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This issue of OPJ is unique, a special tribute to Nohad and Dirce Toulan. Dedicating an issue to them was an easy decision, not just because of their long relationship to the planning profession, but because of who they were and what they meant to Portland and to Oregon.

Most of us knew Dr. Toulan as the founder and long-time Dean of PSU’s College of Urban and Public Affairs. His influence on planning, and the many planners he helped shape through PSU, cannot be overstated. After arriving in Portland in 1972 he not only led the expansion of a small urban studies program to its status today as one of the elite planning programs in the country, he also gave his time and expertise to numerous community planning initiatives, most notably to the committee that drafted the regional urban growth boundary.

But the scope of his work over the last 50 years is far more extensive. He was the first Planning Director of the Cairo Region in his native Egypt, and directed the creation of a regional plan for the Holy City of Mecca. He also consulted widely over the years, contributing to the development of major urban and regional plans throughout the Middle East, Africa and the United States. And he has been recognized with numerous awards in Oregon and nationally for his leadership and vision as a professional planner.

There was also another side to Nohad, and to Dirce who was both an architect and a planner, that needs to be highlighted. In many ways they together embodied the highest and best aspirations of the planning profession: to be thoughtful advocates for bringing people and ideas together to positively shape the human experience. They were from two completely different cultures and religions, living in an adopted country, but everyone who knew them was impressed with their compassion and deep sense of social justice. Their presence made a huge impact on countless people and that spirit of community they represented is a tremendous model for all of us, especially in these challenging times.

I hope you enjoy the remembrances and tributes to the Toulans in this issue, and also reflect on their values and the way they conducted themselves with integrity and a great sense of purpose in advancing the quality of life for everyone.
Nohad Toulan Legacy

By Arnold Cogan, Cogan Owens Cogan

By now, I am sure that all readers of this publication are aware of the tragic and untimely deaths of Nohad and Dirce Toulan in a traffic accident October 28 near Punta del Este, Uruguay. Many of us remember Nohad as a creative educator, a vigorous administrator, an inspiring planner and a passionate visionary. Others know Dirce as an architect and planner who led the effort to create the Dirce Moroni Toulan Library for the College of Urban and Public Affairs at PSU.

For many years, Nohad and I shared a common vision that the state of Oregon should develop a growth policy much more far-reaching than what it is today: a compilation of every community’s land use plan. My interest in the subject dates back to when I left my position as Director of DLCD and wrote about that topic for the AIP newsletter, the predecessor of APA. After reading my article, Nohad and I spent many hours talking about the issue, which we discussed extensively in the Oregon Planner’s Journal of December, 2004 and later in an op-ed column in the May 26, 2005 Oregonian. Ultimately, we expanded that concept into a paper presented in Portland to a conference of the International Academic Association on Planning, Law and Property Rights this past February.

Nohad was closely involved with the Oregon planning experience for decades. A notable achievement was his chairmanship of the Committee on the Oregon Planning Experience (COPE) which reported to OAPA in November 2011. Based on recent ballot measures and public opinion surveys, the COPE report suggests that a significant majority of Oregonians support land use planning but are concerned about its fairness and support regional differences. Few want to abolish the program but they do want it reexamined.

Soon after, in the summer of 2012, Nohad told me, “We can’t keep going permanently with our Oregon land use planning program that is only focused on protecting things like agriculture and forest land. Such a program will, in time, fail. We need to start thinking about planning for the 22nd century.” He was, indeed, a forward thinking visionary.

Later, when we collaborated on the paper for that international conference mentioned above, he wrote, “Today, Oregonians want to protect the environment but they are equally concerned about jobs, economic development, efficiency of our infrastructure, the quality of our educational institutions, and a score of other socio-economic problems. All these issues as well as land use planning are linked and cannot be treated as independent subsystems. In the seventies, SB 100 and its aftermath focused on the establishment of state guidelines for land use planning and growth management but it left the responsibility for comprehensive planning in the hands of local and regional governments. While this made sense at that time it, unfortunately, had some unintended consequences. It froze the state’s settlement pattern. This pattern has remained the same since 1870 with 82% of Oregon’s population concentrated in the 13 counties of what is now the I-5 corridor.”
Ever the probing academic, he continued, “Since adoption of SB100, the number of Oregonians has nearly doubled. We have grown in place with our metropolitan areas doubling their populations. As we look forward to the next 40 or 80 years there is no reason to assume that our rate of growth is going to be much different. We are blessed with a moderate climate, relative abundance of water, and communities with some of the highest livability standards in the nation. Global warming and the problems it is creating in the South and Southwest could produce movements towards the Northwest.”

