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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION</th>
<th>OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME</th>
<th>POLLUTION</th>
<th>ENERGY AND POWER</th>
<th>GOVERNMENTAL INTERRELATIONSHIPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Comprehensive planned use of all land limit open space opportunities and compromise access to and use of existing facilities.</td>
<td>Battle for space by private car owners and compromise visual amenity of Valley.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Unrelated planning for open space.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Unrelated planning for open space.</td>
<td>Conservation and lower concentration of energy from comprehensive planning.</td>
<td>Organized to plan for as well as coordinate land use and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Independent of auto encourages sprawl/cluster/sprawl. Large areas of land consumed by roads, parking.</td>
<td>Access to open space by private car owners inadequate. Multiple use teachers open space incompatible with other uses.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Electricpowered transit reduces air and noise pollution.</td>
<td>Cooperation between public transit system promoted at state level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Increased density on Valley Floor Cluster of other areas. Declining small towns. Decreasing number of farms.</td>
<td>Access to open space by private car owners inadequate. Multiple use teachers open space incompatible with other uses.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Electricpowered transit reduces air and noise pollution.</td>
<td>Cooperation between public transit system promoted at state level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Comprehensive planned use of all land limit open space opportunities and compromise access to and use of existing facilities.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Electricpowered transit reduces air and noise pollution.</td>
<td>Cooperation between public transit system promoted at state level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Independent of auto encourages sprawl/cluster/sprawl. Large areas of land consumed by roads, parking.</td>
<td>Access to open space by private car owners inadequate. Multiple use teachers open space incompatible with other uses.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Electricpowered transit reduces air and noise pollution.</td>
<td>Cooperation between public transit system promoted at state level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Increased density on Valley Floor Cluster of other areas. Declining small towns. Decreasing number of farms.</td>
<td>Access to open space by private car owners inadequate. Multiple use teachers open space incompatible with other uses.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Electricpowered transit reduces air and noise pollution.</td>
<td>Cooperation between public transit system promoted at state level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Comprehensive planned use of all land limit open space opportunities and compromise access to and use of existing facilities.</td>
<td>Access to open space by private car owners inadequate. Multiple use teachers open space incompatible with other uses.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Electricpowered transit reduces air and noise pollution.</td>
<td>Cooperation between public transit system promoted at state level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Independent of auto encourages sprawl/cluster/sprawl. Large areas of land consumed by roads, parking.</td>
<td>Access to open space by private car owners inadequate. Multiple use teachers open space incompatible with other uses.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Electricpowered transit reduces air and noise pollution.</td>
<td>Cooperation between public transit system promoted at state level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Increased density on Valley Floor Cluster of other areas. Declining small towns. Decreasing number of farms.</td>
<td>Access to open space by private car owners inadequate. Multiple use teachers open space incompatible with other uses.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Electricpowered transit reduces air and noise pollution.</td>
<td>Cooperation between public transit system promoted at state level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Comprehensive planned use of all land limit open space opportunities and compromise access to and use of existing facilities.</td>
<td>Access to open space by private car owners inadequate. Multiple use teachers open space incompatible with other uses.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Electricpowered transit reduces air and noise pollution.</td>
<td>Cooperation between public transit system promoted at state level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Independent of auto encourages sprawl/cluster/sprawl. Large areas of land consumed by roads, parking.</td>
<td>Access to open space by private car owners inadequate. Multiple use teachers open space incompatible with other uses.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Electricpowered transit reduces air and noise pollution.</td>
<td>Cooperation between public transit system promoted at state level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Increased density on Valley Floor Cluster of other areas. Declining small towns. Decreasing number of farms.</td>
<td>Access to open space by private car owners inadequate. Multiple use teachers open space incompatible with other uses.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Electricpowered transit reduces air and noise pollution.</td>
<td>Cooperation between public transit system promoted at state level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Comprehensive planned use of all land limit open space opportunities and compromise access to and use of existing facilities.</td>
<td>Access to open space by private car owners inadequate. Multiple use teachers open space incompatible with other uses.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Electricpowered transit reduces air and noise pollution.</td>
<td>Cooperation between public transit system promoted at state level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Independent of auto encourages sprawl/cluster/sprawl. Large areas of land consumed by roads, parking.</td>
<td>Access to open space by private car owners inadequate. Multiple use teachers open space incompatible with other uses.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Electricpowered transit reduces air and noise pollution.</td>
<td>Cooperation between public transit system promoted at state level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Increased density on Valley Floor Cluster of other areas. Declining small towns. Decreasing number of farms.</td>
<td>Access to open space by private car owners inadequate. Multiple use teachers open space incompatible with other uses.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Planned land use and development. Planned open space opportunities meet demands.</td>
<td>Electricpowered transit reduces air and noise pollution.</td>
<td>Cooperation between public transit system promoted at state level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this foldout you will find many of the elements that we show and describe more fully in this book.

This chart is set up so that you can observe the interaction of one environmental factor on another. It is based on the understanding that each and every environmental action affects every other one, which is the basic premise of ECOLOGY.

Use it the same way you use a road map mileage chart that tells by cross reference how far it is from one place to another.

The environmental impact subjects are listed horizontally and vertically. If you wish to see the connections between any two of the impact subjects, you simply find where they intersect and there you will find the information.
Dear Reader:

This book gives you a long look into the future. With drawings, maps, and photographs, it pictures the year 2002 as it might be in the Willamette Valley. It presents two choices for the future -- but these are only two of many different possibilities.

You need to think out your desired future for the Valley. You need to take your views and constructive ideas to the people who are elected or appointed to act for you -- state legislators, county commissioners, mayors, city councilmen. They need to know your concerns.

I would like to be able to give you the answers to the questions of growth development and livability, but frankly we don't have a consensus about necessary actions. Something, however, has to be done or the questions become more complex, and livability is lost.

To begin with, there is a need for legislative commitment to find answers, land use legislation that provides for clearly defined state and local responsibilities, legislative development and adoption of goals and objectives to guide Oregon's growth and development, new methods of citizen involvement and finally, a system must be initiated to insure that local and state government actions are closely coordinated with citizen desires.

The truth is you can do something. Your action and others' actions can become a potent force in shaping our future in the Willamette Valley. Talk with your neighbors -- share the book.

Before you put this book away, think of what you can do -- talk to your legislators and with the local government officials or with your community organizations.

If you simply decide now how you want our beautiful Valley to look in 30 years, you will already have started to make it come true.

Sincerely,

Governor
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Fellow Oregonians and Friends:

The Willamette Valley of Oregon is one of the most beautiful valleys in the world.

Stretching from Eugene in the south to the Columbia River in the north, from the snowy summits of the Cascades to the blue heights of the Coastal Range, it is a verdant, fertile land, still largely untrampled by humanity.

Today the future of the valley is in question. Will the valley fall prey to a now-familiar pattern of uncoordinated growth and urban sprawl? Or can its people, working in community, build a different future? Can they articulate their own ideas for the valley through a more responsive network of government? Can so vast a geographical area coordinate its growth under the common will of the people?

Project "Foresight" meets these questions head-on. In doing so, it has proven to be one of America's most ambitious undertakings.

For two years, the work has been long and tedious, taxing the patience and reserves of technicians, planners, citizens, and public officials. Today, Project "Foresight" has come of age. Scenarios--descriptions of alternate futures--have been prepared for the Willamette Valley to focus attention on various courses Oregonians can take in valley development.

The scenario is a new concept and communication method. It is not a plan, but rather sets the stage for improved citizen involvement and problem identification.

A cynic once grumbled, "All man has learned from the past is that he has learned nothing from the past." Will the next generation say the same? Will bitter hindsight be their lot? Or can they rise up to enjoy the fruits of our foresight?

It is still within our hands to set an example for all to follow. Project "Foresight" is our response to this most challenging responsibility.

Sincerely,

Tom McCall
Governor of Oregon
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HOW TO USE THIS BOOK

This book is an environmental primer for the people of the Willamette Valley. It sets forth basic principles showing how men's actions cause future consequences in the environment.

The book has eight elements:

1. You have already seen the "Guide Chart to the Future" inside the front cover. It tells in digest form how environmental changes affect each other.

2. "How to Use This Book" explains how to get the most out of what you read.

3. "How This Book Came About" tells the story behind the book.

4. "How the Valley Developed Until 1972" describes the Valley today and how it grew over the years.

5. "Scenario I": shows how the Valley will be in 30 years if people continue making decisions based on current trends.

6. "Scenario II": shows how the Valley might be by the year 2002 based on changed assumptions in regard to more density of urban development and that development decisions will be made largely in favor of environmental concerns.

7. "How to Make Your Own Scenarios" tells how to develop your own alternatives for the future of the Valley. It suggests the many choices people have.

8. "Background Information" presents the hard facts and statistics that were used in making the projections and planning assumptions for Scenarios I and II.

We have developed this book in the form of "scenarios." Scenarios are a way of foretelling the future. Film and TV makers use scenarios to develop story lines so that everyone concerned knows in advance what will go before the cameras.

We are using scenarios to tell you, in our best judgement, what is likely to happen to the Willamette Valley environment as people make different choices in how they live, work and move around the Valley. In this way we help you grasp the impact of change. Scenarios simplify professional jargon and make planning understandable to everyone. They help you see what the future will bring so you can decide whether you would like to have it that way.

The Willamette Valley started its development in the modern sense some 100 years ago.

But the big changes are still to come.

We can still affect them if we act now, in the 1970's.

We cannot change the past but we CAN INFLUENCE THE FUTURE.

Scenarios are our best judgements about what will happen. But since the future IS the future, and IS not a fact, other people may have slightly different impressions of what will happen.

Here is how we went about developing our scenarios:

First: Data was assembled over several years by technicians. These form the factual base for our analysis.
Second: We then spent some months absorbing all this data, analyzing it, adding to it, thinking about it. In this task we had the very able assistance of members of our own group, consultants, the Steering Committee and Advisory Committees of Project "Foresight" assembled by Governor Tom McCall.

Third: We then organized this data into seven subjects which seemed to us to be the most significant impact areas in the environment. These are:

- Land Use
- Transportation
- Open Space and Recreation
- Employment and Income
- Pollution
- Energy and Power
- Governmental Interrelationships

Fourth: The next step was the crucial one. This was to use the factual data as a basis for forecasting what would happen during the next 30 years.

We wrote this forecast in two Scenarios:

**Scenario I**: We assume that all factors continue to operate as they do now. No new ways of controlling change are introduced. As an example, we assume under this scenario that people use individual cars as they do now, with the number of cars increasing with population - an increase from X to Y.

**Scenario II**: This scenario forecasts the future according to new attitudes on how people can live together in the Valley, and a desire to maintain the quality of the environment. It too is based on facts. But inevitably the choices here are greater and we have somewhat less assurance of our forecasting than in Scenario I.

For example, in Scenario II, we have predicted more development of mass transit and less use of the automobile. Of course we have to predict how much less use. This is obviously harder to do than counting only on the automobile and forecasting what will happen with an increase in numbers.

In this kind of predicting, based on known data, we used not only our own and the Task Force's judgments along with those of other experts. We also applied experience and testing from similar situations in other parts of the world. In other words, we did not fantasize; we projected from known facts.

At the same time, it should be pointed out that Scenario I, which is based on the past, is no more accurate than Scenario II (or any other scenario for that matter). The future is predictable to a degree. But no matter how accurate you are, the future remains a probability, not a fact.

Both scenarios can be viewed as equally valid because they are both based on hard facts and have been tested against experience by experts.

Both give us as accurate a look as is possible into alternative futures for the Valley.
The people of Oregon seem more aware of their environment than people in most states.

The superb physical environment is basically what brought them or their forebears here in the first place.

Prime agricultural land, clean air and water, vast forests, abundant power . . . all combined to produce a highly desirable way of life in majestic surroundings. The land supported the people, and they derived pleasure living on it.

Central to the state in every way is the great Willamette Valley. Most of the people live and work here, and it is the focus of most of their environmental concern.

It is one of the richest agricultural valleys of this country, perhaps of the world. The Valley has given its people a fine way of life through its fruitfulness -- people have been close to spectacular natural scenery, close to the soil, close to outdoor recreation and to unique panoramas of open space and magnificent river and mountain vistas. The natural environment has made the Willamette Valley a very special place to Oregonians, and indeed to many people who have visited from other parts of the United States.

In recent years the splendid environment in the Valley was compromised in some places, and people did not like it. They grew concerned.

Increasing industry polluted the Willamette River to the point where fish were dying. Clouds of smog from busy Portland drifted down the Valley and combined with other sources to pollute the air and conceal the mountains. Roads multiplied and clogged up with traffic. Older town centers began dying and the spread of suburban developments and mobile homes marched steadily across the landscape. Population mounted steadily.

Fortunately, Oregonians are active in stewardship of their environment, and some of these happenings were controlled before irreparable harm was done.

In 1966, with help from federal agencies, a start was made in cleaning up the Willamette River. Ninety percent of the wastes that used to enter it are now controlled.

Along the river, a Greenway parks system has been started. Many hope it is the beginning of a larger system for the future.

Today, the people of Oregon and the Willamette Valley, with their government officials are saying: "We must deal together with the future of our environment!"

Through the Willamette Valley Environmental Protection and Development Planning Council and its action-oriented Project "Foresight", Oregonians are already challenging the malign effects of environmental decline. A determined effort is being made on a regional basis to analyze the effects of growth and change -- and to plan for the future instead of allowing unplanned chaos in the Valley. Project "Foresight" aims to involve people in analyzing these consequences.

This book is a guide to that involvement. It shows how the environment of the Valley can respond to what people do. The scenarios that are presented here are important steps in planning for the future.

We call this book The Willamette Valley: Choices for the Future.

One choice has already been made. People want their valley to be as splendid in the future as in the past. This book can help you plan for that day.
HOW THE WILLAMETTE VALLEY DEVELOPED UNTIL 1972

Before we look at the future of the Willamette Valley, let's examine her past. Let's see how the Valley developed and changed, especially in the busy period of growth since World War II.

Then the white man came. He had different needs and desires, and in satisfying them, he brought a profound change to the Valley.

