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President’s Message

By Brian Campbell, FAICP, OAPA President

In the last issue of the OPJ I talked about the importance of the Oregon Planning Program, its value to Oregonians generally, and my belief that the quality of life here in Oregon is much better because of it. I also mentioned that we have an obligation to improve upon that system, and keep it from becoming atrophied and unable to meet the long term challenges which confront our communities, and our profession.

To that end, there are several opportunities in the next few months for you, as members of OAPA, to participate in initiatives which will help all of us address this need for continuous improvement to our profession and our communities. First, the next Oregon Planning Conference is set for May 29th and 30th, 2014, and its theme will be The Next 40 Years: Adaptability, Diversity, Resiliency. This will clearly be an opportunity for all of us to build on what was started at the conference last May and at the accompanying Big Ideas Forum. I hope many of you will be able to submit ideas for sessions and focus your creativity on this set of topics, which are so critical to the continuing prosperity and vibrancy of our state and its communities.

Even though the Oregon Legislature is not in session, the Legislative and Policy Advisory Committee (LPAC) has been hard at work on a number of policy issues. This past summer, Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) Senior Policy Analyst Bob Rindy sent the agency’s proposed Policy Agenda to the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) members. LCDC took testimony on this agenda September 27 and OAPA was there. As LPAC Chair Jeannine Rustad was not able to make the meeting, Kirstin Greene provided testimony for the chapter. Our comments focused on the Department’s draft work program as viewed through our adopted Policy Agenda lens. Our full testimony can be found on the Chapter’s website and focused on re-acquainting LCDC members and other stakeholders with our policy agenda.

We endorsed the staff’s recommendation to base the upcoming work on a long-term outlook aligned with the Governor’s 10 Year Goals, Strategies and Metrics. We agreed that future changes to the land use program should also be in response to the “cross-cutting” priorities the Governor’s approach has taken. Regarding the overarching priority areas, we are seeking clarity regarding where energy and climate change fit into the four elements listed in the staff memo. We suggested a new category could be created to recognize the positive relationship between urban and rural areas with respect to promoting our clean energy independence while adapting to and mitigating the effects of climate change.

We noted that, in addition to the Healthy Environment and Jobs and Innovation outcome areas, the land use program can have a strong influence on the Healthy People and Safety areas. We encouraged the Department to consider how the land use program changes will help achieve those important outcomes for healthy people and
healthy communities.

We specifically supported DLCD and LCDC’s focus on the following priority areas:

- Urban and urbanizable lands
- Coastal and natural resources (including responding to Resiliency Plan recommendations and solar facilities rulemaking)

With respect to projects, we supported these action items. References in parenthesis refer to the July 17 staff memorandum:

- Strategies to support implementation of HB2001 and SB 1059 (ongoing)
- Estuary planning (ongoing)
- UGB rulemaking (new from 2013 legislation)
- Population forecasting (new from 2013 legislation)
- Urban Service Agreements (new staff recommendation)
- Periodic Review Replacement (new staff recommendation)
- Industrial Lands (new staff recommendation)
- Farmland Protection Improvements (new staff recommendation)

The Commission and staff said they appreciated our testimony and look forward to continuing to engage with us on policy and rulemaking.

LPAC just finished recruiting for positions on its the Policy Sub-committee, which will be tracking the rulemaking and other initiatives getting underway in the next few months. But there are still opportunities to get your name in the queue to help out as a subject matter expert for the upcoming legislative session. Issue areas outlined in our Legislative and Policy Agenda include: Urbanization, Land Use Procedures, Rural, Energy, Integrated Water Resources Strategy, Regional Planning, Equity, and Destination Resorts. The Education and Outreach, Membership and Professional Development Committees can also use more volunteers, especially from parts of the state outside the Portland area.

If you have any questions about any of these standing committees, and especially if you’d like to volunteer, please contact our Program and Policy Manager, Becky Steckler, AICP at becky@oregonapa.org.
Simplification—A new path for Urban Growth Boundaries

By Bob Rindy, Department of Land Conservation and Development

The 2013 Oregon Legislature, by unanimous vote, enacted new laws regarding Urban Growth Boundaries (UGBs) and population forecasting, core elements of Oregon’s statewide land use planning program.

HB 2254 creates an optional, simplified way for growing cities to evaluate the development capacity of their UGBs, to forecast the need for additional capacity, and if necessary, to amend the UGB. Closely related legislation, HB 2253, requires the Population Research Center (PRC) at Portland State University to produce population forecasts for all cities and counties for land use planning purposes, including UGB planning. Previously forecasting was the responsibility of counties. The PRC forecast will not be a “land use decision” subject to appeal. PRC will issue a forecast for each city and county every four years.

The passage of this legislation is expected to greatly improve the state’s UGB planning process, especially for small cities. While the new UGB process is voluntary, it is intended to become the preferred “standard method” that many cities will want to use. The new population forecasting process should reduce the controversy and litigation that has been associated with forecasting in the past. A UGB evaluation under the new simplified method must be based on a city’s population forecast issued by PRC or an employment forecast issued by the state’s Office of Economic Development.