In a thoughtful analysis, Nohad predicted, “Even if a worst case scenario does not occur and we are not inundated by drought refugees, a continuation of past growth rates will double our population in less than 50 years and there could be 10 million Oregonians living in this state by the year 2100. Are we prepared to deal with this challenge? I am afraid the answer is definitely no. If we continue on the current path, by the end of this century the Oregon side of the Portland metropolitan area will have a population of more than five million. We may not be able to avoid such significant growth but we can plan for it so that our future urban pattern is more balanced among the various regions of the State. We need to identify areas where new towns could be started and towards which economic and infrastructure investments could be directed.”

Nohad Toulan was a friend to many and I consider myself fortunate to have been among them. As I hope these quotes show, he was a consummate educator, planner and visionary. We can best honor his legacy by taking his advice and begin planning now for the 22nd century.
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Nohad Toulan’s Leadership and the Committee on the Oregon Planning Experience (COPE)

By Sumner Sharpe, FAICP and Beth St. Amand, MURP’01

Sumner Sharpe and Beth St. Amand recall Nohad Toulan’s leadership on OAPA’s effort to engage planners in a dialogue about the future of Oregon’s land use planning program in 2000.

Sumner Sharpe

The Oregon APA Board established the Committee on the Oregon Planning Experience (COPE) in 2000 based on input from Oregon planners during the Chapter’s 1997-1998 Statewide Planners Dialogue. The Committee’s charge was to review and comment on the accomplishments, identify the challenges, and recommend ways to “enhance the value and effectiveness” of Oregon’s approach to statewide planning. (See Appendix 1: COPE Mission Statement, “An Evaluation of Planning in Oregon, 1973-2001”, released by the OAPA Board in February 2002, page 28.)

There was reluctance among some members to engage in an evaluation of the Oregon system as they were concerned it might be seen as “political” and could cause friction within the Oregon planning community. However there was great concern about the future of the State’s planning program and a sense that the Chapter needed to say something about the program’s successes as well as the challenges ahead.

Recognizing the sensitivities surrounding this effort, both within the Chapter membership as well as the continuing broader political, legislative and other discussions surrounding the program, the selection of the Chair and Committee members was critical. As Chapter President at the time, I wanted to ensure that the Committee’s report would be accepted and respected by both APA members and the broader community who had been and were going to be engaged in the evolution and implementation of the statewide effort.

In my view, there were only a few people in the Oregon planning community who could lead such an effort; and clearly there was only one person with the stature and respect who could lead this evaluation – and that was Dr. Nohad Toulan, FAICP, and Dean of the College of Urban and Public Affairs at Portland State University. In addition to being a leader in the academic community, Nohad was a planning practitioner, and he understood the conceptual, practical, political realities of undertaking such a review. With the addition of outstanding Committee members, Nohad accepted the challenge and even allocated some of the College’s resources to support the Committee’s efforts.

Because of the scope of the effort, the centerpiece of the COPE’s approach was 55 interviews conducted in 2001 with a wide variety of Oregonians representing different perspectives and experiences with the statewide program as well a wide geographic spread. (A list of interviewees and interviewers can be found in Appendix 4 of the Cope report.) In addition, two well-attended
discussion groups at OAPA’s annual conference in Eugene provided an opportunity to get members’ feedback on what the Committee had learned thus far in the process.

Based on these efforts as well as the knowledge and experiences of Committee members, the COPE report was organized into an evaluation and recommendations in seven topic areas. The Committee’s report was submitted to the OAPA Board in late 2001, and after review and reflection on the COPE recommendations, the Board submitted the report in February 2002 to the Governor, LCDC Chair, DLCD Director, to OAPA members and other interested parties.

Notably, the Board’s release of the report also was sent to Dr. Toulan. This recognition of his leadership was a sign of the Board’s high respect for him as the Board agreed with all of the COPE recommendations and in only a few instances, added some additional comments in a cover memo. But there was no disagreement about the overriding recommendation — to engage new and old residents in a discussion of Oregon’s planning effort and its value in addressing the State’s unique “quality of life”.