The Indians were the original inhabitants of the Valley. They lived "lightly" upon the land and responded to its natural ecological rhythms. They were part of their natural surroundings, seldom exerting pressures on them for change.
First, he built permanent settlements along the rivers. Small clusters of farm buildings and communities began to dot the Valley. Trails became roads; roads became streets; highways spanned the miles between farm and town and trading center.

The railroad arrived, and finally, air transportation. Great airports grew and ground connections reached out from the cities.

More and more people flocked to the Valley to make their living from the rich resources of agricultural land, timber, metals, water and power. Soon there were cities devoted to commerce, industry and education.

Two world wars and a major depression shook the country. People in military and government service travelled around America and saw new places. Stricken by economic hardship, families moved to other parts of the United States.

People travelled more and more by car. As road systems grew, Americans became aware of fertile green areas like the Willamette Valley. With people on the move the Valley received its share of immigrants and soon its population was soaring. There was a 109.3% increase between 1940 and 1970 alone.
The Valley experienced growing pains in housing and commercial services, and its increasing population also needed new highways, roads and streets for cars and trucks. In 1950, there were some 15,000 miles of roads serving 410,000 private cars and 60,000 trucks.

By 1969, the number of cars alone had doubled to 835,000.

Roads were also needed to meet the seasonal surge of tourist traffic. In 1948, tourism was the state's third largest source of economic gain, with tourists spending $92,000,000 per year. By the 1960's, tourists were spending more than $326,000,000 per year throughout Oregon.

The main route of travel in the 1950's was the Pacific Highway, running north-south on each side of the Willamette Valley. We know this road today as 99-East and 99-West.
AFTER WORLD WAR II

Oregon's population grew more in terms of percentage than any other state's in the period between 1945 and 1950. People seeking jobs and a better place to live pushed the Valley's population over 1,000,000 in the early 1950's. It became harder and harder to find adequate housing and schools.

More than a third of the people lived in and around Portland. Eugene and Salem had populations of more than 30,000 people. Farming communities grew on the Valley floor and logging communities in the foothills.

With the pressure for new homes, housing developments began to spread out onto open land around cities and towns, land that had previously been used for farming. This aerial view of Salem, taken in the 1950's, shows this spreading pattern of land-use.
Not only did the suburbs grow. Industry developed near sources of raw materials - timber, pulp and food products. In turn, small communities grew up around these industries. People who lived in these towns and villages enjoyed a beautiful natural environment and had unbounded opportunity for outdoor recreation in their leisure time.

Along with the forest products industry, agriculture had been the life-blood of the Valley's economy. But with growing pressures to use the land for other purposes, agriculture began to decline in relative importance.

Despite its diversifying economy, the Valley remained a remarkably fruitful and varied agricultural land. Across her rolling fields and bottom-lands grew cherries, apples, peaches, pears, prunes, filberts and walnuts; truck crops such as alfalfa, clover, vetch, and rye grass; hops for brewing; raspberries, blackberries, cranberries and boysenberries; and a profusion of flowers and bulbs.
Up to the start of World War II, forestry and logging practices had been wild and wasteful in Oregon and across the country. The 1941 Oregon Forest Conservation Act began to control these practices and to encourage sustained yield on private lands (63% of which were in small ownership). By 1949, the rehabilitation of ravaged forests had begun.

Much of the Valley's produce was destined for canning and freezing - especially the food crops. Oregon was able to overcome the disadvantage its great distance from major markets through a burgeoning technology and industry in freezing and canning.

After the war, Oregon's forest and mills were producing 20% of the country's total board-foot production. Out of 370 billion board feet reserves in 1948, 7 billion board feet were cut in Oregon, returning $650,000,000 to her economy.
Power and energy were needed for the Valley's industries and homes. The Bonneville Dam, completed in 1943, began to tap the state's hydroelectric power potential - an energy source that was thought inexhaustible in 1949. Bonneville served 70% of the people's needs in the 1950's and was supplemented by power from the Grand Coulee Dam. (Grand Coulee, expanded in 1949, had been producing power since the early 1940's.)

Pollution did not receive the attention it does today - at least on an official level. Yet people were beginning to notice the conflict between industrial and recreational use of water - particularly when fish and wildlife habitats were harmed.

A few years after World War II, the Valley's open spaces and recreation areas began to suffer from the heavy influx of new residents and visitors. State Parks reported "a substantial gain" in visitors to state parks in 1948. That same year, the 6,000 acres of Silver Creek Falls Park were added to the parks system, filling a growing need.

Hunting and fishing were the major forms of recreation in Oregon. The number of state licenses issued tripled between 1915 and 1948, with a heavy upsurge after 1940. In 1969, more than 1 million licenses were being issued each year.

The State Game Commission began to show environmental concern when wildlife habitats came into conflict with other uses of the land.

The Valley's conversion to a peacetime economy was relatively smooth, aided by a diversifying industry base. Value added by manufacturing between 1945 and 1949 exceeded the nation's average by 75%.

Aluminum smelting and the production of chemicals, iron and steel, machinery, pulp and paper led the growth of industry in the Valley. Bonneville and Grand Coulee furnished a ready and inexpensive source of power to the new factories and mills.
Still newer industries came into the Valley as time went by. The young electronics industry made a growing mark on the Valley's economy. Research and development enterprises settled around Eugene and Corvallis. Portland became a city oriented to service industries, in addition to port activities and the manufacture of goods and equipment.

As the economy shifted away from agriculture and forestry, those two industries began to diversify themselves. Food processing grew in the Valley. The pulp and paper industry began to utilize the former waste products of forestry.
Today, 1,470,000 people live in the Valley - an increase of about 400,000 in the last 20 years.

Clearly, people's living patterns have changed since World War II. Some 62% of the people live in urban and suburban areas - a 34% increase since 1950. Only 38% now live in the country, a decline of 4.8% since 1950.

The continuing changeover from resource-based industry (farming and logging) to non-resource-based manufacturing has been a big element in that urban growth. Naturally, people coming into the Valley have settled around cities where the jobs are.

The burst of population between 1940 and 1950 has levelled out somewhat, but the Valley is still gaining population in all areas.

The counties in the Portland area - Clackamas, Columbia, Multnomah and Washington - are almost at the one million mark. The mid-Willamette counties - Yamhill, Polk and Marion - have 226,000 residents. Linn and Benton counties have 125,000 people. Lane County has a population of 213,500.

As people settle in their own single-family houses in the suburbs, agricultural land is being bought up for new development - about 8,000 new acres per year. Total farmland is declining as a result, despite an increase in irrigated cropland.

With new developments have come new roads - 8,828 miles since 1950. There are now a total of 23,828 miles of road in the Valley. Eighty percent of these have been local roads and "collectors" which serve the suburban population. Today, 1,423,000 cars, trucks and buses are using these roads. The use of mass-transit buses has declined from 50 million passengers a year in 1952 to 18.5 million in 1970, although this downward trend is now being reversed.

As more people travel by air, more airports have been built. In 1950 there were 21 airports in the Valley - today there are 38 fields using 8,500 acres of land. Most of these fields are used for pleasure flying, crop-dusting and private commercial aviation.

In 1969, 1,500 vessels used Portland's port, bringing an annual flow of $357 million in imports and $665 million in exports.

The Valley still provides splendid open space and recreational opportunities for its people, particularly in parks that are more than 25 miles from urban centers.

The picture is not so bright in the urban centers themselves. Conflicts between residential, commercial, industrial and transportation uses have compromised many urban recreational facilities. There are only 4,550 acres of urban parks or about 3.1 acres per 1,000 people. Twenty-five miles or less from the cities there are some 6,395 acres of parks or 4.3 acres per 1,000.
The greatest wealth lies in the recreation areas, open space and wilderness more than 25 miles from the cities where there are 29,740 acres or 20.2 acres per 1,000 people.

Hunters and fishermen are increasing at a faster rate than the population today, although suburban developments are crowding onto many wildlife habitats. More wildlife breeding and fish hatcheries have been needed to keep pace with the 2 million days of hunting and fishing enjoyed by Oregon's sportsman population.

The economy of the Valley - measured in employment and income - has matured since 1960. The number of employed persons has grown 3% a year. Jobs created by our diversifying industry have required an increasing amount of "support employment" in construction, retail trade, services, finance and insurance, real estate, transportation, public utilities, education and government.

This rosy picture has brought many new residents to the Valley. Sixty per cent of the Valley's population growth up to 1970 was from immigrants moving in from other areas.

Incomes in the Valley have risen 27% over 1960 bringing a real gain in the average person's purchasing power. At the same time, disposable personal income - what you spend at the store and for entertainment - has dropped because of the higher bill for government services. State government has grown to cope with population growth and people's new concern for environmental quality. The support this has required has reduced spendable income from 90% in 1950 to 86% today.

Nevertheless, the commitment of most people to make the Valley a beautiful and unique place to live has made the extra "bill" well worth paying.

Pollution is a major area of concern today. Air quality in the Valley has been declining in recent years. However, action has been taken in the mid-1960's to:

- reduce emissions from cars and smokestacks;
- cut down on field burning; and
- control industrial pollution.

There still are air pollution problems in the Valley, particularly on days when the "air shed" spreads pollution, spawned in Portland, around the Valley (see Transportation, Scenario I).

Control of water pollution has been one of the Valley's great triumphs, centering on the well-known clean-up of the Willamette River. There is secondary sewage treatment by almost all communities and industries. New developments are not allowed to compromise water standards.

Thus, waterways have been returned to the people and the runs of salmon and steelhead are thriving once again.

Disposing of solid wastes is a harder problem. There are 48 sanitary landfills in the Valley (the principal method of waste disposal). Sixteen open dumps are being phased out.
Landfills consume land, however. In disposing of waste, they waste land. Government officials in Salem are currently hoping to ease this problem by recycling various solid wastes like glass and metal beverage containers.

The state is in a transition period in the use and demand for power and energy. Power requirements have grown faster than the population - thanks to industrial demands plus consumer demands.

As hydroelectric plants have reached their capacity, other sources of energy have been needed. The Trojan Nuclear Power Plant on the Columbia River is nearing completion. Coal-fired plants have been built.

People are on the move more than ever--making the car the major user of energy. As domestic fuel oils and gas reserves are depleted, more imports are needed, pushing gas and oil prices higher.

How is this intermix of environmental forces governed?

In 1970, there were 869 units of local government (cities, counties, school districts and other special districts); 150 state agencies, boards and commissions; 150 Federal agencies, boards and commissions - making close to 1,200 governmental units with different powers, duties, responsibilities and policies affecting the Valley environment!

Four Administrative Districts were established in the Valley in 1969 as part of a state-wide plan to eliminate some of the overlap and duplication of effort. A more comprehensive approach to planning is being tried in health planning, law enforcement and administration.

The Willamette Valley Environmental Protection and Development Planning Council has been a major outgrowth of this approach - along with its public-oriented Project "Foresight".

Governor Tom McCall said recently, "I feel certain that now - at last - we have the solid foundation for a continuing system of group planning for our interdependent future."

**THE VALLEY TOMORROW**

Now we are ready to look at the future of the Willamette Valley - a future that we will build through our choices.

Certain things we can forecast with considerable accuracy.

For instance, by 2002, there will be 2.5 million people living in the Willamette Valley - 1.1 million more than today.

Nearly 1.5 million will live in the area around Portland.

Some 360,000 people will live in and around Salem.

Corvallis and its neighboring towns will grow to 196,000 people. The Eugene area will increase to 374,000 residents.

The Valley will pass the 2,000,000 mark sometime between 1980 and 1990.

Half our growth will be "natural growth" - the numbers of births over deaths. Half will be from in-migration.

The greatest percentage of the population will be under 35 years old - about 68%. It will be a young and lively society.

Blacks will continue to be the largest minority, and Chicanos the second largest.

But now it is time to leave the realm of history, and look the future thirty years from now.

On the population "canvas" we have just presented, let's begin to paint our picture...

...two views of the Willamette Valley in the year 2002.
The aerial photograph taken above the Valley in the summer of 1972 shows the kinds of growth spreading out from existing centers that is changing the face of the Willamette Valley.
SCENARIO 1

BY THE YEAR 2000 OUR INCORPORATED CITIES WILL HAVE CONSUMED ABOUT 21% OF THE VALLEY FLOOR, ABOUT 370,000 ACRES. ADD TO THIS APPROXIMATELY 370,000 ACRES USED AS FOLLOWS...1,000 ACRES FOR SOLID WASTE, 75,000 ACRES FOR SAND AND GRAVEL, 30,000 ACRES FOR PARKS, 10,000 ACRES FOR AIRPORTS, 140,000 ACRES FOR ROADS, AND 46,000 ACRES FOR WATER STORAGE. THEN ADD IN THE SUBURBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITIES AND YOU HAVE NEARLY HALF OF THE VALLEY FLOOR USED UP FOR LIVING. THE GIVE COULD VERY LIKELY BE AGRICULTURAL LAND. WITH THE LAND CONVERTED, OUR AGRICULTURAL BASE WOULD GO AS WELL.

"URBAN-RURAL PLANNING AND TAXATION," SPEECH BY KEN OMID TO EUGENE ROTARY CLUB, MAY, 1972.

Land use is a term that covers all aspects of how we use the land.

It includes how we conserve open space and what routes we choose for transportation and transit.

It also includes how land is used to provide space for housing, commerce and industry.

The Valley floor contains about 2 1/2 million acres. That means about one acre is available per person for everything that happens in the Valley in 2002 -- half the land that was available per person in 1972.

Two and a half million people using the Valley in 2002 have given the land an altered appearance.

The developing pattern of housing in the Valley has continued to occupy land on the Valley floor formerly used for farming. People live in their own single-family houses mostly on 1/4 to 1/2 acre lots. With 300,000 new households in the Valley over the past 30 years, this has meant that about 100,000 additional acres have gone into residential development.

We can add to this the other land uses that are necessary to serve these households: shopping centers, schools, strip commercial areas, roads, parking lots, and solid waste disposal. State and local authorities have estimated that these uses occupy 500,000 more acres or 1/5 of the entire Valley floor.

