of the city *in 25 years*, not just the profile of the city today (keeping in mind that 45% of students enrolled in PPS today are children of color, and these children are the adults of tomorrow.) Amalia stated that she is happy that staff has committed to actively pursuing the phase 2 survey with communities of color through targeted outreach.

Julia Meier, Coalition of Communities of Color staff, introduced herself as a new Equity TAG member and a member of the data subcommittee. She reiterated that the phase 2 survey numbers are terrible – communities of color are significantly underrepresented.

Elizabeth Merino, a representative of the VIA Coalition on the Equity TAG, observed that the public has articulated the value of equitable representation in government. Inclusive civic engagement processes can help support equity goals. She noted that discussions about equity highlight the intersection between process and content.

Amalia stated that the background reports for the Portland Plan have to address disparities. The best experts on disparities in health, education, housing, etc. are those who experience the disparities directly. The TAG is compiling sources of data (the Communities of Color report and others) which, in combination, will comprise the Equity Background Report for the Portland Plan.

Stan expressed appreciation for the progress being made to advance equity in the Portland Plan discussions, and invited Amalia and the TAG members to provide more suggestions to broaden the inclusivity of the public process.

Amalia replied that the visionPDX process provides great models for inclusive participation, and she suggested that staff look at the grantee reports for creative examples of how to engage people – not just communities of color, but *all* Portlanders.

Next Step(s)

The August CIC meeting will be skipped to provide everyone a summer break; therefore, the next meeting will be:

- **Wednesday, September 15, 8:00-10:00 a.m., Rm. 7A (7th Floor, 1900 Bldg.)**

Meeting adjourned.

Attachments

The following documents should be considered part of the minutes for this meeting:

Phase II Survey Preliminary Results as of June 9, 2010



Phase II Survey
Preliminary Results as of June 9, 2010

Preliminary findings from the Phase II survey results.
5,823 surveys – 5,024 mail-in, 799 online

Observations

- Overall, most of objectives are “On The Right Track” based on a composite score of “Just Right” plus “Not Aggressive Enough”.
- Top Priorities are similar to the On The Right Track rankings for the top rated objectives:

On The Right Track

1. Healthy Watersheds
2. Maintenance First
3. Raising the Bar
4. Sense of Safety
5. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Top Priorities

1. More Living Wage Jobs
2. Raising the Bar
3. Maintenance First
4. Sense of Safety
5. Healthy Watersheds

- Cross-tabulation analysis of the results based on demographic characteristics show that the responses are generally consistent with the overall results with some minor shifts in relative priorities.

Top Priorities

Communities of Color	Low Income	Low Income/Communities of Color
1. More Living Wage Jobs	1. More Living Wage Jobs	1. More Living Wage Jobs
2. Raising the Bar	2. Housing	2. Housing
3. Sense of Safety	3. Raising the Bar	3. Higher Education
4. Maintenance First	4. Healthy Watersheds	4. Household Budget
5. Healthy Watersheds	5. Sustainable Transportation	5. Healthy & Affordable Food

- Respondents from Communities of Color¹ only represent 10% of responses, significantly less than the 26% of Portland’s population. BPS staff are taking proactive measures to solicit additional surveys to better match the citywide demographics.
- Sense of Safety and Complete Neighborhoods rank as lower priorities for Low Income² respondents, while Housing ranks higher.
- Low Income/Communities of Color respondents prioritize the basics – jobs, housing, higher education, and healthy & affordable food.

¹ “Communities of Color” are respondents other than “White/Caucasian” or “No Response”.

² “Low Income” is lowest income category – households earning less than \$20,000 per year.

“Low/Moderate Income” are households earning less than \$50,000 per year.