After the release of the report, Nohad and other Committee members took the lead in initiating the dialogue, presenting the recommendations to the Governor and members of his staff, legislators, the LCDC, and others. Furthermore, the report helped establish a continuing agenda for the Chapter as evidenced by the subsequent Bullitt Foundation funded project, Regional Planning for the 21st Century.

(The complete report can be found at: Committee on the Oregon Planning Experience (COPE) Oregon Chapter APA.)

Beth St. Amand

Thirteen years ago, I walked into Dean Nohad Toulan’s offices and into living history. As a master’s student in PSU’s planning program, I was assigned to support this OAPA committee under his tutelage. Over the next year, I sat at the Round Table with founders of the Oregon Statewide Land-Use Planning Program and current practitioners statewide — all veterans of a system I only knew through lectures and textbooks. What followed were lively discussions, insights and a front-row seat into not only Dean Toulan’s legendary ability as a facilitator, connector and quiet leader, but an in-depth lesson into the statewide program that I will never forget.

OAPA established COPE in Spring 2000 to review and comment on the accomplishments of mandated land-use planning in Oregon. Dean Toulan cared deeply about the statewide land-use planning system; as he stated in the report’s transmital letter, the Committee’s primary interest was in “securing the healthy continuity of what we started 30 years ago.” As a testament to his commitment, he provided resources for the Committee’s work, including my position. He also inspired the esteemed Committee members to offer valuable work hours on a volunteer basis.

The Committee’s long-term task was to address the evolutionary changes needed to enhance the value and effectiveness of statewide land-use planning. To meet this challenge, the Committee
reviewed existing studies and surveys, met with then-DLCD director Richard Benner, and shared insights from their practice. However, Ballot Measure 7’s passage in Fall 2000 greatly influenced COPE’s discussions, as it did throughout the profession. The Committee felt strongly that the report should reflect the “collective, statewide experience of individuals intimately involved with, and knowledgeable about, the system” and decided to conduct in-depth interviews.

The Committee spent hours to develop 10 fair and effective questions. When the number of interviewees was debated, I remember Dean Toulan’s response: good quality interviews were most important, not numbers. That was a guiding principle in all he did. When I observed him, everything was done with the utmost care and quality, and in a deliberate manner. In a world where life moves quickly, it’s a reminder of the importance of deliberative practice.

Ultimately, we (COPE, staff, planners and students) conducted 56 interviews. Practitioners, real estate agents, known critics, and elected officials gave their time to provide an incredible window into the land-use planning system, on all sides of the counter. Collectively, there weren’t any major surprises, but it represented a picture in time: what was working and what needed to be addressed for the future.

In its final report, COPE presented seven recommendations, including expanding education and changes to local process. Some were implemented, such as the OAPA speakers’ bureau. But the first recommendation to develop a renewed statewide vision for the next 20 to 30 years COPE deliberately listed first. However, before the recent memorial service, several of us reflected on how important having a statewide vision was to Dean Toulan personally. Having an extensive statewide dialogue, as in the 1970s, would not only allow today’s citizens to take ownership in the program, but would provide a statewide direction, framework and context for any possible changes instead of piecemeal tweaks.

In my own practice, I’ve been influenced by the COPE report and the extraordinary knowledge I gained through interviews, the Committee’s lively discussions and collective experience, and most of all, Dean Toulan’s leadership. Through COPE, he integrated academia, practitioners, students, and the interviewees into the same process. Although the Committee led the charge, he thoughtfully set the groundwork and then as an observer and a participant, guided and often challenged COPE to accomplish its formidable task.

As I reviewed the report following the great loss of Dean Toulan, two statements stood out from the Conclusions:

“Every planner, planning commissioner, elected public official or other person involved in the program must be able to explain that program, its underlying bases, and the role of program participants. Beyond mere mechanical explanation of the program, planners and other interested persons must be able to change that program, so that its dynamics fits changing public policies and priorities.

“The continuation of the Oregon planning program requires the reflection of those who experience it, so that the program is able to change, as public policy changes.”

Continuing to understand where we’ve come from and where we stand today is essential to “ensure (the program’s) continuing success over the next 30 years and beyond,” as Dean Toulan stated. Continuing to make significant connections between practitioners, our research and learning institutions, and everyone involved in -- and affected by -- planning, is part of that reflective process, as we work together for the future.

In honor of Dean Toulan, I invite you to revisit the COPE report and reflect on what work still needs to be accomplished.
Practicing the Lost Art of Compromise

By Scott Whyte AICP, City of Beaverton

Congress might not understand the concept at the national level, but at the local level, students at Beaverton’s Arts & Communication Magnet Academy are learning that compromise is necessary for development to succeed.