HB 2254 requires the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) to adopt new rules to formally establish simplified UGB methods for growing cities. Two separate but very similar methods must be established, one for small cities and another for larger cities (the legislation does not apply to the Metro UGB). These methods will clarify how cities decide where to grow when they have shown a need for additional land in the UGB. The new methods will be optional – cities that want to continue using the current system may do so. The new rules must establish “standard ranges” for several key factors in the UGB evaluation in order to provide cities with a range of growth choices. These ranges are to be determined and adjusted over time for different regions of the state. LCDC rules are expected to be completed in 2015 but HB 2254 does not officially take effect until 2016.

Stakeholders Pushed for Changes to the UGB Process

Land use plans need to be updated and sooner or later, for growing cities, UGBs need to be amended. For a variety of reasons, especially litigation, many cities and other land use interests have become frustrated with the complexity, expense and slowness of the UGB amendment process. The complexity of the process also makes it hard for citizens to effectively participate in land use decision-making, and the uncertainty of outcomes has led many cities, especially small cities, to avoid updating their UGB.
At the same time, it is widely recognized that, as a growth management and farmland preservation tool, UGBs have been highly successful in Oregon. In the vast majority of US cities population has grown at a faster rate than urban land area. Because of UGBs, in the past 20 years Oregon has urbanized less land relative to population growth than any other western state. UGBs have also protected farm and forest land – agricultural and forest production are the state’s 2nd and 3rd largest industries – and have lowered costs for roads, sewer and water, important objectives of the statewide land use program.

In response to growing concerns about the UGB process, in January of 2012 the Governor’s Office appointed a group of land use practitioners (the Design Team) to consider reforms. These ideas were sent to a second appointed stakeholder group, the (fifty-member) Urban Growth Advisory Committee representing local governments, citizens and interest groups throughout the state. Meanwhile, the Department of Land Conservation and Development, the League of Oregon Cities and the Association of Oregon Counties jointly sponsored a separate work group to consider longstanding issues regarding population forecasting. Both of these efforts produced 2013 legislative proposals that, in the end, had a high degree of consensus.

The UGB redesign effort was led by Governor Kitzhaber’s Natural Resource Policy Advisor, Richard Whitman, who provided a set of directions to the appointed groups:

- Simplify how communities plan for their future growth.
- Make UGB planning more predictable and less expensive for cities that want to grow within ordinary ranges given their size and growth rate. These methods should work for most cities and should be designed to take no more than a year from start to finish.
- Provide clarity and transparency for key policy decisions early on, so that citizens can participate effectively. Do this by identifying a limited number of key variables that decision-

## Streamlining Urban Growth Boundary Decisions

### HB 2253 and HB 2254

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1 (Forecast Population Growth) HB 2253</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population forecast made for each city, and updated every 4 years. The forecast is the basis for determining the amount of land needed for urban growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2 (Convert Population Forecast into Forecast of Land Need) HB 2254</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City determines land need based on: (a) Forecast of population change over next 14 years; and (b) Range (e.g. middle 80 percent) of ratios of the rate of population change to the rate of change in urban land area for cities in the same area. Example: Population is forecasted to grow by 1000 in next 14 years. Most cities in region have added between 2.5 and 5 acres for every 100 new residents. City may chose between 25 and 50 acres as its land need.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 3 (Existing Land Supply and Net Land Need) HB 2254</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City determines how much of the land need can be met inside its existing UGB: Infill calculated based on inventory of vacant and partially-vacant lots. Redevelopment calculated based on LCDC rules that set ranges drawn from actual development experience. Net Land Need is Land Need less existing land supply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 4 (Location) HB 2254</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City studies all adjacent land within a set distance for possible addition to UGB, excluding: • Lands that are not feasible to serve w. urban services; • Lands w. particular hazard categories; and • Lands w. required site characteristics (if the land is for an industrial use w. specific requirements).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 5 (Location) HB 2254</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City adds lands from study area according to the following priorities: • Exception, non-resource and urban reserves added first; • Lower-value resource lands next; • High-value resource lands last.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Features |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Assures that cities maintain a supply of land that is ready for development. • Reduces costs and litigation, significantly, and speeds review if there is a challenge. • Replaces periodic review. • Protects farm and forest lands by tracking trends and adjusting if needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
making should focus on and by clearly articulating what outcomes are desired.

- Reduce the likelihood of appeals by clarifying the law. Where there is less of a state interest, allow more local discretion.

- Provide incentives for cooperation among jurisdictions.

- Do not make it easier to grow outside of a boundary than inside, and plan for and invest in infrastructure so that growth is encouraged in locations and in a form that it is relatively less expensive for the community as a whole.

- Establish a new urban growth framework that replaces the (mandatory) Periodic Review Process.