- Different geographic districts³ show a similar consistency in relative priorities:

Top Priorities

North	Northeast	East	Southeast	West	Central City
More Living Wage Jobs	Raising the Bar	Sense of Safety	Raising the Bar	Raising the Bar	Sustainable Transportation
Raising the Bar	More Living Wage Jobs	Raising the Bar	More Living Wage Jobs	More Living Wage Jobs	Raising the Bar
Maintenance First	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	More Living Wage Jobs	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Maintenance First	More Living Wage Jobs
Sense of Safety	Maintenance First	Maintenance First	Sustainable Transportation	Healthy Watersheds	Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Healthy Watersheds	Healthy Watersheds	Healthy Watersheds	Maintenance First	Sense of Safety	Housing

Highlights from the written comments:

- Most controversial issues: Diversion of sewer contract savings for green streets (bike lanes) and community policing
- More comments about disc golf, Sellwood Bridge, dog parks, and MLS soccer than CRC (2)
- Many people are impatient and do not understand why it will take 25 years to achieve these objectives - underlying theme to "Not Agressive Enough" comments.
- A thread of comments related to the City's role and relationship to other agencies (schools) and personal choices/behavior – not a City function.

Missing Issues most often mentioned in written comments:

- Historic preservation
- Toxics - air/noise/light pollution
- Homelessness
- Earthquake/disaster preparedness
- Recycling (plastics) and composting.
- Health care and mental health services

³ Geographic districts are based on ONI Neighborhood Coalition boundaries sorted by zip code, so there is not always precise alignment. The biggest discrepancies came with some of the zip code boundaries that overlap between West Portland and the Central City, in which responses were assigned to West Portland.

All Survey Responses

On the Right Track		Top Priorities	
Healthy Watersheds	93%	More Living Wage Jobs	1430
Maintenance First	92%	Raising the Bar	1387
Raising the Bar	91%	Maintenance First	1070
Sense of Safety	91%	Sense of Safety	924
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	87%	Healthy Watersheds	896
Higher Education	85%	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	873
Educational Equity	84%	Sustainable Transportation	870
More Living Wage Jobs	83%	Complete Neighborhoods	835
Home Energy Use	83%	Higher Education	788
Arts Education	80%	Housing	750
Equal Employment Opportunity	78%	Healthy & Affordable Food	714
Household Budget	77%	Educational Equity	677
Active & Healthy Lifestyle	77%	Competitive Economy	668
Complete Neighborhoods	75%	Home Energy Use	609
Participation & Change	75%	Arts Education	558
Sustainable Transportation	75%	Active & Healthy Lifestyle	544
Housing	74%	Household Budget	359
Healthy & Affordable Food	74%	Equal Employment Opportunity	271
Access to Recreation	72%	Participation & Change	161
Competitive Economy	71%	Access to Recreation	157
Satisfaction	62%	Satisfaction	93
Arts Attendance	53%	Arts Attendance	54

On the Right Track: Not Aggressive Enough plus Just Right

Not Aggressive Enough

1. GHG Emissions (51%)
1. Healthy Watersheds (51%)
1. Raising the Bar (51%)
4. Maintenance First (46%)
5. Sense of Safety (43%)

Too Aggressive

1. Complete Neighborhoods (17%)
2. Sustainable Transport (16%)
2. Access to Recreation (13%)
4. Healthy Food (10%)
5. Housing (9%)

Should Not Be An Objective

1. Arts Attendance (35%)
2. Satisfaction (25%)
3. Active & Healthy Lifestyle (16%)
4. Participation & Change (14%)
5. Healthy & Accessible Food (13%)

All Survey Responses Participation Profile

Where do you live?

	2008	
Phase II	Portland	
9%	11%	North Portland
18%	19%	Northeast Portland
10%	24%	East Portland
28%	26%	Southeast Portland
20%	13%	West Portland
3%	7%	Central City
0%		Outside Portland
11%		No Response

Note: Central City was undercounted due to zip code overlap with surrounding districts.

What is your household income?

	2008	
Phase II	Portland	
11%	16%	Under \$20,000
28%	30%	\$20,000 - \$50,000
31%	38%	\$50,000 - \$100,000
16%	16%	Over \$100,000
14%		No Response

What is your race or ethnicity?