On November 19, 2013, planning staff from the City of Beaverton visited the campus of Beaverton’s Arts and Communication Magnet Academy (ACMA) and assumed the role of private developers seeking input in response to a subdivision proposal. The scene recreated at ACMA was a Pre-Application Conference where students were assigned the roles of various local agency representatives. Student roles included: a Civil Engineer, a Transportation Engineer, a Fire Marshal, a Wetlands Biologist, an Arborist, an Intern and a Planner. The class exercise was conducted concurrently at three tables, with each table group reviewing the same plan and having the same set of agency representatives.

To prepare for this new exercise, ACMA instructor Jon Gottshall provided students with a copy of the preliminary subdivision proposal along with instructions as to studying the plan in the context of their assigned roles. Students were also informed of the objective – to identify relevant issues and concerns while formulating creative solutions through compromise.

Students were also informed of potential conflicts of interest between other agency representatives at the table. These conflicts became apparent once the exercise began. For example, one student playing the role of Civil Engineer expressed concerns about utility connections, explaining how a sanitary sewer line in the wetlands portion of the site would be the best option for connection. However, the student playing the Wetlands Biologist expressed a different concern, explaining how these wetlands were pristine and should be left undisturbed. Discussion then ensued as to what other options were available and the actions necessary for these options to be achieved. In the same example, the Wetlands Biologist identified another potential sewer line connection that might be feasible if the developer were to introduce a pump or grade the property differently than shown. The consequence of this option resulted in the loss of more trees, something the City Arborist did not favor. Discussion followed as to whether compromise is possible in light of these differences.

Dollar Figures

Students were not informed as to how much any option would cost the developer. Although "cost" is something routinely discussed at the table (even at the Pre-App stage) for purpose of the exercise, costs were not a factor. As Jon Gottshall explains “I usually keep cost out of the consideration, because they bog down negotiation and drive grown adults crazy. More importantly, I avoid it because I want the kids to consider planning as a potentially exciting career choice, and getting down into the weeds could kill any sort of positive notions they might have.’

In lieu of dollar figures, students were simply told that one item (e.g. a fire hydrant) would cost more than another option (e.g. adding a sprinkler system to every unit in the subdivision).
Costs were also left out as dollar figures can be too persuasive in our decisions to compromise. As part of the rules, students were required to compromise on at least one issue. However, some of these issues had more life-safety consequences than others. As part of the exercise it was important for students to decide which issues should not be compromised regardless the costs.

**Code Citations**

Just as the costs of development can drive adults crazy, so too can the conveyance of issues discussed in the context of code. While it might be convenient for planners to convey what is “code” it also transmits the hidden message that no other option is available. Used in discussions concerning a potential development, it can hamper our ability to think creatively. In conducting the class exercise, instead of code language students were given “key issues” to convey. Students were also informed as to how these issues were important in performing their roles but were not made aware of any connection to the law.

**No Prioritization of Choice**

Students were provided three or four key issues to convey to the developer, but were not informed as to the importance of one issue over another. During the exercise students were free to choose which issue they would compromise. Each role description identified certain “preferences” intended to help the student assume their role. Role descriptions also contained a subpart titled “Other things you know...” where students were given some knowledge as to what other agency representatives would likely express in response to their issues.

**Examples of Compromise**

During the class exercise students playing the role of “Intern” were required to observe and count the number of acts of compromise they witnessed. Following the table discussions Interns reported having observed between five to eight acts of compromise. Interns were also asked to identify one clear example of compromise and one example of an issue left unresolved. These examples were discussed in a subsequent meeting that followed the table discussions.

Establishing a mutual purpose that is more meaningful than one single concern. At the end of the exercise, staff from the City of Beaverton unveiled the fact that the subdivision of discussion was actually a real development proposal, requiring lengthy discussions with various agency representatives, the developer and private parties. Staff further explained how the development was eventually approved, but only through compromise. Instructor Jon Gottshall provided final comments on the exercise: “What impressed my students was realizing how many interests come together in a development and how many of those interests come into conflict with one another. In fact many of the conflicts come from city agencies whose concerns do not overlap. Each of the concerns has merit, so figuring out what to be flexible with and what to stand firm on was a real challenge for students.”