Most people think of the Willamette Valley as extending from the ridges of the Cascades to the ridges of the Coast Range. Actually, of the 7.1 million acres that constitute the Valley, 5.1 million are in forest land. Virtually all activities, therefore, have occurred on the remaining acreage, mostly on the Valley Floor. "The Valley is not an inexhaustible "land bank."

Why have people wanted to live in single family residences in a spread out pattern of land use?

Socially, people desire to improve their lives by moving into a neighborhood with their economic and social equals, or with people who may make a little more money. The distinction of owning one's own home and surrounding property is part of this desire; so is the opportunity to choose where and with whom to live.

Physically, older neighborhoods have deteriorated, mainly in the inner cities. Housing stock has become either very shabby or very costly. Parking is hard to find. Playgrounds are scarce. People find it cheaper as well as more desirable to move to suburban developments.

The equation in the margin shows how this process of deterioration and obsolescence works.

Economically, it is cheaper to move to the suburbs because of long-term payment inducements by developers and low-interest rates by the Federal Housing Administration. In many cases, paying for a house in the suburbs has proved less costly than renting a home in town.
Redevelopment programs in the cities have also induced some families to move to the suburbs. These projects harmed the neighborhoods where people lived. Relocation seldom duplicated the neighborhoods and the ways of life they offered. The redevelopment areas—when finished—often did not coincide with the life styles of the people. New facilities often became too expensive.

A simple answer was to make a clean break and go live out of the city.

A particular pattern to suburban development resulted. Instead of spreading uniformly across the land from the cities, development has occurred in what is called "leapfrogging."

Leapfrogging is just what the name implies—pockets of development skip outward from the city center. Large areas of undeveloped or underdeveloped land lie in between and are usually held open for speculation.

The sketches in the margin tell the story. An existing urban area (1) grew and sent out a shoot (2) of houses and other development. As the population grew and land became more expensive around settled areas, developers bought up cheaper developed or underdeveloped land lie in between and are usually held open for speculation.

Services that supported these communities had to be extended out across undeveloped land to new developments—sewage, water, utilities, roads, and public services such as schools, fire, police, and health facilities. This was an uneconomical pattern.

Banning the Boom

Once more, Cali, a grayly suburban jut about recycling urban blighted try to pay. Connared into an isolated city to economic stagnation, only a white wilderness, full of houses and streets, has public utilities, roads, and public services, but the city is beyond most residents' reach, and the nearest schools must now use an extra session. In 1967, the U.S. Census counted 10,000 people in O'Shaughnessy, and the middle schools were empty. The city's schools were packed.

Unfortunately, the trend of house builders has been to build more expensive homes on undeveloped land, pushing outward on the city center. Large areas of undeveloped or underdeveloped land lie in between and are usually held open for speculation.

The sketches in the margin tell the story. An existing urban area (1) grew and sent out a shoot (2) of houses and other development. As the population grew and land became more expensive around settled areas, developers bought up cheaper developmen and underdeveloped land lies in between and are usually held open for speculation.

Services that supported these communities had to be extended out across undeveloped land to new developments—sewage, water, utilities, roads, and public services such as schools, fire, police, and health facilities. This was an uneconomical pattern.
Thus leapfrogging was expensive to the city that provided urban services. It cost a great deal of money to lay sewer and water lines and roads past undeveloped land to serve a small development farther out. In most cities the developer paid little of this cost. In effect his development was "subsidized" by all other taxpayers in the city.

The parcels of land passed over when development leapfrogged out from the cities were generally no longer practical for use as farms. Farmers' taxes had to be raised to pay for the urban services that passed them by. Since the owners could make no money at farming, they wanted to sell and get out. The result was more subdivisions, mobile home parks, commercial development, machine shops, warehousing and other small-scale industry, junkyards, and municipal dumps. (If the landowner held out long enough, perhaps a developer would appear to build apartments or townhouses in a more planned manner.)

The overall picture of this kind of uncoordinated development in the Valley has been one of CLUTTER.

Basically, there are three qualities of the Willamette Valley that make people happy to live there: a low-key, relaxed way of life; a feeling of closeness to nature and open space; and a feeling of living a "small town life," even in an urban area.

As clutter has appeared on the landscape, these qualities diminished or became compromised. The Valley is big, and it has not been the victim of massive development like the Santa Clara Valley in California was decades ago. The kind of building and development going on has affected the environment as significantly as the amount of structures built. Clutter in 2002 is not very deep on the land. It generally has occurred along the arterials. The roads leading from downtown get the most clutter because they are most accessible to everyone by car.

But if clutter doesn't "populate" the land very heavily, it is highly visible. It screens and obliterates the landscape and blocks out the natural environment. Without forewarning, people found they have been cut off from the experience of the Valley in many places by the thin neon line of clutter. By using the Valley in a haphazard fashion, people have lost qualities that they love. The river itself has been cut off at many points from access by the public.

Land has generally gone up for sale when its purchase value exceeded its current returns as an operating farm, pasture, or dairy.....regardless of the soil potential, natural conditions or value as "open space".

While people may move to the suburbs for the "improvement" of owning their own homes, the developments themselves provide little social variety of choice in how to live. They all follow a rather homogeneous pattern. There is social mobility, but within the confines of a rather bland system.

This spread to the suburbs has had a profound effect on older urban areas, and even on established close-in suburbs.
As growth has spread out, older existing neighborhoods and commercial facilities have tended to deteriorate. In many cases they have died functionally before they actually wore out physically. As residential buildings deteriorated in the cities, there was often a similar decline of schools, playgrounds, parks, health facilities, and other public services. This is a living example of the equation shown earlier.

Social patterns have changed as new residents move into decaying housing. Minorities and the poor now reside in lower-cost housing, they are seen as a threat by middle-income people, who continue their flight to the suburbs.

Shopping centers and other commercial facilities further out in the suburbs have drained business away from downtown. People now get in their cars and drive a mile or so to the nearest shopping center rather than coming in to the inner city to shop.

To try and meet this competition, cities have continued to build car-free malls and parking lot structures downtown, all of which is quite expensive. Yet most people still prefer to shop in their own communities where there is ample street-level parking all around. This has even hurt shopping centers closer in to the city. Construction of newer and more elaborate commercial facilities further out has caused them to deteriorate functionally.

It resembles the pattern of a pebble thrown in a pond. Commercial activity ripples further and further out, leaving the center becalmed. Development may leapfrog. Obsolescence settles in behind it.

All this scattered development is possible because the automobile and the highway system make movement very easy. At the same time, the automobile and its streets and parking facilities consume so much land that developments must sprawl, and people are so spread out that mass transit cannot be economical.

Trends established in the 1970’s, then have:

- contributed to the decline of urban centers residencially and commercially;
- encouraged patchwork development and consequent scatter-action and inefficient use of land;
- resulted in commercial sprawl which has camouflaged the environment of the Willamette Valley under a veil of visual pollution; and
- through dependence on the private automobile to give access to spreading development, caused more and more developments to grow out over an increasing network of roads.

The pattern of land use and development by now has resembled the Santa Clara Valley in California. Though the population growth is not as great, and though the Willamette Valley is bigger, the trends have been the same. Uncontrolled scatter-action and growth with few incentives for farmers to keep land in agriculture have cluttered our Valley particularly around Portland, Salem, and Eugene.
As economic pressures increase, farms go on the block and are replaced by single-family residential developments.

This is made possible by roads and highways serving people's dependence on private automobiles. By providing access to areas away from cities, the road system permits spread of the suburbs.

The result frequently is that development skips over some of the more expensive open space closer to downtown, and occupies less costly land -- generally former farms -- further out. Municipalities have to extend services over distances to provide sewage disposal, water, roadways, and other necessities. Taxpayers are usually the ones to foot the bills.

One of the results is clutter -- signs, billboards, growing roadways, trailer parks, roadside stands, parking lots, drive-ins, outdoor movies. Clutter does not take up a lot of space, but it hides from view what remains.
In some parts of the Valley, as in this aerial view near Portland taken in 1972, the floor of the Valley was beginning to fill in years ago.

Maybe it can't happen in the Willamette Valley -- and maybe it can by 2050 or 2060 -- but a similar, though smaller valley in California had a grim fate in the mid-20th Century. At the left is what the floor of the beautiful Santa Clara Valley looked like in 1950. Not too different from the Willamette Valley in 1972. And at the right is what the Santa Clara Valley looked like in the same spot only 20 years later, after unplanned and uncontrolled development.
In 1972, many areas in the Valley were still in agricultural use. The Valley floor was open. People lived around the major cities and towns for the most part. Suburbs had spread out from the edges of cities and developers were beginning to exploit the open space still further out.

Ten years later, developments had spread out even further onto the former farmland near the big cities. Developments "leapfrogged" over more expensive land to less costly farmland out in the country. The open space in between began to decline in value.

By 1992, the open areas that had been bypassed began to fill up with residential areas, mobile home parks and industry. This required new road networks to serve private automobiles. Roads made the developments possible - then developments made the roads necessary.

In 2002, the Valley environment is dominated by "clutter" - a continuing spread of single-family housing developments and the commercial areas that serve them. The clutter does not extend back very far from the roads - but it effectively hides the landscape that everyone loved.
Two major factors have shaped the use of land in the Willamette Valley: the single-family house and the private automobile.

Most people prefer to own homes outside the center city. This has enticed developers to buy up open space in the country and use it for the construction of suburban housing developments.

As farmland and other open space close to existing developments rose in cost, developers bought up less expensive land further out. Later on the bypassed land filled up with strip commercial areas, industry, smaller residential areas and mobile home parks.

Naturally, more roads had to be built - locals, collectors and arterials. People depended almost completely on the private automobile to get around.

Slowly, the open space of the Willamette Valley has begun to vanish behind a screen of urban sprawl and commercial "clutter". The Valley environment that drew so many residents in earlier years has lost much of its former charm.
SCENARIO 1: TRANSPORTATION

How people move themselves and their goods and merchandise from place to place has given form to their environment.

You have only to compare Venice, where people ride on the water and walk on the land, with American cities where people ride in cars, buses, trains and elevators, to see how this happens.

The tight urban villages of Europe and the early settlements in our own country developed because people had to walk to their destinations. Our new sprawling suburban communities which surged forth after World War II owed much of their form to the automobile as a means of getting about.

How has transportation affected the Willamette Valley in the past few decades?

As housing and commercial development spread across the Valley people depended on private automobiles for movement, with increasing use of buses in urban areas and between cities.

This reliance on the automobile and buses, plus the related pattern of suburban housing developments, meant that a network of roads and streets was required to give access at all points to people's houses, shopping centers, into the city, and other places people wanted to go.

There had to be a hierarchy of different roadways servicing the automobile: locals, which let people drive around their own communities; collectors, which collect traffic from many local streets and funnel them toward high speed routes; arterials, which are important conduits for center-to-center travel; and freeways and highways, which handle more long-distance high-speed traffic. (*High speed* in name only, since the crush of private automobiles at peak hours in 2002 causes slowdowns on many highways and arterials.)

Because of scattered patterns of suburban development existing and new roadways have often had to be modified. With new growth taking place further out, some:

- collectors became arterials;
- locals became collectors;
- and there has been a need for more new locals.

This is because new developments further out require locals in existing residential areas to be widened... and widened again when traffic builds up more.

In these situations, people increasingly find themselves living "by the side of the road" or having their homes moved back to make room for the traffic. In some neighborhoods, the developer or the road-building agency seeks to ease this condition by making wide setbacks from the roadway. This uses a lot of land while seeking to solve a problem.

Land use for transportation has become an important factor in how the Valley environment looks. In areas of housing developments and related uses, as much as 20 - 25% of the land is in roads, streets, and private and commercial parking areas (generally at street level). In cities it can go up to 40 - 45%.
People have to be able to get their cars home and park them there. Many households have more than one car.

The cars require not just one, but a number of storage places:

- where the owner lives;
- where the owner works;
- where the owner shops and does business;
- where the owner goes for fun and recreation;
- where the owner goes to school, the doctor, the beauty parlor, and so on.

If we estimate that a generous parking space plus access takes 400 square feet per car, each car in the Valley today requires 1,200 square feet or more of storage space. Given 800,000 two-car families, this can mean as much as 45,000 acres for parking alone.

Development patterns and movement patterns seem to be mutually dependent.

To build housing developments increasingly further out in the country, developers require public-financed roads to bring homeowners out. Once these roads are built, the development pattern extends out again, and requires more roads for servicing (and an extension of the other services that suburban communities need, such as sewage, power, water, police and fire protection).

The car and its roads make the housing development possible and the housing development makes the car and its roads necessary. Both, by the spread-out and unconnected nature of development, make a rail transit system unlikely and uneconomical. Rail transit depends on clustering, on aggregations of village-type housing. It become less practical with spread out suburban-type development.

The effect of dependence on private autos in the cities has been quite striking:

- there is a need for increasingly larger roadways and off-ramps to bring the cars downtown from the suburbs;
- once the cars are downtown, they must be housed in parking structures or on parking lots;
- cars have to be serviced at each destination point in the city; and
- there is increased dependence on one-way streets.

Streets and roads have become overcrowded at peak hours even though arterials were designed with many lanes to handle just this peak hour traffic. For 20 hours per day the extra lanes are unnecessary, and the expensive urban land they consume lies wasted. Residents of the city breathe air pollutants from cars, trucks, and buses in Portland which become trapped in the center city, then tend to spill out and drift up the Valley airshed, smogging the Valley and hiding the mountains.
In 1972 the highways were within designed capacity, but the state decided not to build any more major routes.

This happened despite the fact that the Valley was relatively free of air pollution under the 1975 Federal controls before 1990. Since then, the number of increased vehicles has brought air pollution up again despite further controls.

Trends toward increased horsepower have tended to increase pollution by consuming more gasoline and producing more exhaust.

Air pollution hasn't been the only problem connected with automobiles. Over the years the level of noise generally emanating from vehicular traffic has increased in the Valley adding to people's discomfort and stress. Physiological and psychological problems have arisen--mainly in urban and built-up areas--and the public and public officials are concerned about the problem. Solid waste problems have developed as people try to dispose of tires, waste oil, car bodies and parts.