The following substantive “outcomes” were also suggested, and are reflected in the legislation:

- Continue to assure that communities plan for residential and related land needs in relation to their predicted growth rates, so that land prices are kept reasonable for both needed housing and employment. But, focus more on availability of land with needed services, and less on overall long-term land supply.

- Continue to preserve important farm and forest lands by setting a higher bar to urbanize those lands, while making it easier to include low value resource and exception lands. Recognize regional differences in how the bar is set.

- Preserve important landscape and natural resource attributes, and consider physical geography to guide urban form, both for community functionality and character.

- Focus state infrastructure investments, including transportation funding, in ways that encourage communities to plan for efficient growth patterns – mixed uses along main streets and in downtowns, investments that support higher densities and affordable housing along transit routes and/or close to employment. Use state investments to foster outcomes that reflect state and local planning goals.

**Efficient Urban Growth**

The new methods were designed to “push” increased urban efficiency: land area in a UGB may increase only at a lower rate than population growth. The rules must provide for a simplified Buildable Land Analysis (BLI) to help cities predict infill and redevelopment of land currently in the UGB (controversy over the BLI has been a frequent source of litigation). HB 2254 requires the UGB process to focus more on designating a supply of serviced and serviceable land rather than simply a long-term supply of land. In this regard, the process is geared toward a 14-year serviceable UGB land supply rather than the historic 20-year raw land supply. Also, in a significant change to land use law, the methods include “conditions” that substitute for “goal findings,” another source of litigation in the past.

It is important to note that the legislation also simplifies and clarifies longstanding law regarding UGB “locational analysis.” ORS 197.298 sets “priorities” for adding land to a UGB and ensures that productive farm and forest land is added to UGBs only as a last priority. This revised priorities statute will apply not only to the new optional methods, but to the traditional UGB process as well, and takes affect (along with other laws enacted by HB 2254) on January 1, 2016.

The required rulemaking to implement HB 2254 will be a major undertaking for LCDC over the next two years. The commission is set to formally begin this rulemaking September 27 with the appointment of a rule advisory committee and with a schedule aimed at adoption of the rules by January 1, 2015.

For more information on this subject, visit the DLCD website [here](#) or the Governor’s website [here](#).
Become a member of APA

You may be a member, but is the person sitting next to you in the office one too? Members get discounts to great conferences (plan now to attend May 29 and 30, 2014, Portland), workshops (Legal Issues Workshop, December 6, Portland), and member get togethers (Happy Hour, Thursday, December 5, Portland), multiple opportunities to volunteer and much, much more. Check out special discounted memberships for students, planning commissioners, and Chapter-only memberships.
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2013 OAPA Legal Issues Workshop
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1:15 pm — Case Law Review
3:00 pm Carrots over Sticks: A new Look at Transferable Development Rights

For more information or to register, go to www.oregonapa.org/ or click here.

Space is limited and will sell out! Register today!
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Making Great Communities Happen
Old Town Portland: Reimagining a Vibrant Future

By Manly Norris

On paper, Old Town is one of Portland’s most vibrant neighborhoods. It has a downtown waterfront location, historic character, is highly accessible, and borders the popular Tom McCall Waterfront Park. Yet in reality the neighborhood is burdened with challenges, including abundant social services, limited economic diversity, few residents calling the area home, and a weak sense of place. Throw in some conflicting views between developers and preservationists over building height limits and you have a neighborhood caught in the crossroads of an identity crisis.

In recent years, other areas in Portland like The Pearl, South Waterfront and Lloyd have benefited from heavy investment and attention, but financing for another round of mega-development to jumpstart Old Town is impossible in Portland’s current economy. Thus the neighborhood remains largely neglected, but it is certainly not off the radar. Old Town is a priority for the city in updating both their West Quadrant and Central City 2035 plans.

This spring an interdisciplinary team of students from the University of Oregon created a development proposal for revitalizing Portland’s historic Old Town, the overlooked neighborhood with the potential to become one of the city’s next hotspots. The “Sustainable Real Estate Challenge” represented the culminating practicum for the University’s Oregon Leadership in Sustainability (OLIS) program, a new interdisciplinary graduate program addressing the environmental, social and economic challenges of urbanization. The student project was sponsored by the Oregon Commercial Real Estate Development Association (NAIOP) and gave the students the opportunity to apply sustainable planning and design concepts in work involving a significant project. Led by University of Oregon adjunct instructor Ric Stephens, the students embarked on an intensive ten-week research process, with mentorship from local experts in the design and real estate fields, as well as from professionals working on similar revitalization projects in Cuba, China, and the UK.

The students, absorbing the neighborhood’s political squabbles and economic realities, focused on Old Town’s strengths and opportunities. Greg and Mark Goodman from the Downtown Development Group and Peter Englander from the Portland Development Commission gave the students (almost all of whom are from out of state) tours of Old Town to acclimate them to the study area. By April, the OLIS students had organized and hosted a design charrette in Old Town’s White Stag building, where professionals and other interested parties created site plans, graphics and valuable discussion about the neighborhood’s future. Later, students sat down with Mark Edlen of development firm Gerding Edlen, who provided guidance on the project’s financial pro forma.