Scott Whyte is a Senior Planner at the City of Beaverton and former OAPA Board member. Scott has conducted pre-application conferences for the past ten years.
Big Changes Seen in Eugene Growth Trends

By Eben Fodor, Fodor and Associates, LLC

Residents of Eugene are witnessing what appears to be a post-recession boom in urban core development of multi-family dwelling units and student housing. To gain a better understanding about how this recent growth has been shaping Eugene and its neighborhoods, data has been compiled from several city databases on building permit activity.

The result is a fairly complete picture of residential development by year, type and neighborhood location from 2000 to the present. (The city no longer provides public reports on residential building permit activity issued by year – let alone by type and neighborhood.)

The data show Eugene has been growing much more compactly than was predicted in the Envision Eugene planning process. There has been a dramatic shift from single-family construction before the recession to multi-family afterwards. In 2004, new housing was 57% single-family. So far this year, 85% of all of Eugene’s new housing units were attached multi-family.

Equally dramatic is the shift in the location of new housing construction from the urban fringe to the urban core. Growth that was taking place primarily in Bethel and Santa Clara before the recession, is now occurring in the Downtown and West University Neighborhoods.

The pace of growth is also surprising, given that the recession is still being felt in Eugene and around the country. Permit data for Eugene is incomplete for 2013, however, with two more months to go, it’s possible that the total number of housing units this year could exceed the recent peak in 2004 of 1,233 units.

Multi-unit developments like this one at 18th and Patterson have been sprouting up in central Eugene. Most seem to be geared towards UO students. Many are replacing single-family homes, changing the character of neighborhoods.
The data show a remarkably speedy transition from sprawling single-family development on greenfields to denser multi-family development in existing urban areas. Some of this is accounted for by the recent growth of student housing demand attributable to recent past growth at the University of Oregon. The actual proportion of growth in the city’s multi-dwelling housing stock due to the growth of University connected housing is not available at this time.

The shift from detached single-family to attached multi-family units is also attributable, in part, to the new economic reality of lower wages and tighter household housing budgets. The city’s controversial Multi-Unit Property Tax Exemption (MUPTE) program has also stimulated attached multi-unit development by providing 10-year tax exemptions for eligible residential projects in the downtown area.

Three years ago the 20-year Envision Eugene process assumed that 61% of new housing would be single-family dwelling units. However, this rapid transition toward compact infill may obviate the need for an urban growth boundary expansion to accommodate growth over this period.

Has Eugene become a “smart growth” success story? Certainly the economic and environmental impacts of denser, urban-core development are preferable to those of sprawling fringe development. But the smart growth formula was intended to mitigate many of the negative impacts of intensified urban development by providing added amenities and infrastructure to support a high quality of life and to maintain neighborhood integrity and sense of community.

It’s not clear whether any mitigating urban amenities are being planned in or around the impacted neighborhoods. The incredible mobility Eugene residents have enjoyed may be coming to an end. It’s easy to see that the critical arterial roads in the area, such as Pearl, Hilyard, Willamette, 11th and 18th, will soon be overloaded. There is no offsetting increase in pedestrian and biking facilities planned. Nor are there added parkland and recreational amenities planned to accompany this growth in the City core. These changes may have caught the City by surprise too, and the improvements could come along eventually. In the meantime, it’s smart growth without the “smart” part.

[Note that the City does produce a federally-mandated “construction report.” However, this only shows aggregated, city-wide data for completed development for prior years, so is one to two years behind. The City data does not distinguish student housing from other types of multifamily housing.]

Eben Fodor is a Eugene-based community planning consultant with Fodor & Associates LLC. For more information on the data presented here, see http://www.fodorandassociates.com/Reports/EugeneHousingData.htm.
Urban Planning and Design Competitions

By Martin Dubbeling, Sebastien Goethals, and Ric Stephens

How can the public and private sector efficiently and economically obtain innovative, high-quality, multi-disciplinary plans and designs for large-scale projects?

An approach that offers multiple benefits is the design competition. "Design competitions deliver exciting buildings and projects. They drive up quality, stimulate creativity and innovation and generate a range of ideas improving choice. They are a highly successful procurement model that brings out the best in a project – often providing a platform to showcase new and emerging talent." [Brady, 2013]

Design competitions permit a freedom of creativity that usual project formats don’t allow, which brings significant innovations and most of the new trends in urban planning, design and architecture. In some ways, competitions are essential to imagine new solutions to improve our environment because they don’t limit the creativity and opportunities to think differently.