If this paints a negative picture of dependence on private automobiles, there are many who might not want it any other way. Cars do provide the opportunity for people who own them to go where they want, when they want. Some people see this freedom as vital. In the Willamette Valley, however, people are concerned about what this freedom does to the environment and how land is used. But most still want to drive their own cars.
Practically the only way people can get to recreational facilities, for instance, is by using their cars. When they get to a park or recreation area, they need large parking lots.

This has caused a situation where people's needs for open space and recreation have conflicted with their auto-oriented way of life. They ruin what they want by going there in large numbers and all in private vehicles.

TRUCKING

Along with the private auto, the truck is an important mover in the Valley. Trucking makes heavy use of highways up and down the Valley, particularly in serving the Portland distribution center. Trucks also bring goods and products to and from more locally based industries such as pulp mills and metallurgical mills. They also haul mobile home units over increasing distances.

Trucks are a convenient means of moving goods over public roadways. They also work well in conjunction with containerized cargo at the port. This is a major business in the Valley, especially in Portland.

Trucks, though, are noisy, contribute to air pollution, cause wear and tear on the road system, and clog up urban areas.

AIR TRANSPORT

There has been a massive increase in air travel and in general aviation since the 1970’s. (General aviation includes private aircraft and non-scheduled commercial flights.)

The major airports in Portland, Eugene, and Salem have had to enlarge physically to accommodate this increase, and there have been 15 new general aviation airports built over the past three decades. About 1,700 new acres have had to be devoted to airports since 1972.
The auto in cities

"In all the world's cities, from Bogota to Bangkok to Boston, the conflict between the city and the car is at the point of impending crisis," the Brookings Institution says in a new research report, "Making Cities Liveable." The report was adapted from a book by Wilfred Owen, The Accessible City.

The report considers the automobile the prime cause of many urban problems in the United States. The car has made it possible, it says, for "people with enough money and the right color" to engage in a massive out-migration to the suburbs.

The negative effects of this trend are not being countered by community plans or by appropriate safeguards to prevent the pollution of the air and the safety of the cities left behind. This pattern has been copied all over the world, with particular devotion to less developed countries, it says.

Some of the ill effects everywhere include: The creation of unmanageable megalopolitan sprawl, congestion, inefficient street systems and the related problem of inefficient land use, the absence of facilities for pedestrians in locations where walking would be the most efficient mode of transport, and lack of public and social service. All this has the ultimate effect of helping to create the kind of urban environment that has led to automobile dependence. A realistic and growing problem. A starting point for solutions, if proposed, might be mass transit.
Continuing dependence on private automobiles for transportation around the valley requires that provision for vehicular movement be made.

Oregon has decided against more big highways. Is double-decking a possibility for the future?
From World War II the vast majority of Valley residents have depended on their own private automobiles for transportation for any and all purposes—to work, to school, to the shopping center, visiting, and going on vacation. Until the 1970's this auto-dependence did not have a tremendously adverse effect on the environment.

However, the trend continued, and by 1982, the continuing expansion of residential and other developments out further into the countryside was being made more and more possible by new roads of various capacities: local streets, local collectors, arterials, and the connections to existing freeways. Some people were using bus lines.

By 1992, the network of roads, streets, collectors, and arterials had intensified again. To serve the increased population and its vehicles, these systems had to be constantly renewed and upgraded. A lot more land was devoted to the movement and storage of cars. People had to park their cars at home, at work, and anywhere else they took them.

In 2002, a population of 2,500,000 people, most of whom have more than one car per family, really utilizes the increased roadway system of the Valley. Accompanying the spread of houses to the open space and the growth of roads has been the other roadside uses that occur in the suburbs: drive-ins, outdoor movies, shopping centers.
Back in the early 1970's, the Oregon state government, concerned about the effect of massive highway systems on the environment, decided against constructing any major new freeways.

Thus, I-5 and 99-East and 99-West are still the major routes up and down the Valley.

Since the population has increased by 1,100,000 people in the last 30 years, and the number of private vehicles along with it, there has had to be an increase in the roadways that handle the traffic.

These increases have been, of necessity, in the local streets and roads, collectors, and arterials that provide access to existing freeways and to the cities where most of the people commute to work.

The consequence of this, seen in the map of the Valley in 2002, has been the consumption of more and more land for the use of vehicles. In addition, much land has been needed for parking in urban areas, in commercial and industrial zones in the suburbs, and for the cars and campers of people who drive them to rivers, parks, and wilderness recreational areas.

Another consequence of the almost exclusive dependence on private transportation (there has been an increase in use of buses) has been that a Valley-wide system of public transit integrally planned with other types of development has been made economically impossible.
SCENARIO 1: OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION

"...the mountains
Grazing lands and the meadow lands and the ground
Sweet and open and well drained."

That is what the poet Archibald MacLeish wrote about the Willamette Valley as seen by Lewis and Clark back in 1806 (see inside back cover).

Over the years, that is what has given the region its uncommon hold on people - the open spaces of mountains, rivers, buttes, forest and farmland. It has been as unique a symbol of the Valley as crowded skyscrapers have of New York or a vast blue bay of San Francisco.

Trends that began after World War II caused the loss of some of this quality, and the erosion of open space and recreation facilities.
PRIVATE OPEN SPACE

Since 1972, there has been a decreasing supply of open land in agricultural use. Falling farm profits and the tendency to develop land further away from city centers has caused many landowners to sell their land. This is particularly true of marginal farm lands that have fallen out of production because of competition from other areas of the U.S. Advancing technology has increased the productivity of prime land and marginally productive lands have become unprofitable. As agricultural usage has declined, this land has become available for development in 10-40-100 acre parcels for housing developments and in smaller lots for mobile home parks and commercial centers.

The result has been extensive physical and visual clutter--open space screened, hidden, or made inaccessible by random and scattered intrusions. Since these developments have been random and scattered, they obliterate more open space and scenery than they actually occupy.

The problem is not so much development itself, but the small-scale scattering of all kinds of developments, which give a mangy quality to the landscape. The quantity of development is bad enough, but its quality oppresses the senses of Oregonians. "It's like finding a beer can on a wilderness trail."

The out-of-doors recreation, for which the Valley has long been renowned, has suffered from unplanned development.

More and more housing subdivisions, commercial areas, and the roads and parking lots that service them have destroyed wildlife habitats. Encroachment on streams has harmed fish and diminished propagation. Declining levels of maximum substantial yield for fish and wildlife have occurred concurrently with the presence of 882,000 licensed fishermen and 360,000 licensed hunters in 2002.

PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

Public open space--parks, recreation areas, rivers, wilderness--has deteriorated because of more automobiles, more intensive use by the larger Valley population and more tourists.

Access to open space has become less efficient. People must drive to it--and the land has become less effectively utilized.

Use, accessibility, and enjoyment of open space have been compromised by the patterns of land use (scattered development) and transportation (lots of cars and roads). We have less public open space in all respects--amount, quality, and availability.
URBAN OPEN SPACE

Urban open space has been in short supply for a number of years. People and freeways have competed for access to water front with freeways usually winning. Disintegrating city cores have lost people and business to the suburbs and are able to afford fewer and fewer parks, open spaces, and recreation areas.

Urban open spaces have been created and maintained where there is a strong social and community base—where people are "together." In transitional areas where existing buildings have deteriorated and a ghetto environment has taken over, there is little new and replenished open space.

How do the residents of the Valley experience its open space and the recreation opportunities that are part of it as they move into the 21st Century?

There is no doubt that parks and open spaces in rural areas and the wilds are still more available to Valley residents than to residents of more crowded regions. The Greenway system of parks along the Willamette River (nearly 250 miles long now) is right at the center of the region. Some remaining farmland has been kept open through tax incentives from the state, and it forms a "visual amenity" for people. Wilder areas up in the more rugged hills and mountains are also open.

But much of this space, especially in land formerly occupied by farms, is gradually disappearing beneath clutter, developments and the roadways leading to them.

People in other areas might scoff at the Oregonian’s concern for dwindling open space. "You have more than anybody! We come all the way from Southern California just to visit your parks and camp sites!"

But residents of the Valley know that when open space has been "paved over", it almost never becomes open space again. It is like using up capital when you could live on interest.

It has been noted by many behavioral scientists and psychologists that open space exerts a positive psychological effect on people, particularly people who face the same sort of environment every day.

Open space is "functional," too. It acts positively as an air purifier. By not adding to existing pollution it also has a beneficial effect. Open space can retain fresh water as ground water and doesn’t add to pollution like new developments do. Open space dissipates noise pollution.

There are some forms of recreation that invite crowds and even flourish with large numbers of people, such as group sports and spectator sports. These are frequently urban modes, however. The Valley is especially beloved for its recreation opportunities in rural and wild settings where other people are an intrusion—camping along the river, hiking and climbing in the mountains, enjoying a quiet fishing holiday.
Yet Valley people seem to have been getting less open space and recreation than they "pay" for. Per acre costs have gone up because of increasing emphasis on development and continuing need for more real estate. Competition for land makes open space harder to buy. Prime land has been going to large scale homebuilders who can better afford it.

Costly provisions for access and parking in recreation areas have used up a lot of our open space, and the presence of many cars degrades the recreational quality of open spaces.

Oregon has had many good laws and regulations concerning open space and related recreation activities. One bill requires that 1% of highway funds and gas tax money go for bicycle and foot trails along developing roads and in park areas. Continuing examinations of ways to develop the Greenway park system and similar areas on the Willamette's tributaries have helped retain open space.

Land use can be regulated by law. But there are less visible pressures having to do with the way people live in 2002. Most people have much more leisure time--shorter work weeks and longer vacations. They have developed habits of using open space and recreation places unknown a generation ago.

The weekend drives people used to take for recreation stopped being fun in the 1960's; now they wish to escape the traffic. They can pack up for four-day weekends for hunting and fishing and camping trips. They can leave the Valley for lengthy vacations, but that only means their counterparts are coming into the Valley for their vacations. A lot of people favor day trips to river parks or the hills for hiking and picnics.

All of this means that remaining open space can get pretty frayed from over-use. This particularly so near urban and suburban areas, where there is heavy daily use of facilities.

In 1972 an article on the revived Willamette River in the National Geographic stated "obviously, man and nature have come to terms along the Willamette."

"Come to terms" sounds rather warlike, but perhaps it describes what is needed more and more in the Valley in 2002.

People are far from antagonistic to nature. In the year 2002 they treasure it and are as profoundly aware of its importance as they were back in 1972. But there are more cars, more people with more leisure time, all competing for less land. And the measures taken in 1972 to preserve and acquire land and prevent its cluttering have not been adequate for our needs in 2002.
OPEN SPACE & THE CONTINUATION OF 1972 TRENDS

The open space of the Willamette Valley is one of the major factors giving it the special quality that people admire. Residents are concerned that it seems to be disappearing.

Land formerly in farms, dairies, orchards, and pastures is being phased out and bought up for construction of other uses.

Some land uses - such as logging - have taken areas of open space out of commission for long periods of time. The land can't be used for other purposes while it recuperates.

Continuing need for power has caused increased intrusion onto the landscape by power lines, stanchions, and power stations.

The need for - and lack of - urban open space is acute. Here in the city is where many other uses often occupy the land. New connectors have been built to accommodate an ever-increasing flow of commuter traffic from the suburbs.

Even where there is urban open space, as at Forest Park in Portland (right in photo), it is often compromised. Here the people cannot reach the river, which is isolated beyond freeway, railroad, and industrial and marine installations.
Further into the Valley, the picture improves, but this scene indicates too that the only way people can get to open spaces and recreation at distances from the city is by the private automobile.

People go for long jaunts in search of open space recreation, often in vehicles designed for the purpose. They take their houses with them. Such access to public open space frays its natural aspects.

Here we are in 2002. The ideal of man and his faithful companion alone on a beautiful stretch of rural river isn't possible when 2,500,000 Valley residents want to get to the dwindling supply of open space.
There was plenty of open space in the Valley in 1972 when the population was only 1.4 million. People could take family drives through the countryside, enjoying the views or go for picnics in county or state parks. Generally they could feel a closeness to nature and enjoy sweeping panoramas of the Valley.

In 1982, new roads and developments had used up large portions of the available open land - mostly farmlands that were becoming difficult to manage economically. Open space seemed much scarcer. On family drives, you were likely to pass through more built-up areas.

By 1992, it was getting hard to find uncluttered open space. The Valley was filling up with new development. People of course continued to use their cars to get to parks and recreational areas. This meant more parking lots and roads in the wilderness and rural areas.

By 2002, much of the open space of the Willamette Valley has disappeared for good. Everywhere you look there is scattered development and commercial infill. More cars, more roads, more people - the Valley has become more like a city and open spaces are increasingly further away.
Since 1972, the population of the Willamette Valley has grown by 1.1 million people. Out-of-state tourists are pouring into the state in greater numbers every year. This has put considerable pressure on the Valley's available open space and recreational facilities.

In the 1970’s, the Greenway park system was begun along the banks of the Willamette River. It is the main system of open space on the floor of the Valley today. Though it has grown since 1972, it remains strained and over-used.

The picture is brighter in areas that are 25 miles or more from the cities. These parks are still in good shape - but every year the higher levels of tourists and Oregon residents who drive out to enjoy them create new pressures. New parking places must be provided for cars and campers.

Several Valley residents go to the coast or to central and eastern Oregon for recreational opportunities. Overcrowding is becoming a problem there as well.

In the cities and suburbs open space is at a premium. Land use has been based primarily on economic profit - thus the space available for recreation has diminished year by year.
By the year 2002, the Willamette Valley has demonstrated an exceptional degree of economic and demographic growth.

Employment has levelled off in two of the Valley's major industries - agriculture and forest products. But this situation has been more than balanced by employment gains in other sectors of the economy.

The manufacturing base has diversified. There has been an increase in the government and service sectors. Together they have provided a major impetus for economic growth.

This growth has produced many economic and social benefits; it has also created social burdens.

On the benefit side, a high rate of economic growth has helped provide more job openings for people of the Valley. Nevertheless, unemployment has been slow to decline because the increase in job opportunities has attracted many "outsiders" to the Valley. In fact about 50% of the Valley's population growth in the last 30 years has been caused by people coming into the Valley from outside. This means less than half of the Valley's population growth since 1970 has been due to natural increase (births over deaths).