After ten weeks of intensive research, the OLIS
team presented their recommendations at a public event at architecture firm Zimmer Gunsul Frasca (ZGF) in downtown Portland. Students organized their recommendations into three conceptual, alternative scenarios grounded in Portland’s stories and strengths. The Cultural Heritage scenario promoted the neighborhood’s historic character, emphasizing the restoration of its cast iron building facades, cobblestone streets and monuments celebrating the city’s maritime history. An EcoDistrict scenario, based on Portland’s international leadership in urban ecological design and neighborhood-scale sustainable development, invigorated Old Town’s streets with biophilic design and pocket parks. The Creative District scenario was rooted in Portland’s reputation as an international hotspot for creative industries and strongly supported its growing artisan economy.

The final report presented to NAIOP contained over 300 recommendations exemplifying the best practices in sustainable planning and ecological design. Given that the type of “catalytic”, mega-development associated with Portland’s recent neighborhoods projects (Pearl, Lloyd, Brewery Blocks) was financially unfeasible, the students promoted the concept of an incremental period of growth during which more small-scale, actionable projects might be achieved. For instance, simply establishing an official gateway into Old Town via Tom McCall Waterfront Park would draw people into the neighborhood and provide them with the sense of having arrived at a destination. Students believed their “petri dish” approach to development would help retain the neighborhood’s grit and historic character, and allow for Old Town’s authenticity and sense of place to emerge over time, bringing a complementary balance to the Pearl District’s polish and novelty.

The “Sustainable Real Estate Design Challenge” was part of a growing number of programs from the Architecture and Planning departments at the University of Oregon that match classroom work with a relevant city project. The Sustainable City Initiative, which began in 2009 and is already being replicated in a handful of universities across the country, allows students to gain experience while helping a city tackle an issue, save money, or see a neighborhood from a fresh perspective. The 2013 OLIS practicum project in Old Town gave students the chance to step out of the classroom and into the city’s fray where they could help write the next chapter of the neighborhood’s story.

Manly Norris is a recent graduate of the University of Oregon Leadership in Sustainability (OLIS) program, and is living in Portland, OR.
Taking advantage of Portland’s unseen potential: Introduction to ecomanufacturing

By John Morris and Heather Gates, Fluid Market Strategies

Portland is a leader in sustainability and innovation in the US. This leadership is demonstrated through the city’s thoughtful urban development foundation and community structure. Residential neighborhoods and commercial enclaves find themselves intermixed within the area. Despite the increasingly advanced strategies in large scale sustainability, little has been considered when addressing localization of green manufacturing within the metro area of Portland.

Over the past 3 years, Fluid Market Strategies (Fluid) has been working on a Portland development plan that will drive sustainability, jobs, and energy efficiency within Portland’s urban core. The sustainable development is conceptualized by two main factors. The environment (ecological and built) and industrialization (specifically manufacturing), which support the proposed EcoManufacturing District. Fluid has produced a framework for introducing an EcoManufacturing District designed to enhance urban manufacturing districts within Portland based on a modern vision for urban manufacturing, moving away from the traditional smokestack industry and towards a lighter, more energy efficient operation base that meets the needs of local markets. The EcoManufacturing District model has been developed as the nexus of Fluid’s core sectors of business and will leverage the expertise within the Portland business community as well as in city and county government.

In partnership with key stakeholders in Portland, this proposed district could develop the next generation of sustainable manufacturing sites which will be energy efficient, employ renewable power, allow for district energy development, support natural ecosystem enhancement, retain existing businesses, bring new business opportunities to Portland and drive employment opportunities for local residents. Thus presenting a progressive model for the remaining Portland industrial areas and the rest of the country, demonstrating how municipalities can attract new businesses and create new jobs while also protecting the environment and reducing the carbon footprint of local businesses and the city.

In engaging this model, the goals of an EcoManufacturing District can be integrated to accomplish the following:

1. The aim to reach net zero
2. Buildings that are utilizing on-site renewable energy to reduce peak grid load
3. District energy powered by renewables that reduces the carbon footprint for the EcoManufacturing District
4. Easy access to mass transit

5. Fostering the protection and growth of existing environmental components of the District

6. Manufacturing products that help drive the clean tech cluster

7. Recruiting other sustainable manufacturers to Portland

8. Driving innovation for clean tech manufacturing

These elements have the ability to drive a productive and sustainable environment that gains a localized level of support both for the community and economy. In efforts to achieve this success though EcoManufacturing development, Fluid has identified ways to utilize comprehensive assessment tools, scalable project capital and public policy support. By leveraging Fluid’s tools and accessibility to planning a healthy transition for the growing region, EcoManufacturing Districts would become a hub for the Portland Development Commission Industry Clusters.