Design competitions date back over two millennia and include a war memorial for the Acropolis in 448 BCE. Numerous famous historic and current projects are also the result of design competitions including the White House; the Eiffel Tower; the 9/11 Memorial; and Park Russia, the largest theme park in Europe. Design competitions are ideal for large-scale, highly visible projects which have sufficient time and budget to conduct the competition program.

There are many advantages to the competition method for the sponsor. A properly run design competition is a good way to:

• Generate a wide range of new ideas in the approach to a design
• Enhance the credibility of the sponsor
• Uncover new talent who might not ordinarily be approached in the traditional process
• Attract the attention of the press and the general public to the needs being addressed
• Broden public discourse about design, as well as about the specific project
• Increase exposure for the sponsor (AIA, 2010)

These projects also offer the competitors an opportunity to win prizes/contracts, develop public relationships, engage in project research and design, attract media attention and acquire further contracts. These opportunities collectively may be much more valuable than being awarded a contract via the traditional bidding process.

Numerous professional organizations have prepared guidelines for competitions including the American Institute of Architects, Royal Institute of British Architects and the International Union of Architects. These and many other similar programs typically address the
following design competition components:

**Sponsor, Agencies/Firms & Stakeholders**
Organizations sponsoring the program and the beneficiaries of the design recommendations and proposals should be clearly identified and engaged in the process.

**Professional Adviser, Advisory Team & Professional Organizations**
The design competition should have an adviser and/or advisory team responsible for organizing and managing the event. Ideally this process is guided or coordinated by one or more professional organizations.

**Designers, Design Teams & Students**
The event should clearly identify who may submit entries. The competition may be open to everyone or restricted to specific firms, institutions or geographic areas.

**Jury**
An independent jury of design professionals and/or stakeholders should be formed to ensure an equitable selection process.

**Program, Procedures & Conditions**
The design competition may take a variety of forms (open or limited; project or ideas; one-stage or multi-stage, anonymous or cooperative) and the appropriate model applied. The program must be transparent, accountable, participatory and equitable. A jury report must be prepared that demonstrates these qualities.

**Dialogue**
The extensive experience of participants in urban planning and design competitions can be used. The organizers may consider starting and maintaining a dialogue with the participants to improve the program, procedures and conditions.

**Submission Requirements**
A guide to submission requirements must be available to all participants. This would include the types and formats of materials such as reports, multi-media, models, etc.

**Rules, Ownership & Litigation**
The rules of the competition must be available to all participants. These include ownership of submission materials and litigation proceedings in the event of a disagreement.

**Schedule**
The design competition schedule must be available to the public and include the following dates:

a. Preliminary discussion & formulation
b. Competition planning
c. Competition initiation
d. Competition operation
e. Receipt of entries
f. Jury operation
g. Announcement of winner
h. Follow through

**Prizes, Compensation & Honoraria**
Design competitions must specify the award categories and association prizes. For many design competitions, invited design firms are compensated for their initial work. Honoraria should also be considered for specific participants based on established criteria. The winner of the competition may or may not be selected for a contract or future work. It should be noted, that many firms spend more on the competition than will be compensated by the prize money.

**Event, Exhibition & Publicity**
The design competition should include a variety of public events such as open houses, design charrettes, award ceremonies, and others. The media should also be invited to provide press coverage, and this effort should be assisted with media kits.

In the search for design excellence, competitions offer a unique approach that elevates design quality along with many other public and private sector benefits. Many of the world's
most iconic places are the result of design competition: from the Acropolis to the Eiffel Tower; from UK Houses of Parliament to the US White House; from ancient monuments to hundreds of contemporary works of architecture, art, landscape architecture, planning and urban design. The design competition is an extraordinary place-making tool.

**References**


Witzling, Lawrence, and Jeffrey Ollswang. (1986). The Planning and Administration of Design Competitions. (Funded by the National Endowment for the Arts.) Milwaukee, WI: Midwest Institute for Design Research.


Martin Dubbeling is the Principal for Connecting Cities and organizer for an international urban design competition for the New East Coastal Area of Shantou, China. Sebastien Goethals served as an analyst for this multi-million Euro competition, and Ric Stephens was a member of the international jury.
September 9th Women and Diversity in Planning Brown Bag Speaker

By Jennifer Shih, AICP, OAPA Women in Planning Chair

OAPA’s Women in Planning Committee hosts brown bag lunch in September to discuss diversity issues in Oregon with Anita Yap, AICP.