Unfortunately for Oregonians, many of the new jobs created by economic growth have been filled by qualified persons coming into the Valley from other areas. This tended to keep less skilled Oregonians on the unemployment rolls.

The distribution of the population has added to the unemployment problem in the Valley. Most development over the last 30 years has taken place in the metropolitan areas of Portland, Salem, and Eugene, resulting in an imbalance of employment opportunities in smaller communities of the Valley.

Despite this pool of hard-core unemployed, economic growth and job expansion resulted in raising incomes for the majority of people in the Valley. In 1970, per capita personal income averaged $3,877. In 2002, it has increased to around $15,000, representing a growth rate of over 4.5 per cent a year.
Some of this increase has been inflationary, however, and income growth in real terms has been proportionately less. But, even after inflation, real per capita income since 1970 (stated in 1967 dollars) has risen from $3,335 to $7,500, reflecting a significant gain in the average person's purchasing power over the past three decades.

Much of the growth in per capita incomes has gone into increased consumer spending. This increase in per capita consumption along with the growing number of consumers has further stimulated the economy of the Valley, creating additional jobs in the industries which produce consumer products.

This rapid economic development and accompanying population growth has produced heavy pressures upon the government to provide new and expanded programs, particularly in the areas of environment and social services. Thus an increasing share of the average person's income has gone to financing government services. In 1970, disposable personal income of Valley residents amounted to about 86% of total personal income. By 2002, this proportion has been reduced to approximately 82%, meaning that a steadily increasing proportion of personal income is used to finance government.

So while economic growth has generated greater public revenue, it has also brought about an even greater demand for government services.

The Valley's development over the past three decades has been accompanied by the rise of numerous social and ecological problems. The environmental and social disruption associated with pollution, urban sprawl, urban decay, traffic congestion and resource depletion intensified as the economy and population expanded.

From an economic standpoint, the social costs that came with rapid economic development should have been given more attention in planning 30 years ago. In 1972, the people of the Valley still had a tendency to isolate the economic benefits of development from the related social costs. The costs were there, but they were not obvious enough to arouse the concern of the Valley's people.

This was natural enough in the past because social costs were difficult to identify and estimate. They were long-range in nature and ordinarily did not have a direct financial impact on people. As a result, the market system had never put a price on them for the consumer to pay.
In 1972, the Valley's dependence on resource-based industries was declining and undergoing a changeover to non-resource-based industries. This meant a decline in the economy and population of communities that had been dependent on timber products and agriculture. By 1982, the pattern was quite evident.

Non-resource-based industries located for the most part around growing urban centers, and the people who were employed in them settled in the suburbs outside the cities. In Portland, the growth of service industries and related commerce was pronounced.

Agglomeration of industry and suburbs around urban areas is still on the increase in 2002. Increased roadways are needed to carry more commuter cars and the goods and materials transporters.
The trend ever since the 1970's has been for industry to locate in and around established urban centers, principally Portland, Salem, Eugene, Corvallis, Springfield, and Albany. Industries based on agriculture and timber products have declined and non-resource-based industries have increased, and with them the desire to be close to urban centers and transportation lines.

Portland's greatest growth has been in service industry and business such as financial enterprises, real estate, construction. A considerable increase in tonnage for the port has also occurred. Air travel and cargo handling have increased at the airports of Portland, Salem, and Eugene, and there has been a growth of general aviation business in the smaller fields in the Valley.

People generally live outside the cities and use private cars to commute to work. This can be a slow process in 2002.
The concern with various forms of pollution that were afflicting the Valley and the rest of the nation back in the 1960's and 1970's paid off in a number of good remedies for specific pollutants.

The Willamette River, which was going the way of Lake Erie back in the 1960's was revived, restored, and made a fit water environment for man and fish through the joint efforts of the state, the Federal government and private industry, in the short span of 5 years.

Oregon has prided itself for a number of years in going beyond basic standards of air and water purity. Most of the nation looked to this state as a leader in pollution control and abatement.

By 2000, tertiary sewage treatment was universal in the Willamette Valley. The by-products of treatment have even found their way into the Valley economy in the form of fertilizer and fish food derived from dried and processed odorless residue. Water flows clean and clear.

The story is not quite so rosy concerning air pollution. By rigid observance of the 1975 Federal air pollution controls for motor vehicles, the Valley's air was relatively pure up until about ten years ago. Then, the increasing numbers of automobiles driven by the Valley's 2,500,000 inhabitants drove air pollution over acceptable marks again, and officials have had to re-examine controls and requirements for high levels of air quality.

An area that has received adequate control is exotic wastes and odor pollution. When pulp mills successfully combatted their air pollution problems in the 1970's, unpleasant odors still emanated from the plants. Through new chemical technology, this was cured and no longer assails the nostrils of Valley residents.

Four pollution problems do remain to plague people in the Valley. They are noise, solid waste disposal, visual pollution, and heat dispersion.

Noise has become an area of concern--noise from planes, trains, jackhammers, trucks, road machinery and private vehicular traffic on an increasing grid of roads, streets, arterials, and highways through the spreading suburbs in the Valley.

In the 1970's, medical authorities began detecting hearing impairment among people exposed continually to noise pollution. Doctors discovered harmful psychological effects from persistent exposure to noise in the form of anxiety and tension. This is a problem that the Department of Environmental Quality has tried to solve for a number of years without any conclusive results.
The disposal of solid waste, garbage and refuse on open land has continued. As land fill it has required a total of 20,000 acres by 2002. It is predicted to fill another 10,000 acres in the next ten years.

Some recycling measures have been instituted, however; mainly where they were economically feasible. There are strict controls on the disposal and recycling of metal and glass beverage containers, for instance.

There is concern over the heat given off by the many steam-driven electric generating plants. Those powered by nuclear reactors have the added potential of radiation leakage. National standards have been set and the state has endeavored to live up to them or better them, but the huge demand for electricity is difficult to deal with. Few good hydro-electric sites remained after the 1960's.

One of the areas of considerable irritation is visual pollution. This was described under Land Use as clutter, and it is the result of land-extensive development in leapfrogging, scattered-site patterns. All the small-scale commercial uses, trailer parks, and less-expensive housing developments that fill in between bigger developments cause visual blight along the roadways and effectively obscure the Willamette Valley from view.

This kind of pollution is qualitative, although there is concern that too much of the Valley floor is being absorbed. But not many fried chicken drive-ins, gas stations, drive-in movies, and trailer parks have to be built along the arterials to alarm people that the Valley is disappearing. People are becoming increasingly concerned about this form of pollution which is beginning to make the Valley look increasingly like the areas around Los Angeles. Many people feel that something must be done. Sign controls and some zoning controls have been applied but more stringent regulators will have to be applied before it is too late.

The Valley is an "air shed" as well as a water shed. This means that smog and pollution that start in Portland, with its industry and constant stream of automobiles, drifts outward, being added to by vehicular and industrial pollutants along the way. The air becomes hazy, and at times it is impossible to see the mountain. Inversions of temperature can keep this smog below a layer of colder air and intensify the problem.

Costs and benefits of pollution control

An area of increasing controversy is the economics of pollution abatement. Conservatives in the Nixon Administration claim costs of abatement will be huge, the benefits will sometimes be small and that the nation's standard of living will deteriorate as the public pays the tab. Although many economists disagree, there have been few precise studies that clearly delineate cost-benefit ratios.

The National Wildlife Federation has just completed a study of pollution abatement. The organization estimates that cleanup programs will yield far more benefits to the public than they will cost. The reason, according to Director Thomas Kimball: To allow pollution to continue is very expensive. Air pollution damages in the United States in 1972 will cost nearly $13 billion. Kimball says. The figures do not begin to include the less quantifiable costs such as those of health effects.

Kimball says it is important to match programs with potential benefits. Air pollution abatement began in 1970, and by 1975, the average family would reaped $1 billion. By 1980, Kimball says. The savings will begin to build, and by 1990, the benefits of air pollution abatement would begin to rise. But public support would begin to wane and begin to wane.

Many people feel that something must be done. Sign controls and some zoning controls have been applied but more stringent regulators will have to be applied before it is too late.
Oregon's strict observance of air and water pollution standards began to have positive effects in the 1970's. The clean-up of the Willamette River was a notable event that made news all over the U.S. Other kinds of pollution were beginning to cause concern, however.

By 1982, adherence to Federal air pollution standards of 1975 had reduced emissions from vehicular and industrial sources to a satisfactory level. Water standards were also satisfactory. But visual and noise pollution were on the rise with a growing population and increases in car traffic.

Even observance of the 1975 Federal standards for air quality was inadequate by 1992, when the population and its autos had grown beyond the bounds of the controls. Along with increasing distress caused by noise and clutter, disposal of solid wastes was a major concern.

Today's heavily consumption-oriented society is faced with tons of solid wastes that must use up open space in the form of landfill. Visual pollution in the form of clutter has increased, as has noise, and air quality is undesirable.
Despite Oregon's high standards against pollution of all kinds, the Valley in 2002 suffers from several forms of pollution that have compromised the famous quality of its environment.

The principal reasons for pollution:
- more people
- spread development
- more motor vehicles.

This combination causes more air pollution, more noise, more visual pollution or clutter on the landscape. The society is one that consumes more and more materials and products, and has to throw them away on open land as land fill.

High requirements for energy and power have made necessary building nuclear power plants for satisfying 50% of the Valley's needs. A related problem of excess heat dispersal from these plants now faces authorities.

In many places, the Valley has "disappeared" under clutter, smog, and land fill. Great efforts and expense will be necessary to return it to its former high quality.
Nuclear power plant coastal sites selected

PORTLAND, ORE. (AP) -- Portland General Electric Co. engineers were on a cruise recently off Tillamook County for a possible nuclear power plant.

The coast is "back from the blush" and would not be the site of a nuclear power plant, executives say, but "nothing's been ruled out.

The area is "back from the blush" except that we don't want to blow things up, and there are other potential sites on the mainland in Wash and Or., and in Cali., south of Sacramento and LA, and near the Nevada-California line.

TAPING, near Anchorage, The company hopes to have a monumental decision after 1982, he said.

Warren said a Portland general engineering firm would be doing a study on the potential for a new nuclear power plant on the Oregon coast if the Oregon Legislature would sign off on it, as has been done in Wash.

The company is also studying sites on the mainland in Wash and Or., but has no plans to develop them.

The state's energy needs have soared in recent years, and the company is planning to have a nuclear power plant running in the early 1980s.

Warren said the company is not looking for a site yet, but is considering several areas along the Oregon coast, including the Tillamook County site.

Energy consumption and the growth of population have fed each other over the years. The bigger the amount of one, the faster the other grows.

But energy consumption has grown faster than population.

Our consumption-oriented, highly industrialized society has become dependent on vast supplies of energy. Yet these supplies are becoming scarcer and more expensive. Tapping these supplies has serious effects on the welfare of the environment (and consequently, the people). People are concerned in 2002 by threats to air and water quality and the negative aspects of a "waste" economy.

The major energy needs are for industrial processes, especially aluminum smelting; transportation, especially private automobiles; and space and water heating for cities and new developments.

Several energy and power sources still are available in the Valley for various uses. Fuel oils, electricity, and natural and bottled gases are used in housing. Vehicles still depend mainly on fossil fuels but more and more oil is being imported and the price of all petroleum products has risen appreciably. Hydro-electric power peaked around 1980, and then no further increase was deemed practical. (Remember in the 1960's and 1950's when people thought of it as an "inexhaustible" resource?)

Electric energy has grown the fastest over the years. It continues to be supplied by thermal generating plants fired by oil, coal and nuclear fuel. The fear of nuclear power plants subsided, and people are as accustomed to them as the British became years ago. Today nuclear power plants provide 50% of the Valley's power.

Some sources of heat and power continue to be under-utilized in the Valley. They include the enormous amount of excess heat expended by thermal generating plants that could be used for central city steam heat, but is not. Instead this heat is discharged into the atmosphere or bodies of water. Energy from solid wastes has not yet been tapped and the effluent continues to pose pollution problems.

Increased power needs and the 40-year life span of the nuclear fission plant have intensified development of alternative means of power generation — mainly magneto hydro-dynamics and breeder and fusion reactors. In 2002, we stand at the dividing point between the older technology and what is to come.

The pattern of suburban spread development and reliance on private automobiles is both symptom and cause of this energy crisis. Extension of utilities and services across open land, and the network of roads for automobiles have required formidable amounts of energy and power. Lack of cohesive planning has resulted in energy loss and uneconomic use of resources over the years.
Ever since the mid-20th Century, we have lived in a consumption oriented, highly industrialized society. It has placed immense demands on energy and power sources. Throughout the 1970's the old pattern continued - single-family housing in spreading suburbs reached by private automobiles. It has reinforced the demand for power and energy.

Hydroelectric power was once thought of as inexhaustible. But it peaked in the early 1980's. New electric energy has been supplied by thermal generating plants fired by oil, coal and nuclear fuel. Private automobiles are increasingly expensive to own because gasoline prices are constantly going up. Domestic supplies of fossil fuels are dwindling and more fuel is imported.

In 1992, there are still some sources of energy that are untapped by Valley citizens - notably the excess heat from thermal generating plants that could be used for central city steam heat. There is also energy to be found in the solid wastes that now go into landfill.

In 2002, men are searching for new sources of power generation. Although nuclear power plants provide more than half the Valley requirements, demand is still increasing and nuclear fission plants have a very short "life." Men are turning to alternative sources - mainly magneto hydrodynamics and breeder and fusion reactors.
Energy consumption in the Valley reflects the patterns of land development and transportation routes. In and around the cities where people live and work and where industry is located, energy consumption is great.

It is somewhat less in the surrounding residential suburbs, though it is still heavy.

Consumption is lowest of all in the remaining rural parts of the Valley, away from the suburbs and near the foothills.

The major energy needs are for industrial processes, especially aluminum smelting; transportation (especially private automobiles); and space and water heating for cities and suburbs.