Within each of these clusters, Portland is home to international companies. These companies increasingly are launching sustainability standards for their vendors. We can help our industry leaders and associated vendors become more sustainable while providing a place to recruit more localized manufacturers in the Portland metro area by creating these districts.

Fluid has identified the opportunity and means to create and establish a one-of-a-kind platform for vendors to meet new and increasing sustainability requirements by multinational companies by practicing sustainable development. Currently companies such as Nike, Intel, Adidas, Proctor & Gamble and IBM are asking their supply chain vendors to document their commitment to sustainability. If those vendors are manufacturing their product within an EcoManufacturing District, those vendors will be considered exceptionally sustainable. By bringing manufacturers closer to our core economic clusters, we will greatly reduce the carbon footprint of our leading international companies. We will also increase the number of jobs for the city of Portland.

John Morris is the Director of client services and business development and advises the program management team and leads Fluid’s efforts in government relations, education and research.
Walk with Me – Critical thought on Global Footpaths

By Geoffrey L. Chabre, Undergraduate, University of Oregon

Across nations, cultural identity varies in as many ways as the human eye perceives color. Sometimes this variation manifests in subtle cues opposed to flamboyant expression. Development of urban features in the western world has come about through thousands of years of trial and error. Vehicular travel and traffic furniture, multi-modal constructs around transportation and development of urban and suburban places are relatively recent creations.

Examining only one of the common urban features shared by industrialized nations – memes – or packets of culturally transferable information can be harvested. Examining these may reveal a relationship between physical and social constructs, suggesting more than the observable façade. Culture memes can lay hidden within plain view through socially benign urban amenities. Investigating intent, creation, development and usage of footpaths from different cultural perspectives provides opportunity to examine socially prescribed importance for urban features. Examination reveals a deeper public, social, economic and cultural philosophy through sidewalks.

British Innovation

The UK has undergone a deconstruction of sorts in order to promote a “safer, pedestrian friendlier thoroughfare.” (...). For the 2012 Olympic Games they proposed removal of a raised sidewalk area in the heart of London's cultural center favoring multimodal transportation differentiated with “visual and textural cues.” (...). The reasoning suggests vehicular traffic will have to be more cautious when intermingled closer with foot traffic. London city planners cite success with similar projects on other streets in London where accidents have decreased involving pedestrians. This demonstrates that all parties, regardless of transport mode, tend to pay better attention when barriers are absent. This idea goes against the popular wisdom that curbs and sidewalks are safer barriers for separating pedestrians from traffic. Tradition confronting invention is setting Great Britain in a place of very forward experimentation. Re-examining public places existing on the fringe of chaos in this arena is generating innovative urban creativity.

Collaborative Design

Lee Imonen, a sculpting instructor at Lane Community College in Eugene, Oregon and well known Northwest artist, stated that the current blueprint around public spaces in the US began to take shape around thirty years ago. Lobbying for individual rights in development and support for the coded definition of sidewalks and public places gained momentum. Over the past the past 10-15 years a rethinking of how we view public and urban places has begun waves of urban revitalization. Imonen points to Portland Oregon
as an example stating that projects such as the Pearl District have made it “cool to live in the city again.”

Imonen attributes this revitalized new way of perceiving public places as the combined evolution of education and a new generation of designers, Generation Y. Describing a project that he and his students worked on to create new artistic bicycle racks on the sidewalks around Eugene, Oregon, Imonen retells a collaborative story that began quite differently. Ultimately the city has the final say on design implementation. Prof. Imonen and his students were interfacing with established city infrastructure, which they found challenging to engage in transformative conversation. They found it vital to work with someone who wanted a dynamic quality to be manifested on Eugene city streets. This worked well as being unfamiliar with city code structure and detail, many of the already completed student works would not have been accepted. Reframing the conversation from “these works don’t meet code” to “how can we work with what we have
and move forward” was appreciated by everyone involved. Prof. Imonen noted that there are 28 pages of Eugene code regarding bicycle racks alone. Imonen’s insight to this process of seeking approval and interfacing with the infrastructure led him to say that in order to affect positive forward changes, “it is important to seek out people who are willing to push the boundaries of the system and who want changes to affect their public spaces.

**East West Connection**

Around the world, during a personal experience in China, my traveling companion’s father was having difficulty navigating the Beijing sidewalk. An older gentleman but by no means feeble, he frequently tripped over unnoticed obstacles. It soon became clear that others in our party were also having varying difficulty with the same issue. We spent a good amount of time on foot in the city and this allowed for ample first hand familiarity. We remarked about the placement of posts sticking out of the ground to keep vehicle traffic from encroaching where one might expect a wheelchair ramp. Tree well landscaping that dropped nearly a foot with no warning or barrier. Uneven and non-uniform to the uninitiated, these footpaths were seemingly far more underdeveloped for the user, however from an Eastern perspective that might not necessarily be true.