On September 9th, OAPA’s Women and Diversity in Planning Committee members gathered for a talk on diversifying the planning profession led by Anita Yap. Anita’s qualifications include over 20 years of experience with Oregon land use planning including work in regional, state, and local government and as a private consultant. She has received numerous awards, including OAPA’s own Distinguished Leadership by a Professional Planner award. Some highlights of the group discussion follow.

Overcoming historic inequities in Oregon represents a great challenge to achieving equity in planning. Too often, equity issues are not included in projects or are addressed too late in the planning process.

In order to increase diversity, organizations need to make a deliberate commitment at both the board and staff levels. It is critical to create an environment where everyone feels comfortable, and intercultural training can help to achieve this outcome. When recruiting new staff with the goal of hiring a diverse workforce, candidates should be asked during interviews about experiences working with diverse communities.

As Oregon becomes more culturally diverse, the next 40 years represent a great opportunity for the planning profession to both increase diversity in the planning profession and focus on equity in planning projects. However, organizations need to prioritize this endeavor for it to be successful.

The Oregon Health Authority’s Office of Equity and Inclusion has developed a free, recorded webinar series that focuses on health equity. These resources can be accessed via the following link: http://www.oregon.gov/oha/oei/Pages/diversity-health-equity.aspx. Additional resources on health equity, race, and cultural competence can be found at the following link: http://www.oregon.gov/oha/oei/Pages/tr-resources.aspx

The committee would like to thank Anita for her time and thought-provoking session. Thank you also to Kirstin Greene and Cogan Owens Cogan for hosting the meeting in their conference room.

The Women and Diversity in Planning Committee is seeking a core group of members to meet and set direction for the committee. If you are interested, please email jenniferdshih@gmail.com.
Legal Issues Workshop in Pictures

Photos and Text by Becky Steckler, AICP, OAPA Program and Policy Manager

Snow and record cold temperatures didn’t stop over 140 planners from coming to Portland for the annual OAPA Legal Issues Workshop on Friday, December 6. This popular workshop was sold out again, showing the importance of legal issues for Oregon’s planning program.

Planners happy to be at the Legal Issues Workshop.

OAPA President Brian Campbell, FAICP welcomes attendees.

Ethics session panel members (L to R) Denny Egner, AICP, Deb Meihoff, AICP, Jason Franklin, AICP, and Terry Moore, FAICP take questions from the audience.

Above: The “Three Amigos” (from L to R) Mike Robinson, Dan Kearns, and Ed Sullivan present the ever popular, informative, and entertaining case law review. Left: Attendees pay close attention to workshop speakers.
What Planners Need to Know About Economic Development

By Tom Hogue, Department of Land Conservation and Development

Congratulations! You’ve been handed another hat to wear. Now what? In typical fashion you’ve probably been asked to respond to a last minute recruitment lead that has your mayor excited. Recruitment is a tough game and one better left until later in the creation of an effective city economic development program. But local political reality prevails.

Do yourself a favor. Don’t start with an advisory committee to gather opinions and laments. Instead, create a working group with specific work tasks. Call it the economic development fire drill team. They will be charged to gather and maintain the accurate data needed to respond to recruitment leads, and be able to host successful recruitment visits on short notice. They have to maintain confidential information and sign non-disclosure agreements. They should gather examples of lead requests and response packets from other cities. They will need to work well with the utility service providers and partner agencies. Ask them to report their readiness status to the city council in 3 months. Then schedule a dry run. Your Business Oregon development officer can help with all of this.

Next, arm yourself with a few clichés. These will be useful in the various short conversations you will have regarding economic development. I’ve collected a few favorites over the years. You have to spend a nickel to earn a quarter. You have to fish with many lines in the water. If money is a problem you are working on the wrong plan. No dirt – no deal. Eventually you will need a complete communications program including a solid 2 minute elevator speech everyone on the team can deliver. You might be surprised, or not, at how many cities don’t get beyond the advisory committee and the clichés stage.

One of the strong advantages planners bring to the economic development game is the ability to deliver on the hard work that a complete economic development program requires. A lot of it looks just like the kind of planning you want to do anyway. I like to say that you can do a lot of good planning if you wear an economic development hat. People are willing to listen and participate differently. So get started.