Today the nuclear fission plant is responsible for much of the power generation for the Valley’s needs. People are more tolerant of these plants than they were in the 1970's. Fission reactors have a short life, however — about 40 years. Alternative power sources are under continuing development.
SCENARIO 1: GOVERNMENTAL INTERRELATIONSHIPS

In 1972, residents of the Willamette Valley faced nearly 1200 separate units of local, regional, state, and Federal government. These included 869 local governments (cities, counties, school districts, special purpose districts); about 150 state agencies, boards and commissions; and about 150 Federal agencies, boards and commissions.

Now, 30 years later, there are still nearly 1200 separate units of government whose decisions affect the livability of the Willamette Valley.

The number of cities and counties in the Valley has remained fairly constant over the last 30 years. In order to provide municipal services more efficiently, several smaller cities merged with neighboring cities. Portland and Multnomah County consolidated. This reduction in the number of cities, however, was balanced by the continuing industrial, commercial and residential expansion into areas of the Valley which were unincorporated in 1972. In turn this expansion led to the creation of many new and relatively small suburban cities.

There has been a slight reduction in the number of special purpose districts. In 1972, there were three Boundary Review Commissions in the Willamette Valley. As a result of their activities, the number of special purpose districts had already declined over earlier years. By 1982, there were Boundary Review Commissions in every area of the Willamette Valley. They have continued to encourage reduction in the number of special purpose districts.

Federal and state funding structures have had a mixed effect on special purpose districts. By channeling funds to "general purpose" units of government (cities and counties), Federal revenue-sharing encouraged reduction in the number of "special purpose" districts. On the other hand, grants for specific purposes such as planning, education, sewage treatment and transportation have continued to exceed shared revenues. Since such grants have been available to special-purpose governments, the effects of revenue-sharing have been unclear in this respect.

Urban growth boundaries have been established for most large Valley cities. Development near the boundaries was slowed but escalating land prices within city limits resulted in political pressure for their expansion. Once the first outward adjustment took place, speculators began to compete briskly for land just outside the boundary lines and stimulated a continuing outward readjustment.

In 1969, the State Legislature passed Senate Bill 10 requiring the formulation of comprehensive plans by counties and larger cities. Within a few years, these governments had adopted such plans. The State has since compelled the cities and counties to update their plans regularly in accordance with standards established by the State and regional planning agencies. Councils of Governments have played an increasingly important role in the planning process. Federal legislation in the 1970's required state regulation of land-use planning; the state in turn delegated part of this responsibility to the Councils of Governments.
In the area of environmental controls, the 1970's saw a continuation of a process begun in the 1960's: restriction of state powers by Federal pre-emption of controls, particularly in fields such as radiation, emissions, and noise control. By 1985, however, a series of legal challenges had defined the effective extent of such pre-emption and Oregon continued to impose stricter controls on pollution and land use than the nation as a whole.

Beginning in the early 1970's with the Serrano vs. Priest case, court decisions increasingly cut back on the use of property tax revenues for any purpose other than providing services to property. This reduction in constitutionally acceptable applications of the property tax reinforced public opposition to property taxes. The revenue sources of local government shifted almost completely from property taxes to shared revenues and other sources such as use taxes or income taxes. This shift convinced local governments that they could no longer generate a tax base by competing for commercial and industrial developments.

Beginning in the 1960's, the concept of citizen participation began to broaden. Within the larger cities, improvements in communications technology coupled with the demands of public opinion for greater grass roots involvement made the establishment of viable neighborhood organizations feasible. These organizations have, since that time, played an increasingly strong role in city decisions that affect their neighborhoods.
In the 1970's there were over 1,200 separate units of government in the Willamette Valley - all having different responsibilities for the Valley environment directly or indirectly. These ranged from local school districts on up to agencies representing the Federal Government.

By 1982, Boundary Review Commissions in every area of the Valley had encouraged reduction in the number of special purpose districts. Councils of Government began to play an increasingly important role in the planning process.

Over the years, people voiced their own ideas and needs more openly to legislators and local officials. Neighborhood organizations were formed, but they frequently repeated the parochial pattern of acting only for their own specific areas.

By 2002, there are still nearly 1,200 government units making decisions. The trouble is, they are having to make many more decisions. There is considerable overlapping and duplication of effort — and occasional failures in communication.
Over the past thirty years, the total number of government units that affect the Valley's environment has not diminished. This is true, even though there are fewer special purpose districts. The number of cities and counties has remained fairly level since many smaller cities have merged with their neighbors. A number of smaller suburban communities have sprung up, keeping the total number of government units constant.

However, these 1,200 units of government - local, regional, state and federal - have many more decisions to make for a population of 2.5 million. With so many agencies, there is bound to be a certain confusion as to who plans what and how it affects the Valley as a whole.

Counties and larger cities now have to make comprehensive plans - this is the law of Oregon. However, this same law does not apply to spreading suburbs outside of the cities. There is still a need for regional comprehensive planning so that agencies do not duplicate or cancel out each others efforts.
Thirty years ago, a prominent sociologist said "We can state unequivocally that a regional perspective in planning is and will continue to be mandatory."

This attitude has been shared for some time by Oregon officials responsible for how the Valley's land and resources are used. They have understood how environmental planning decisions interact. They have adopted comprehensive approaches for land use, transportation, and protection of open space.

In the early 1970's, it became apparent that land on the Valley floor was being used more and more for the development of single family houses and related commercial uses. If random, project-by-project development had continued, a great amount of open space would have been buried under sprawl and clutter.

Since most people did not want to live in the center of cities, an alternative was needed if the Valley was not to suffer from uncoordinated development and consequent environmental deterioration.
The alternative put into effect was a process of contained urban development on four levels or degrees of intensity:

- expansion of existing urban centers, horizontally and vertically, by building new developments on empty lots and rejuvenating existing city core areas;
- contained suburban development next to the city, basically in housing clusters on 1/4 to 1/2-acre lots;
- creation of planned communities;
- expansion and rejuvenation of existing communities.

Criteria established to guide development included:

- separation of cars and pedestrians;
- adequate open space in and around urban settlements;
- integration of transit lines within the community;
- control of heights and densities;
- careful location of building types (commercial, residential and industrial);
- parks and playgrounds in neighborhoods;
- respect for and access to the surrounding natural environment;
- building well-rounded towns and city centers instead of "bedroom communities" or specialized towns.

These criteria were designed to respond to the needs of people and the environment and to create a disciplined growth in ways that would relieve pressures on the environment. They were not an unchangeable master plan. Instead, they were a way for people to plan within a commonly-accepted set of guidelines for the future. The aim was to provide diversity, vitality and excitement, not planned sterility.

Basic to the approach, particularly in the new communities, was the concept of clustering.

**STATE LAND USE PLANNING**

The National Land and Water Resources Planning Act of 1971 (S. 632) would establish a more comprehensive national land use policy and set up a program to assist states in developing, implementing, and administering statewide land use plans. Similarly, the National Land Use Policy Act of 1971 (S. 992) would authorize grants to encourage states to plan and regulate land use for the protection of areas of critical environmental concern and for the control and direction of growth of more than local significance.

Both S. 632 and S. 992 could give the states an active role in regulating local land use. Proposed amendments by the National Association of Counties and the National Service to Regional Councils suggested that regional and local elected officials sit on state land use planning commissions. They emphasized that regional councils are best able to protect local and regional interests, that such councils are already recognized in state land use policies, and that they should be directly funded to carry out this responsibility.

**CLUSTER not CLUTTER**

Clustering in community planning is a way for people to live together in a variety of ways, in houses of many sorts, in more direct and fruitful relationships with their community, each other, and the environment. People now can live in clustered communities in single-family houses on their own land, in town houses or in condominiums. Different people have different needs, and they are met by providing a variety of residence choices.
Clustering is not a way to get more buildings on the land and than build up density (although some people want to use it in that way). It is a way to take a given amount of land and keep most of it open by concentrating the buildings on it in one area. Farmers have used this idea for years to keep as much of their land in productive agriculture as they could.

Typical American Farmhouse Cluster

![Diagram of Clustering]

Clustering is not evil in itself. It is evil in its effect. Just a little of it effectively obscures the Valley for many people. But when it was absorbed by planned community development, these small-scale commercial and light industrial uses blended into the rest of the civic landscape. Clutter belongs now because it was given a place instead of being flung across the landscape willy nilly.
Devoid of commercial sprawl, agricultural lands now remain mostly in active production. They provide beauty and access to open space. They give the sense of well-being that psychologists and behavioral authorities attribute to open space. Agricultural lands have been kept open through tax incentives, zoning that encourages clustering and the purchase of development rights to set aside farm land for open space.

In the Valley's older urban centers emphasis has been on rehabilitation. Redevelopment has occurred, but it has not been allowed to destroy living neighborhoods or alter the ways people want to live in the city. Upkeep and improvement of the urban structure, old and new, is an integral part of the comprehensive approach. This has included residential areas, schools, parks and recreation, cultural facilities, as well as structures in the central business district and neighborhood centers. The obsolescence equation on page 20 has been reversed.

In a building, "rehabilitation" means new kitchens and bathrooms, safer wiring, and major structural improvements. In a city it has meant improved transit, more parks, efficient schools and hospitals. Social amenities have been improved. People no longer disappear to the suburbs or hide behind their doors at night as some used to 30 years ago.

One of the things that made flight to the suburbs so easy was low-interest, low down-payment loans for individual houses. The same funding and financing has now been applied to rehabilitation of the city. Today, the Willamette Valley has a program for development that permits -- indeed requires -- conservation of open space by clustering communities and providing a public transit network. The clustered communities are invigorating and are molded into the Valley environment. The public transit network provides ease of access to many points in the Valley for everyone. Transit lines connect the three community types -- urban centers, contained suburbs, and planned new communities and expanded existing towns. In the newer communities, town centers developed on publicly owned and leased land around major transit stops.

People enjoy the pleasures of their great environment. They live in places of their choice in communities that are planned to protect the environment they love. They have ready transit to home and work and recreation opportunities throughout the Valley. And the qualities that Valley residents have always sought have been preserved:

- a feeling of closeness to open space and nature;
- access to recreation opportunities in natural surroundings;
- a small-town "feeling" to life even in urban areas; and
- a low-key, relaxed way of life in a diverse and creative environment.
In 1972, the floor of the Valley was beginning to show the effects of suburban development that spread out from the cities and consumed farm lands and open spaces. However, there was still a great deal of open space in the Valley, either in agriculture or other uses, and it was one of the major factors that made the environment so special.

Realizing that the future effects of uncontrolled suburban development would be the disappearance of the landscape to most people, a system of comprehensive planning was instituted that situated growth in urban centers, controlled suburbs, and planned new communities. Existing smaller communities in the foothills were also a part of this.

By 1992, the pattern was well established, and it was easy to observe the relationships between the comprehensive land planning approach and other elements that affected the Valley environment - especially transportation and the conservation of open space accessibility. Public transit systems were integrated into the process of planning for new development, and open space was conserved.

Today in 2002, people can decide where they want to live from a generous array of choices: in the center of cities, in suburbs that do not spread out over the countryside, and in newly developed communities or expanded older towns where there are many kinds of residences to choose from, including town houses, single-family houses, and subsidized low-income housing.
The use of land in the Willamette Valley over the years since 1972 has been based on a program of comprehensive planning that has permitted growth and development, but which has prevented uncoordinated spread on the land.

Basically, growth has been contained in existing urban centers, which have been able to grow up and, to some extent, out; in contiguous suburbs, which have had definite limits set to the amounts of rural and open space they could consume; and in clustered, new communities and expanded existing towns in the foothills.

These types of communities, as the map of the Valley in 2002 shows, are connected. The suburbs form the "urban tissue" that connects the cities with the new communities in the foothills. Each kind of community has its own advantages that are different from other kinds of communities. People can therefore decide what kind of place they wish to live in. With public-support measures such as subsidized housing for low incomes, everyone has social and physical mobility around the Valley.
As a major form giver to the landscape, regional transportation and transit has vast potential for enhancing or defacing the environment.

The decision by the State of Oregon to build a comprehensive rail transit system more than two decades ago has encouraged the Willamette Valley to develop along chosen lines, preserving the unique qualities of open space and natural environment that residents and visitors so admire.

The bold decision to plan and create a regional rail system all at once was possible because of several factors:

The Federal Government, specifically the U.S. Department of Transportation (D.O.T.), supported the program through grants. This was the first time in the U.S. that a mass transit system had been developed on a real geographic, regional basis. D.O.T. was interested in supporting it to demonstrate the validity of the concept. Previous systems had been designed to serve large metropolitan regions, such as the Bay Area Rapid Transit system in San Francisco.

By leading with the transit system, expenses were controlled, comprehensive planning became possible, and the system contributed to the now-accepted form of development in the Valley rather than having to conform to the older uncontrolled spread and sprawl. Transit and transportation planning went hand in hand with community planning. They interacted with each other and made each other possible.

What was the cost of the basic "spine" of the system, the elevated, double-railed, pneumatic-tired transit system that runs north-south in the Valley paralleling the railway? Answer: $5.4 million per mile, or $702,000,000 for the 130-mile-long system. Because of the need to put the system underground for five miles to reach Portland, there was an additional expenditure of $100,000,000. Yearly costs per ten-mile section of the system in 1995 were $6.4 million, including electrical energy, maintenance, and administration costs.*

The choice of an elevated system was difficult because it cost more than a ground-level system. But the advantages were obvious. Pedestrians could cross under the right of way. The elevated track had little impact on the landscape. Views were more exciting and beautiful. The system was far less dangerous.

All in all it seems to have been an excellent decision.

Future extensions off the main line into newly developed communities are now planned. These include monorail systems such as those first used in the 1960's and 1970's in Seattle, at the Dallas airport and in Disneyland. Monorail trains ran on an interurban basis to connect communities. Being elevated they provide separation for cars and pedestrians. They are relatively quiet and pollution free. Networks of large and small buses have been established within communities and reaching out to recreation spaces in the Valley. These bus systems have taken a great deal of pressure off roads and highways. They provide access throughout the Valley for everyone, and do not threaten the atmosphere since they are run on a low-pollution power source.

The transit system has operated as more than a mover of people. Coordinated with environmental planning, it has contributed to the form of communities and the freeing of open space. It permits people to make choices of where to live and work and how to get there. Consequently it has operated as a social and economic "form maker". Stations have acted as central development nodes in new and developing communities, and have brought rejuvenation of older urban centers.