Professor Yu Yang – an urban planner from China – was rather enlightening on the fairly recent development of Chinese Urbanization. He stated that the design and construction of sidewalks will always “satisfy the use of cars” before any other consideration. In Chinese urban practice the car is paramount where industrial modernization has occurred. The public follows second and then “trees” or nature considerations. Prof. Yang also stated that sidewalks are mostly a byproduct of road construction. Other challenges include the overall design process and civic infrastructure which is at best problematic from a western perspective. Sidewalks here are mostly treated as afterthoughts.

Very little – if any – ergonomic or user emphasis, let alone disability compliance goes into sidewalk development. Not to mention aesthetics. According to Yu, the only system of accountability comes from the designer or civic overseer following code rather than any legal incentive for safety and usability. Additionally, in China the designer is often the final reviewer and he has no one else to answer to except the code which can be ignored or pardoned for deadlines.

Urban construction problems arise from an official capacity as well. Chinese policy states that the city mayor has the final say over proposed urban projects. Developments are then often used as vehicles for personal and political promotion. The difficulty here is that quantity is valued over quality. Beijing for example is a city with 25 million inhabitants. Developments within the city and construction projects are often unable to keep pace with population demographics. The value of projects according to Professor Yu lay within the size of a portfolio of work, emphasizing the number of accomplishments within the shortest time frame. Most construction projects are allowed three months for completion regardless of magnitude. Compounding issues of poor design or planning, completed projects often do not get revisited under any official capacity.

If there are usability or integrity issues around a project constructed by a former civic administration that for public health and wellbeing “require” repair they are often ignored by the current administration. Disavowing responsibility for repair or redevelopment is commonly done by assigning blame to the previous administration. This system does not have the intent of working for the betterment of the Chinese people, at least not from a western perspective. For what are perceived as failures in management from a Western view may not be perceived as such in the East. Individualism maintains supremacy through the history of Western development. It is difficult to take a system that was developed with a different philosophy and overlay it upon centuries of collectivist attitudes. The system in China is designed to benefit those in power and from a culturally collectivist viewpoint it keeps the wheels of progress in motion.
Generally China’s view on the pillars of sustainability follows as: In the west and specifically the United States individualistic cultural norms dictate that there is reciprocal thinking and regulated processes of development creating and designing public places. The relationship between the three E’s are generally more balanced in an overlapping correlation.

This allows taking in a variety of considerations and viewpoints simultaneously from developers, public and current regulatory systems which must be in agreement on a final product.

Public opinion is a known variable for design in the United States. In China according to Prof. Yu public opinion not only is overlooked, it is rarely volunteered. Yu stated that the Chinese public would not know how to provide input on something that had yet to be created. Everything in Chinese infrastructure is provided by official means and at the very least there has always been a framework. This ability to think in a socially proactive way does not yet exist in most Chinese culture. The ability to presume that one voice makes a difference in the grander scheme is basically non-existent. The thought public voices should be encouraged to affect positive changes in a top down established system has not yet developed. China’s rapid growth in economic affluence is beginning to create a process of change. However there is so much observable history and intentional grounding in this collectivist culture that the Chinese people are not far enough removed to fully grasp concepts of democratic public process. The need for basic self preservation and social compliance is culturally paramount and reflected in the creation of pedestrian pathways.

Collectivist Social Justice

Another interesting phenomenon regarding sidewalks relates to accidents and injury. The US legal system requires municipal and corporate accountability for the safety and accommodation of the individual user. Emphasis on individualism supports accommodation, recognition and special needs. As a side effect it also supports a sense of entitled individualistic culture as observed by the volume of frivolous suit cases. According to Prof. Yu, the recompense responsibility for accidents in Chinese municipalities is usually deferred or blamed on “individuals.” In other words, the user or the individual responsible for a particular infraction is at fault not the employer or developer. For example an individual who left a manhole uncovered resulting in pedestrian accident was found at fault and removed from his position, the municipality absolved of wrongdoing or negligence. The overseeing organization as well as the ‘victim’ felt the issue was resolved by the removal of the individual who “caused” the infraction. Removing or “firing” him no longer put him in a position to repeat his offense thus serving the public greater good and the individual as part of that public. Compensation and responsibility are secondary and crude cultural considerations. Blame and “saving face” is the driving force behind legal social accountability in China. At first this appears to be going against collectivist culture as it focuses on individuals. Though if consideration is made for what is being served by a sense that justice has been done for the individual. Justice results in serving the greater good as we are all “individuals.” Thus it is a perception around who should receive justice and what that justice should look like. It may not appear from the Global West to be equitable. From a collectivistic Eastern perspective this “justice” is perfectly logical.