	2008	
Phase II	Portland	
3%	8%	Asian or Pacific Islander
1%	7%	Black/African American
2%	4%	Native American
1%	9%	Latino/Hispanic
78%	74%	White/Caucasian
4%	2%	Mixed/Other
12%		No Response

Cross Tabulation Based On Demographics

On the Right Track	All Returns	Communities of Color	Low Income	Low/Mod Income	Low Color
Healthy Watersheds	93%	91%	92%	94%	93%
Maintenance First	92%	91%	89%	91%	87%
Raising the Bar	91%	87%	88%	91%	87%
Sense of Safety	91%	92%	86%	89%	84%
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	87%	80%	88%	88%	82%
Higher Education	85%	84%	86%	88%	89%
Educational Equity	84%	80%	83%	85%	88%
More Living Wage Jobs	83%	81%	87%	85%	86%
Home Energy Use	83%	79%	84%	84%	80%
Arts Education	80%	74%	79%	81%	77%
Equal Employment Opportunity	78%	71%	78%	81%	78%
Household Budget	77%	77%	85%	81%	87%
Active & Healthy Lifestyle	77%	74%	81%	79%	78%
Complete Neighborhoods	75%	74%	81%	78%	85%
Participation & Change	75%	70%	77%	77%	73%
Sustainable Transportation	75%	75%	81%	78%	82%
Housing	74%	72%	85%	80%	81%
Healthy & Affordable Food	74%	72%	79%	78%	78%
Access to Recreation	72%	71%	75%	74%	76%
Competitive Economy	71%	70%	63%	68%	63%
Satisfaction	62%	60%	67%	64%	69%
Arts Attendance	53%	51%	58%	57%	61%

On the Right Track: Not Aggressive Enough plus Just Right

Top Priorities	All Returns	Communities of Color	Low Income	Low/Mod Income	Low Color
More Living Wage Jobs	1	1	1	1	1
Raising the Bar	2	2	3	2	7
Maintenance First	3	4	6	4	13
Sense of Safety	4	3	12	9	9
Healthy Watersheds	5	5	4	6	6
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	6	13	9	5	17
Sustainable Transportation	7	12	5	8	12
Complete Neighborhoods	8	7	14	11	8
Higher Education	9	8	7	7	3
Housing	10	9	2	3	2
Healthy & Affordable Food	11	11	8	10	5
Educational Equity	12	10	13	12	10
Competitive Economy	13	6	18	17	14
Home Energy Use	14	14	11	13	11
Arts Education	15	16	15	14	18
Active & Healthy Lifestyle	16	15	16	15	16
Household Budget	17	18	10	16	4
Equal Employment Opportunity	18	17	17	18	15
Participation & Change	19	19	19	19	21
Access to Recreation	20	20	21	20	19
Satisfaction	21	21	20	21	20
Arts Attendance	22	22	22	22	22

Communities of Color (507)

Household Income

	<u>2008</u>	
	<u>Portland</u>	
19%	16%	Under \$20,000 (95)
29%	30%	\$20,000 - \$50,000
33%	38%	\$50,000 - \$100,000
14%	16%	Over \$100,000
6%		No Response

Low Income Households (560)

Race or Ethnicity

	<u>2008</u>	
	<u>Portland</u>	
5%	8%	Asian or Pacific Islander
3%	7%	Black/African American
3%	4%	Native American
1%	9%	Latino/Hispanic
78%	74%	White/Caucasian
6%	2%	Mixed/Other
5%		No Response

Low/Moderate Income Households (1977)

Race or Ethnicity

	<u>2008</u>	
	<u>Portland</u>	
3%	8%	Asian or Pacific Islander
1%	7%	Black/African American
2%	4%	Native American
1%	9%	Latino/Hispanic
84%	74%	White/Caucasian
5%	2%	Mixed/Other
4%		No Response