People now have much more access to open space and recreation since emphasis was placed on mass transit rather than on private automobiles. Using the elements of the transit system - central rail up and down the Valley connected to local circulation systems - people can reach many varieties of open spaces with ease, and without the bother of having to drive their own cars. Riverbanks, farmlands, mountains and wilderness areas, are increasingly accessible to people in central cities, suburbs, and developing communities along the transit routes.

There is still some automobile access to recreation and open spaces, but it is now closely controlled. These controls include fewer parking areas for private cars, advance reservations for parking, time and location limits, and charges for the few parking privileges available. The tragedy of overuse by machines that almost befall Yosemite National Park in the mid-20th Century has been avoided in the Willamette Valley.
A number of transit types and systems available through technology already known in the 1970's can be used as alternatives: (1) transit corridor arrangements based mainly on the elevated rail transit system; (2) bus guideways and dual-node systems, where individual movement units can be plugged onto a public roving system; (3) integrated high-speed long-distance modes and local systems; and (4) individual or multiple-use local systems that permit movement within and around communities.

Diversion of gas taxes and monies formerly going into freeways and highways were an additional source of revenue. Oregon's decision in the 1970's not to build any more major highways "liberated" these funds. The availability of mass transit lessened the need to build other kinds of roads.

The location of stations at strategic points for a variety of life styles has been significant in the Valley's development. Through the public purchase of land around stations, the state and community have the review right to any development that occurs in the centers. Leased to developers, these areas have become the life-givers to developing communities. Plans for multiple use around stations are encouraged, so that commerce, institutions, open space, recreation, and residential uses occur in harmony with each other in downtown areas. And the developers' lease payments to the state for the privilege of developing around stations makes the maintenance of a rail system feasible.

Acquiring lands around transit stations was an innovative step and has since proved a prototype for nation-wide developments. It is based on the principle that value which accrues because of public investment ought to benefit the public, not private investors. As these lands were leased to developers for the construction of approved, mixed-use town centers and commercial developments, they allowed the transit system to pay its way.

The reason the state decided to go all out in developing the transit system was that there were other forces at work as early as 1972 that would ultimately have made mass transit uneconomic and inoperable. These forces included scattered, leap-frogging development, dependence on private automobiles, building grids of roads connecting cities, and the spread-out and uncontrolled "clutter" of commercial and industrial areas between suburbs and cities. The significant decision in the 1970's was to install the system before there was an actual need for it and before the system could be proven economically viable.

Today in 2002, this comprehensive transit and transportation system contributes greatly to the environment of the Willamette Valley.

Efficient mass transit has actually proved faster than individual auto travel. It is more convenient for more people, and has captured at least one-car-per-family's worth of traffic.

Vehicular traffic has been reduced, sometimes by as much as half.

There is less pollution because of fewer autos and low-polluting energy sources for mass transit.
Parking space has been liberated for other uses.

Noise has been reduced.

There is less load on existing roads and no need for additional roads.

A transit system now serves inner cities, suburbs, and contributes to the positive growth of new and rejuvenated communities.

This same system offers people choices about how they wish to live in the Valley environment.

People have not had to give up their automobiles completely. Some are still in use for long distance travel, out-of-state vacations, and short runs within the Valley to places not served by mass transit. But the convenience of mass transit has caused a pronounced de-emphasis on auto-reliance, and Valley residents are enjoying a much cleaner, quieter atmosphere. In addition there are small electric powered cars, bicycles, and electric mini buses. And, of course, the newer communities are tighter knit and easier to move about in by foot and moving sidewalks.

Moving sidewalks finally made a major technological breakthrough some 15 years ago. Their cost and usefulness out-of-doors made the dream which started in the 1880's in New York and Paris a reality at last.

Over the years, officials were concerned by the considerable growth of travel by air. They feared that expanded airports and a lot of smaller airfields would be needed around the basin for general aviation.

The decision was made, however, to "fill seats, not the land around airports." It meant eliminating unnecessary and repetitious flights, and booking all aircraft (including wide-bodied models) closer to their capacity. This prevented expansion onto additional land around the major airports at Portland, Eugene, and Salem.

General aviation has been accommodated in four or five sub-regional air fields rather than in 15 or more new fields scattered around the Valley. Private airplanes between 1980 and 1990 began to be a problem in terms of air pollution, noise, and consumption of open space. Oregon moved to restrict their use and control their affect on the environment.

To service air passengers arriving and departing from commercial airports, there are now connections to the mass transit system permitting ease of movement between terminal and city and out into the Valley.
Back in 1972, people of the Valley still depended overwhelmingly on the private automobile for transportation. This was of concern to state and regional officials because of the enormous amounts of land required and the types of development supported by road systems. It was decided to go all-out for the development of a public transit system.

By 1982, major elements of the system were almost all constructed and serving the region. The elevated rail system that ran north-south connecting Portland-Eugene with stops at appropriate points in between was planned along with new ideas about how land should be used for other purposes, especially community development and open spaces.

The pattern of comprehensive planning of transit systems, land use, and open space had become a visible force creating the quality of the Valley environment by 1992. Existing cities and contained suburbs were served by the elevated rail system, and new communities and rejuvenated hilltowns grew around transit stations in their centers.

Since the land around the stations was owned by the public and leased to developers, it provided economic support to the transit system. Other support was from gas taxes formerly devoted to highway construction (no longer needed because of less reliance on the roads). In 2002, the system of public transit and comprehensive planning of development works in a mutually-supporting way.
A bold move was made by the State of Oregon back in the 1970's to develop all-at-once a regional public transit system that would help give form to future development and answer to the needs of Valley inhabitants on into the 21st Century.

This far-sighted project was supported by the U.S. Department of Transportation as the first really comprehensive mass transit approach on the basis of a geographical region. There had been public transit systems serving metropolitan complexes, such as the Bay Area Rapid Transit system in San Francisco, but this was the first time such a concept had been taken a step further.

The principal "spine" of the transit system is an elevated rail system that runs from Portland to Eugene. Since it is elevated, it does not violate the landscape. Stations are located at significant nodes, and where they can efficiently connect with other public transit systems.

Branching from the major spine and connecting it with new communities and rejuvenated existing communities in the foothills are smaller-scale transit systems. Within communities, there are movement systems that range from mini-buses and aerial tramways (connecting to open space and recreation facilities) to "dual-mode" systems that allow people to drive leased units locally, then connect to mass guidance systems to go longer distances.
There are three types of open space:

Private open space.

Public open space.

Urban open space.

In the past 30 years we have become increasingly aware of how these are mutually related. Thus, we have been acquiring land and easements in an organized fashion to develop valleywide systems of open spaces according to a carefully developed plan.

Private open space - principally farmland on the Valley floor - gives the Valley its intangible quality of beauty. You can't put your finger on it. But it is the reason many people have chosen to live in the Valley. They enjoy being in contact with the spaciousness, openness, and natural beauty of their environment. People don't have to stand on a piece of land to enjoy spectacular views. But if someone builds a food stand or erects a billboard, they wipe out the property's "usefulness" as open space.

Public open space - is the space that people use directly -- parklands, wilderness areas, hiking trails and river greenways. This space is both visual and functional.

Urban open space - can mean a variety of things. City people need relief from the urban environment through parks, squares, fountains, playgrounds, and places where they can get together outside the walls of their own houses.

By 2002 private open space in the Valley has been assured through continued use of large portions of agricultural land of good quality on the Valley floor. This use has given people good visual access to scenery.
By 1970, we had begun to realize that our cherished "visual open space" was being threatened and we took action to preserve it. We realized that there weren't enough parks in public ownership. Most parks were beginning to be over-used. Much of the great open space we used to drive, hike, and ride through was in fact privately owned and was beginning to be sold off. New techniques had to be devised to keep private open space OPEN.

It was quickly apparent that the public could not buy up the entire Valley. Nor could farmers be required to continue farming when increasing taxes forced them to sell to developers. Fortunately, the realization came early enough to allow the success of new techniques. Private open space, it was found, could be preserved in many different ways without outright acquisition, and all of them have been used where applicable.

Many farmers did not want to sell out. They were happy to keep their lands in production (and hence, visually open) if it were made economically possible. From legislation that was already on the books in Oregon and other states (California's Williamson Law, for instance), there were tax incentives for the landowner to keep his land in farm use. In Oregon, these were updated to make provision for long-term commitments on farm land use. The decision to apply tax incentives to farm open space became the option of the public rather than the individual.

Visual easements were variations on this same technique. They were used to keep open space in farming and preserve visual access for everyone.

The state began a program of outright purchase of certain lands that were deemed desirable and necessary in the overall open space system. Some of this land was considered a "bank" for potential development as recreation or scenic areas.

The purchase of "development rights" by the state or county has also allowed for conservation of open space. This technique gave the buyer control in perpetuity over the development of the land. The farmer could maintain his land in agricultural production, and the state guaranteed that it would remain open space. Developers also have purchased perpetual development rights on farmlands adjacent to their developments to keep them open as part of their open space requirements.

Another technique for making open space available is called "compensable zoning." This assures land owners that they will be adequately compensated when their land is zoned for other uses such as open space. Compensable zoning is explained in the margin.

Comprehensive land use and planning, with emphasis on clustering of development, reliance on mass transit, and public and private open space, has worked to the benefit of everyone since the 1970's.

Today, in 2002, because of these measures, everyone can enjoy open space. Clutter on the landscape has been checked because of comprehensive land use planning. Development concentrates in the cities, the suburbs, and the newer communities. Measures to conserve open space outside those communities have received support from Valley inhabitants, because they benefit environmentally. Farmers and land-owners support them because they do...
Legislation to encourage cities to block off motor vehicle traffic in crowded downtowns by creating pedestrian malls was approved narrowly yesterday by the Senate Finance Committee.

Under the bill by Senator Nicholas C. Petris (Dem-Oakland) cities with a population of more than 150,000 persons could receive up to $5 million for construction of the malls. The money would come from the State Motor Vehicles fund.

The measure also would make it easier for a local government to decide to create pedestrian malls. The law currently requires city or county councils to determine that motor vehicle traffic would not be unduly inconvenienced before creating the malls.

Petris cited the mall in Copenhagen where he said several downtown blocks were roped off to traffic. He said the results have been less pollution and traffic congestion in the central city while merchants have increased business in the mall area.

The bill was sent to the Senate floor on a 7 to 2 vote. United Press

Private open space measures have gone so far as to indemnify farmers and other land owners against injuries to hunters and fishermen on their property. This has made much more open space available for hunting and fishing than was possible thirty years ago. Wildlife habitats have been protected by wise land use patterns.

Public open space has been conserved for enjoyment in areas where it is ecologically and socially most beneficial:

- along rivers and tributaries;
- in wilderness areas;
- near agricultural lands, where a park next to a farm results in large open spaces and views;
- in areas where fragile conditions must be protected -- flood plains, slopes, wildlife habitats;
- in places offering sweeping views and panoramas;
- in timber preserves;
- in areas for hiking, boating, bicycling, picnicking, hunting, fishing, camping and climbing;
- in urban parks where people can gather and share cross-cultural experiences and feelings.

Open-space land use has protected the land and has given people many choices of how to use it respectfully. Public agencies, with guidance from the people, have been able to pick and choose what areas best satisfy people's needs for open space.

Beginning with the Greenway park system along the Willamette River 30 years ago, an uninterrupted system of open space has extended out and up from the parklands along the river. People are never very far from many parts of this system and can reach it by public transit without using their cars. For most people sitting at home or riding around the Valley, there is plenty of visual access to open space so that the fine Valley environment can be seen at all times.

Urban open spaces in older urban centers and in new and rejuvenated communities are integrated through comprehensive land-use planning. Those open spaces are located at strategic places where people need them, and they link up with the regional system of public open spaces.

In communities today there are:

- public squares and parks around transit stations;
- small parks and playgrounds through neighborhoods and communities;
- pedestrian corridors and malls;
larger parks and sports areas; and
open space links to the mountains and the Valley floor.

In existing cities and smaller communities, people have worked with their elected officials under Federal programs to provide:

- new parks;
- rehabilitated existing urban open spaces;
- miniparks and neighborhood playgrounds; and
- neighborhood and community facilities that people decide they need -- gardens, places to exchange opinions, places to sell crafts and products, places where adults and children can be together.

This community creation of urban open space is part of the overall rehabilitation of center cities and neighborhoods that started under Neighborhood Development Program-type concepts. Rehabilitation also included residential housing, schools, health services, neighborhood commerce, and cultural facilities.

The coordination of private, public, and urban open space into one environmental fabric can be seen, felt, and experienced by all Oregonians. It has brought new meaning to the Valley's grace and splendor.

Never far away from open space and the rhythms of Valley life, people can know that the land is as "sweet and open" as the poet described it.

The open space options available in the planned environment include
- local parks and play areas, pedestrianways connecting to large open space and recreation opportunities further away; and
- greenways and river parks. In the hills and more distant mountains, open space and recreation of a different sort are accessible by public transit.
Open space on the Valley floor in 1972 consisted of state and county parks plus a rather inadequate supply of urban open space in the cities. A great amount of what was experienced as open space was actually privately owned farms, but these "open space banks" were beginning to give way to housing developments and other uses. The residents of the Valley were concerned.

By 1982, the state had embarked on a new policy of comprehensive planning that included the conservation of private open space and the related development of public open space. The new public transit system had been created, so there was no need for any new or upgraded roads to take up Valley land. People could reach open spaces without using cars.

Planned development of urban, suburban, and new community growth took into consideration the respect for conserving access to open space, both directly and indirectly—visual appreciation being an important element of the Valley's qualities. A whole array of choices was available to residents: forests, rivers, farms, the wilderness, and urban open spaces.

Farmers who kept their land in production, and therefore in visual open space, were compensated in several ways so they did not suffer financially. By 2002 open space network developed that included in-town parks and connected pedestrian ways, parks and greenways along all the rivers of the Valley, and easy access by public transit to recreational areas further away.
Central to the system of the Valley open spaces are the "Greensways" or river parks that now line the Willamette and many of its tributaries.