Conclusion

Cultural information has been exchanged for millennia by trade, exploration and conflict. Now memes spread from person to person expressing identity through a variety of established social norms or pop cultural. Today’s global environment has increased the rate of exposure to where seconds dictate interactions rather than weeks. The term “going viral” embodies this phenomenon combining the systems of ICT (information/communication technology) with figurative biological functionality effectively creating a cultural memes pandemic. This constant collision of culture and identity happens with such speed and regularity it has a tendency to go unrecognized resulting in unintended consequences with global implications. What can
be gained from this examination of sidewalks is a deeper reflective understanding of urbanization and culture. Looking at usage and development of sidewalks elsewhere we gain insight into societal value systems. Understanding little differences with common ground we can begin to decipher issues that are far grander in scope. It begins with the first step.
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Estidama — Arabic Sustainability

By Ric Stephens and Rami Talleh

Estidama is an Arabic concept that is better understood within the context of the evolution of sustainability from an early focus on the environment to an emerging awareness of additional realms.

The Triple Bottom Line

The "bottom line" for any business is the total of revenues and costs. If the business is profitable the balance will be positive or "black." If not; the balance will be negative or "red." The recognition that sustainability (including the business 'environment') includes not only economic, but social and environmental values, created the concept of the triple bottom line. This was originally referred to as The Three P’s of people, planet and profit. The term profit was later replaced with prosperity in recognition of meeting public sector rather than exclusively private sector needs.

The Three Pillars of Sustainability

The triple bottom line was soon recast as society, environment and economy as more inclusive concepts. These "Three Pillars of Sustainability" are recognized throughout the western world as the foundation for comprehensive sustainability. The Venn diagram also illustrates the integration of these concepts and a balanced approach to all of these defines sustainability. More recent versions of this approach replace society with equity to emphasize the need for fairness. The Three E’s define sustainability in terms of intergenerational equity and mirror the traditional definition of sustainability.

The Fourth Pillar

In recent years, there has been much discussion of including another sphere of sustainability. Some experts have suggested energy as a binding concept, but a larger opinion is shared that sustainability is lacking in the realm of values related to meaning. In brief, what is the ultimate
meaning behind sustainability? Should it include another pillar with philosophical or spiritual values to have this meaning? Arabic sustainability includes this fourth sphere translated as “culture.” This is a critical pillar for a society which blends rather than separates state and religion. From a planning perspective, it further emphasized cultural and intangible cultural heritage as part of the planning process.

**Leadership for Energy and Environmental Design and the Pearl Community Rating System**

The U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) has developed a measurement for sustainable development called Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED). "LEED for Neighborhood Development integrates the principles of smart growth, urbanism and green building into the first national system for neighborhood design." Information on LEED ND can be obtained from the USGBC website http://www.usgbc.org/neighborhoods. The Abu Dhabi Urban Planning Council (UPC) has developed a similar program specific to estidama called the Pearl Community Rating System (PCRS). Information on PCRS can be obtained from the UPC website [here](http://www.usgbc.org/neighborhoods). The LEED program is based on a North American context, and the PCRS is adapted to an Arabic context.

**Regenerative Design**

Sustainability is based on intergenerational equity, but newer concepts have deeper values and higher aspirations. Regenerational design introduces into Ecological Design at least two additional streams—the Science or Art of Place, and the science of living systems. “Regeneration is far more than simple renewal or restoration. Definitions of the word ‘regenerate’ include three key ideas: a radical change for the better; creation of a new spirit; returning energy to the source.” [Pamela Mang] Estidama illustrates an Arabic approach to the expanding concept of sustainability towards regenerative design.

Rami Talleh is the Planning Manager for the Abu Dhabi Urban Planning Council. Ric Stephens is the Editor for the Oregon Planners Journal, university instructor, and planning consultant. His current Mideast projects include the Abu Dhabi Urban Planning Council Intensive Training Program and Oman National Spatial Strategy.
CALL FOR PAPERS AND INVITATION TO EXHIBIT—51st International Making Cities Livable Conference on Making Cities Livable for All
Deadline November 1, 2013 for abstracts for papers
Deadline November 20, 2013 to Exhibit

Event Location and Date: Portland, OR, June 8-12, 2014

Call for Papers
At this conference, we shall pay special attention to effective planning strategies and visionary design solutions to making our cities and suburbs healthy and livable for ALL—young and old, poor as well as well-to-do, and those with health and mobility issues.

The conference will bring together 350-400 delegates—world renowned experts, elected officials, practitioners and scholars in planning, and transportation planning, public health, urban design, architecture, landscape architecture, and social sciences to better understand how the built environment affects health and well-being, and to learn from the most successful solutions around the world.

For information about presentation topics, please visit: http://www.livablecities.org/conferences/51st-conference-portland/conference-topics.

Those wishing to present papers should submit a 250 word abstract for consideration before November 1, 2013. Please submit online, following the Call for Papers Guidelines on the web at http://www.livablecities.org/conferences/51st-conference-portland/call-papers.

Invitation to Exhibit-
You are invited to submit proposals for an exhibit of Successful Designs for Making Cities Healthy for All. Projects in design or construction phase (eligible for inclusion in the Exhibit) must be real projects commissioned with the intention to build. Completed projects (eligible for inclusion in the Exhibit, AND the Awards Program) must already exist and be in use, having been completed or restored within the last ten years.