Cross Tabulation Based On Geography

On the Right Track	All Returns	North	NE	East	SE	West	Central City
Healthy Watersheds	93%	94%	96%	91%	94%	93%	95%
Maintenance First	92%	94%	92%	91%	94%	92%	92%
Raising the Bar	91%	93%	93%	89%	93%	92%	92%
Sense of Safety	91%	93%	92%	90%	91%	91%	94%
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	87%	92%	91%	81%	90%	85%	93%
Higher Education	85%	88%	88%	82%	88%	86%	90%
Educational Equity	84%	87%	88%	76%	87%	82%	90%
More Living Wage Jobs	83%	89%	88%	79%	85%	81%	89%
Home Energy Use	83%	89%	86%	75%	87%	82%	89%
Arts Education	80%	85%	86%	68%	85%	80%	84%
Equal Employment Opportunity	78%	83%	84%	70%	83%	76%	80%
Household Budget	77%	83%	81%	70%	81%	76%	86%
Active & Healthy Lifestyle	77%	82%	81%	74%	79%	77%	88%
Complete Neighborhoods	75%	81%	79%	65%	81%	71%	83%
Participation & Change	75%	81%	79%	70%	78%	71%	80%
Sustainable Transportation	75%	81%	79%	65%	80%	73%	89%
Housing	74%	82%	79%	68%	79%	71%	77%
Healthy & Affordable Food	74%	83%	76%	66%	78%	69%	75%
Access to Recreation	72%	81%	70%	68%	74%	69%	79%
Competitive Economy	71%	73%	70%	71%	70%	75%	74%
Satisfaction	62%	65%	65%	62%	63%	59%	71%
Arts Attendance	53%	56%	57%	44%	57%	54%	64%

On the Right Track: Not Aggressive Enough plus Just Right

Top Priorities	All Returns	North	NE	East	SE	West	Central City
More Living Wage Jobs	1	1	2	3	2	2	3
Raising the Bar	2	1	1	2	1	1	2
Maintenance First	3	3	4	4	5	3	11
Sense of Safety	4	4	10	1	8	5	7
Healthy Watersheds	5	5	5	5	7	4	6
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	6	12	3	9	3	9	4
Sustainable Transportation	7	13	6	16	4	10	1
Complete Neighborhoods	8	8	9	10	6	7	13
Higher Education	9	7	11	6	9	6	9
Housing	10	11	7	7	11	11	5
Healthy & Affordable Food	11	6	12	8	10	16	8
Educational Equity	12	9	8	15	12	12	16
Competitive Economy	13	15	16	11	16	8	12
Home Energy Use	14	10	14	12	14	15	10
Arts Education	15	14	15	17	13	13	15
Active & Healthy Lifestyle	16	16	13	13	15	14	17
Household Budget	17	17	17	14	17	18	14
Equal Employment Opportunity	18	18	18	18	18	17	18
Participation & Change	19	19	19	19	20	20	19
Access to Recreation	20	20	20	20	19	19	21
Satisfaction	21	21	21	21	21	21	22
Arts Attendance	22	22	22	22	22	22	20

Household Income

	<u>2008</u>						Central
	<u>Portland</u>	<u>North</u>	<u>NE</u>	<u>East</u>	<u>SE</u>	<u>West</u>	<u>City</u>
Under \$20,000	16%	15%	9%	15%	12%	10%	22%
\$20,000 - \$50,000	30%	34%	29%	38%	32%	24%	29%
\$50,000 - \$100,000	38%	34%	35%	33%	34%	31%	27%
Over \$100,000	16%	12%	20%	6%	16%	25%	15%
No Response	-	6%	7%	7%	6%	10%	6%

Race or Ethnicity

	<u>2008</u>						Central
	<u>Portland</u>	<u>North</u>	<u>NE</u>	<u>East</u>	<u>SE</u>	<u>West</u>	<u>City</u>
Asian or Pacific Islander	8%	3%	2%	5%	3%	2%	2%
Black/African American	7%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%
Native American	4%	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	3%
Latino/Hispanic	9%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
White/Caucasian	74%	83%	86%	79%	84%	83%	84%
Mixed/Other	2%	4%	4%	5%	4%	4%	4%
No Response		5%	5%	7%	6%	6%	5%