It is crucial that your city have an effective business retention and expansion program. If you are not showing the love to your existing businesses, they are not going to like the attention you give to the fickle recruitment prospect. And remember - that prospect will eventually ask local business people about the city’s attitude toward business. Don’t be surprised at their answer. A retention program is hard work and not glamorous. You need someone that has or can earn the trust of local business people and can find out about their situation without blabbing it around town. You’ll hear lots of complaints at first, but if done well and persistently, eventually someone will let you know something you can act on. It’s a test! How you handle the information, and what you accomplish, will be noticed.
This article is written for planners, so take a look at your zoning and development code, and process. Many cities effectively exclude entrepreneurial activity. Start-ups are renters, not developers. Can an entrepreneur in your city operate in their garage? Can they grow and find an affordable useful space for light industrial or small scale retail? Can a new business occupy an old space without going broke installing sprinkler systems and other retrofits before they earn a dollar? Or my favorite, can that metal sculptor find a live-work welding shop downtown so he can make specialty parts to ship and make art for tourists?

And lastly, you will need to develop a new skill so you can work with the business financial documents. This is necessary to be conversant on the various financing programs you will be working with. But more importantly, a little effort on this subject and you will be prepared to have fun with creative finance techniques that will make you a winner. Here are a few clues. Low interest loan money is available, but money with longer loan terms makes projects pencil better. To make financing work, re-arrange which parts of the project get financed by which program. And to make that work, you will need a pot of flexible local money. For that you will need access to a local organization that can qualify for pass through program money. Take a class – IEDC and NDC are two providers. And, please, attend an Oregon Economic Development Association conference event. We all are wearing multiple hats these days.

Tom Hogue is the Economic Development Specialist for DLCD. He is on the board of the Oregon Economic Development Association. He lives and works in Salem.
OAPA CALL FOR EXECUTIVE BOARD CANDIDATES

The Oregon Chapter of the American Planning Association (OAPA) is seeking candidates for five executive board positions that are up for re-election in 2014 to serve on the board for the 2014-2016 period. These positions are the Vice President, Treasurer, Secretary, and two at-large positions. A list of the current board members can be found on the chapter website at http://www.oregonapa.org/contact. If you are interested in being a candidate for a board position, please contact Stephanie Kennedy at oapa@oregonapa.org to submit your contact information and the position in which you would like to be considered by 5:00 PM on January 3rd, 2014. The chapter executive board will approve the slate of candidates at its board meeting on January 10, 2014.

Chapter voting will occur between February 5th and February 25th and candidates will be notified of the election results in March. New board members will begin serving on the board at the first board meeting in April, which is scheduled for April 4, 2014.

Candidates for all positions on the OAPA board must be chapter members in good standing at the time of their nomination and must have their primary place of residence, primary place of work, or both in Oregon.

CALL FOR ENTRIES

2014 OAPA Awards

Each year, the Oregon Chapter of the American Planning Association honors outstanding efforts in planning and planning leadership. We invite you to participate in the celebration of the best in plans and planning by nominating projects and people you think deserving of such recognition. Categories for submittals include:

• Professional Achievement in Planning
• Special Achievement in Planning
• Distinguished Leadership by a Professional Planner
• Distinguished Leadership by a Community Planner
• Distinguished Leadership by an Elected Official
• Betty Niven Award for Distinguished Leadership in Affordable Housing Advocacy
• Student Achievement in Planning
• Professional Achievement in Journalism

Application packets and instructions are available at www.oregonapa.org. Nominations must be received no later than 5PM on February 28, 2014. For more information contact Awards Committee Chair Stacy Humphrey, AICP at stacy.humphrey@greshamoregon.gov or (503) 618-2202.

AICP TEST PREP WORKSHOP

Saturday, February 1, 2014
1:00 pm to 3:30 pm
PSU Engineering Building
Room 315
Portland, OR

What do you need to know to pass the AICP exam in May 2014? Start your studies off right with the OAPA AICP Test Prep Workshop.

Topics covered will include:

• Overview of primary test topics
• AICP Ethics
• Test taking/studying techniques
• Recommended study materials
• Practice questions

Each participant will get a collection of the best AICP test prep links and study materials. It will provide an overview of the exam, what to expect, and how to prepare. The workshop also helps in organization of study groups.

To register, go to the OAPA website at www.oregonapa.org. Registration is $35. For questions about registration, contact Stephanie Kennedy at oapa@oregonapa.org. For questions about the content of the workshop, contact Seth English-Young at (914) 715-7872 orsey544@yahoo.com.