Six categories of exhibits are eligible:
• Neighborhood Plazas
• Active Mobility and Complete Streets
• Family-Friendly Housing
• Housing the Homeless
• Mixed Use
• 10-minute Neighborhoods

For more information, please visit: http://www.livablecities.org/conferences/51st-conference-portland/exhibit.

CITY OF DONALD DESIGN CHARRETTE
The City of Donald is hosting a design charrette on November 16th to generate new concepts for the downtown streetscape and public open space. If you have expertise/experience in downtown planning, urban design, landscape architecture, and/or sustainable development, please come spend the day with other experts, university students and the citizens of Donald to guide future development. Space is limited, so please sign up as soon as possible. Email City Manager Heidi Blain at manager@donaldoregon.gov.

PORTLAND LEGAL ISSUES WORKSHOP
Friday, December 6
Portland Building

The Oregon APA’s annual Legal Issues Workshop is back. On Friday, December 6th, enjoy some old favorites (case law review) and some new ones (transferable development rights) as you earn 5 hours of legal and 1.5 hours of ethics certification maintenance (pending AICP approval). Here’s the detailed agenda:

8:00-8:15: Registration with coffee and doughnuts
8:15-9:45: The Ethics for Disaster: UO Professor of Philosophy, Naomi Zack addresses the moral aspects of hurricanes, earthquakes, tornadoes, plane crashes, Avian Flu pandemics, and other disasters. Moderated by OAPA Ethics Officer, Denny Egner.
9:45-10:00: Break
10:00-11:00... Brave New World: Exactions after Koontz: Earlier this year, in Koontz v. St. Johns River Water Management District, the U.S. Supreme Court added a wrinkle to the familiar territory of Nollan and Dolan. How might this affect planning on the front lines? Presenters: Carrie Richter, Garvey Schubert Barer; Dorothy Cofield, Cofield Law Office; Megan Thornton, West Linn.
UPCOMING EVENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

11:00-12:00: Digging Deeper on Annexation: An introduction to the law of annexation and boundary changes, with a focus on public infrastructure financing. Presented by Chris Crean (Beery, Elsner and Hammond).

12:00-1:15: Lunch (on your own)

1:15-2:45: Case Law Review: The perennial favorite is back with the trio of Ed Sullivan (Garvey Schubert Barer), Dan Kerns (Reeve Kearns) and Mike Robinson (Perkins Coie) giving you the breakdown on recent cases in Oregon and beyond.

2:45-3:00: Break

3:00-4:30: Carrots over Sticks: A New Look at Transferable Development: Transferring development rights is an old concept that is seeing some renewed interest both in terms of a means of protecting farmland as well as natural and historic resource protections in urban areas. Presenters: Darren Greve, King County (WA); Kelley Beamer, Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts; Katherine Daniels, DLCD.

Pending AICP approval, you can earn 5 hours of legal and 1.5 hours of ethics CMs.

Registration is $95 for OAPA members and $125 or others. $10 early bird discount for people who register before November 1.

For questions about registration contact Stephanie Kennedy (oapa@oregonapa.org, 503-626-8197). For questions about the program, contact Jon Makler (planningengineering@gmail.com).

REQUEST FOR POTENTIAL PLANNING PROJECTS
2014 Toulan School MURP Graduate Planning Workshop Proposals due: December 6, 2013

In the winter and spring quarters of 2014, graduate students in the Master of Urban and Regional Planning program at Portland State University will be creating and completing applied planning projects in a required course known as “the MURP workshop.” This course is intended to give our students hands-on experience in conceiving, planning, and implementing a community-based planning project.

If you are interested in having a project considered for the upcoming workshop, please answer the following questions and email them to Sy Adler (adlers@pdx.edu) by December 6, 2013.

1) What is the title for your project?

2) Who is the client for this project? Please briefly describe the organization or community served by the project.

3) What is the problem that your proposed project will attempt to solve? Please note that we are seeking “planning projects.” A “planning project” is problem-centered, has a specific geographic area of concern, requires the development and evaluation of alternatives, a product that includes a recommended course of action, and depends on direct community consultation and participation. Note that research projects, projects that don’t involve direct contact with and involvement of the public, or projects that don’t create choices for clients are generally not acceptable for workshop purposes.

4) What is the desired product, and how will it address an identified community need? Who will use the product? Please note that all products, though developed for and delivered to clients, are expected to be shared with the public on the Toulan School website.

5) What resources (time, money, information/data, printing, gas money/bus passes, meeting supplies and refreshments, etc.) can you provide, if any, to help support the completion of the project?

6) Please provide the contact details (name, role in the client organization, telephone number, e-mail address) for the person submitting the request on behalf of the client organization, and who will be regularly and consistently available during the winter and spring terms to interact directly with the student group.