Since the 1970's more parks have been added, and the parks, recreation, and open space systems have become an integrated and inter-related series of opportunities for people to experience the natural environment of the Willamette Valley. Included in this network of open space is the private land--mostly in agricultural use--that provides the unique visual panoramas that are so special to the people of the Valley.

Through having been integrally planned in connection with other land uses and with the public transit system, open spaces and parks occur where they are needed and where people can most easily get to them. Instead of having to drive cars to picnics or camping areas, the residents of the Valley can reach them by public transit. This means that the natural environment is now available to everyone.

There is a whole "hierarchy" of open space occurring, from small neighborhood parks and urban playgrounds up to majestic wilderness areas. In between are large urban parks, central plazas in new communities, rural and river park areas, hiking trails, and farmlands kept in use for visual access. The success of the whole system is basically due to comprehensive planning--land use relates to transit and transit relates to open space.
CLUSTERING, PUBLIC TRANSIT & OPEN SPACE

Clustering for conservation of land and open space has been a Valley tradition ever since human settlement began. The Indians clustered in tribal villages.

Farms and their related communities on the Valley floor clustered to leave as much land as possible open for cultivation.

There were clustered hill towns founded around resource-based industries such as timber products and agriculture.

In the past 30 years, clustered development of new communities and the rejuvenation of older hill towns has meant that inhabitants can enjoy open space.
Clustering hasn't meant living in a great housing development cheek-by-jowl with a lot of other people. This West Coast condominium shelters 15 families in ways that preserve their privacy and let everyone enjoy natural vistas.

Individual houses clustered around a "common," or mutually shared public greenway conserve the land for all.

Open space in cities is vital to providing amenities that make urban areas enjoyable and exciting places to live...

...kids can play near home within easy calling and viewing distance of their mothers...

...serene parks are available...

...and more exciting, involving plazas, parks, squares and fountains act as the spark to bring together the community.
A trip on the main elevated transit line and related branches into town centers is an exciting sequence of experiences.

Leaving the transit system at the town center, people move through the station . . .

... and out into the town square, where there is activity and life of all sorts at all times of day and night. From the town center . . .

... it is an easy walk home through parks & playgrounds. The transit system glides by almost noiselessly overhead.

Comprehensive planning of the Willamette Valley on three major levels has permitted the techniques of clustering, open space creation and conservation, and integrated public transit...

...urban living is available, as is life in single-family houses in contained suburbs, and the stimulating atmosphere of the new communities that have grown around transit stations. The stations have become "public squares" for the communities -- the land around them was purchased in the name of the public and leased to developers to create approved, multi-use town centers.
This plan of a new community center planned around a transit station shows how they did it in Sweden several decades ago. This is the town center of Vallingby, a city for more than 80,000 people.

There are a number of smaller systems for moving people within and between communities, and recreation and open space opportunities...

... and people who do not wish to walk within communities can take people-mover systems or moving sidewalks to their destinations.

When such systems were proposed in New York and Paris in the 1870's, they were never realized. With our technology & the commitment to having a full-scale integrated public transit system today, the idea has come of age.
SCENARIO 2: EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME

The economic base of the Valley has gradually changed over the past thirty years. These changes have had significant implications about how people live and what the Valley produces. Just as important, and as profound in its influence on people's lives, is the strengthened emphasis on preserving the Valley's unique environment.

The structure of employment in the Valley has changed markedly since the 1970's. Continuing and expanding upon a trend already apparent in the 1960's, the rate of growth in employment in certain portions of the private sector slowed down, but the slack has been more than taken up in other areas of employment.

Gradually the economy of the Valley has shifted away from a heavily resource-oriented base. Consequently, employment opportunities have moved away from such resource-based industries as forest products to service industries, to the public sector, and to the new industries attracted to the Valley because of the environmental amenities and competent labor force to be found there.

People and industries have tended to seek for the qualities that exist in the Willamette Valley. Amenities do attract "footloose" industry, that is, industries which are mobile and not tied of necessity to a particular location, and the Valley has continued to get more than its share. This can be compared to the situation in the Southeast U. S. a number of years ago, when states were aggressively competing for new industries.

Amenities do attract "footloose" industry, that is, industries which are mobile and not tied of necessity to a particular location, and the Valley has continued to get more than its share. This can be compared to the situation in the Southeast U. S. a number of years ago, when states were aggressively competing for new industries.

Atlanta, at that time possessed of many urban, suburban, recreational, and cultural amenities, attracted a large amount of industry. Mississippi, which had few amenities to offer, did poorly and remained stagnant.

A number of industries find the superior environment and a good way of life for their employees most in the newly developed communities and rejuvenated towns around the Valley. These industries have been strong forces in local economies. Some of the amenities offered by the Valley are:

Compatibility of home-work relationship. The trip between a person's home and his place of business has been greatly reduced by the new transportation choices made by Oregonians.

Range of choice of where to live and work. The access to areas throughout the Valley has made it possible for people to pick and choose which communities they wish to live in, and whether they desire to live near their work or within easy transit reach.

A range of housing types in all communities has encouraged economic and social mobility.

Increased environmental amenity and access to open space has become possible for people in all types of careers wherever they live in the Valley. These open space and recreational opportunities have proved exceptionally valuable in a time when most people have more leisure time.

The costs of the improved environment and the things that made it possible -- mass transit, open space retention, recreation opportunities, creatively contained communities -- have not been cheap, but they have been shared by the Federal, state, and local governments, private industry and developers, and the people. Disposable income has tended to be less than under a more pronounced consumer-expansion economy, but better quality of life more than makes up for it.

Landport district studied

EUGENE (UPI) - The feasibility of establishing a dry landport district in Lane County is under investigation.

Members of Lane County's Citizen Advisory Committee for Economic Development decided Tuesday that such a district might be the means of encouraging what the committee feels is needed economic growth in the county.

Committee chairman Nils Hult said he will appoint a subcommittee to investigate and make final recommendations.

The dry port district, which would require voter approval, once boundaries were set, could involve operation of railroad, airport and warehouse facilities, construction of nuclear power plants and subsidizing of industrial plants.
To offset any job loss occurring as a result of the transition from a resource-based economy, new employment opportunities were generated in such fields as public transportation. The development of the rail transit system and related feeder services has produced many construction, maintenance and service jobs.

Construction of transit systems and stations and their administration and maintenance have stimulated economic growth and related employment both in existing cities and in new town centers. New town construction itself, of course, has been responsible for many new job opportunities.

The emphasis on preserving open space has kept more agricultural land in production. This has preserved farm income to some extent. It has even provided second incomes to owners of hobby farms -- once considered a planner's nightmare.

There are now other benefits to life that can be called "income". People get satisfaction and sustenance from a clean environment, attractive surroundings, a new sense of community and easy access to recreational facilities. Most of these intangible qualities cannot be measured. Most people agree today that their real "income" is much higher than before.

In order to achieve this state of affairs hard decisions have had to be made. Some of the environmental and land use controls involved choices that were not always easy to accept. Sometimes they meant more restrictions on individual freedom -- such as doing what you wanted to do with your own land, and consuming as many resources as you could afford. Other times they meant less autonomy for local governments.

After having considered and assessed the alternatives, and after viewing the effects of unrestricted growth on other areas of the country, most Valley residents agree on one thing: the decisions made and the regulations implemented have not been too high a price to pay for the heightened quality of life it has bought.
The trend in 1972 was a decline in resource-based industry and an increase in non-resource-based industry and services. This pattern has continued.

Under new concepts of comprehensive land use planning, public transit, and energy and power controls, the picture of employment and income opportunities in the Valley by 1982 had begun to shift.

Many industries that did not have to settle in specific places, and which came to the Valley for its environmental amenities, decided to locate in newly-developed communities and the hill towns.

Today, people can to a significant extent choose where they wish to work and live and how their home-work relationship should be. They can walk to work or use the public transit into the city.
When the Valley's industrial patterns changed from farming and timber products to metallurgy, electronics, mobile home manufacture, and other industries not based on its natural resources, there was concern that there would be agglomeration of industries in the cities and a decline everywhere else.

When it was decided to concentrate development in urban centers, contained suburbs, and new communities and rejuvenated hill towns, the opportunity appeared to locate "footloose" industry in these new communities. Since footloose industries did not have to be located in cities, and since most of them came to the Valley for the superior environmental qualities provided in the new and rejuvenated communities, they were happy to locate there.

Construction of these communities and the public transit systems that serve them has been another decided plus for the Valley economy. The management and maintenance of transit lines and the new town centers that have sprung up at the stations are new sources of income.
Almost 70% of the people of the Valley have grown up experiencing the widespread environmental consciousness that began back in the 1960's, when the Willamette River was cleaned up.

The importance of the Valley's environment is a constant concern in 2002 and the public has little patience with despoilers.

In order to continue the high quality of life in the Valley, people have cooperated to preserve the environment. They have established pollution controls and land-use patterns that protect open space. They have removed clutter from the landscape. They have been busy damping down noise, recycling solid wastes and finding ways to use excess heat from generators.

The visual pollution and clutter that began to be such an irritant in the 1970's have been greatly diminished by zoning. Scatteration of housing developments and commercial infill has been controlled. More control of billboards and signs has produced a visually pleasing environment in urban areas and along roadways. Developers now lease public land around transit stations and face rigid controls over what they can put up. This insured that town centers became visually exciting without getting sleazy or honkytonk. Clustering of new developments, emphasis on rehabilitation of city centers and containment of the suburbs have provided generous open space and pleasant views.

Because there are fewer cars, there is less air pollution and less noise pollution today than 30 years ago. Most cars are not even allowed in densely developed urban areas. People can walk about and ride electric mass transit in relative quiet. They breathe cleaner air. Since people depend on electric rail transit throughout the Valley, the air has cleared and riders can hear rural sounds as they are sped swiftly over the landscape.

Water of uncommonly high quality continues to be one of the blessings of the Valley, a blessing guaranteed by tight quality controls, careful location of industries and tertiary treatment of all sewage.

Some years ago people of the Valley realized that a portion of their landscape was disappearing under tons of garbage. This was caused by the need for disposing of solid waste as land fill.
Since then, people have demanded that emphasis be put on recycling of solid waste. Metal, glass, and other materials have been made to "live more than one life." They are converted into form after form and use after use.

This emphasis on reuse and recycling has also affected the area of tertiary sewage treatment. For example, when Cottage Grove opened its tertiary sewage treatment plant more than 30 years ago, the odorless, dried residue of the process was given away to gardeners as fertilizer. It was also made into pellets as experimental food for fish cultures. In 2002, this residue has become increasingly plentiful, and has been used on a much larger scale in agriculture and fish farming.

Today, the Valley uses all its resources, enjoys clean air and water and has open space available to all. Because clutter has been controlled, every Oregonian can have close contact with his environment. And, he does so in a serene attitude undisturbed by noise, smog, bad odors, or the view of the beer can on the wilderness trail.
Thirty years ago, men triumphed over water pollution in the Willamette River. People began to feel a deep concern for their environment. But the spread of new construction across the Valley floor had begun a pattern of visual pollution that was increasingly offensive.

Air pollution was reduced by 1982 because of the enforcement of Federal guidelines. The water of the Willamette and other rivers was purer than ever because of tertiary treatment of liquid wastes. Visual and noise pollution began to decline because of the comprehensive planning of development and public transit — with a concomitant decline in the use of private automobiles.

In 1992, streets were cleaner and used by fewer cars. Air was cleaner because there were fewer emission sources. Clutter was beginning to disappear through new controls over signs and development. Wastes were recycled and reused — thus sparing the land that was formerly used for land fill.

In 2002, we have clean air and water. Clutter has been taken away and absorbed into developed communities where it can be controlled. Downtown areas are built for pedestrians. Public transit glides above the landscape almost noiselessly. The car has its place and stays in it. People are in contact with the environment.
In 2002, there is a new atmosphere in the Valley. The key to it is the public transit system—a low-pollution, almost noiseless elevated rail network throughout the Valley. People no longer depend on their cars as they used to. This has reduced air pollution, noise pollution and the consumption of vast areas of open space for highways and roads.

Cars have all but disappeared in urban and new communities because of the convenience of mass transit.

Industries are now dispersed throughout the Valley instead of in a few urban cores. This has reduced pollution into the Valley airshed, as has the emphasis on stricter controls.

New laws have reduced the consumption of energy and power—thus reducing pollution. People have chosen a superb natural environment as the main element of their "life style" rather than more physical possessions and gadgets.

Today solid wastes are recycled. Excess heat from generators is used. Wastes are processed for agriculture and fish farming. Former sources of pollution now contribute to the economy.
A desire to limit pollution and reduce waste in power consumption - and deeply felt concern for the quality of the environment - led to a new energy policy for Oregon between 1975 and 1980.

The objectives of the policy were to:

- limit the region's per capita use of energy;
- improve efficiency of energy usage; and
- conserve irreplaceable fuels.

By 1980 a ceiling of 370 million BTU's per capita per year was placed on energy consumption. (BTU means British Thermal Units, a standard energy measurement. A person requires 12,000 BTU's of food energy each day, the equivalent of 3,000 calories.)

After that, the per capita consumption of energy declined gradually toward the 1970 figure of 180 million BTU's per capita per year.

An effective curb on increasing demand for energy was a tax on energy of all forms. By artificially raising prices years ago, gains were made that began implementing the new energy policy. Proceeds from these tax monies were used to develop mass transit systems and to underwrite public corporations who planned and organized integrated residential, commercial, and industrial complexes. This program tied in neatly with the comprehensive planning of land use, open space, and transit and transportation throughout the Valley.

While the tax measures were primarily aimed at improving housing development practices, a special energy tax was imposed on industry in longer range terms. The theory was that if high energy tax causes industries to relocate out of the Valley because of energy costs, there would be more energy available for labor-intensive industries and the Valley resident.

Efficient use of energy has been possible because of planned-use policies concerning development and transit. With clustering and no sprawl, there has been less requirement for massive power generation all over the basin. Similarly, the automobile has declined as an energy consumer and mass transit provides quiet, and relatively pollution free rides, using a central energy source.
Just as the rail transit system was created all at once to prevent land use and transportation practices that would ultimately have made it too costly, so the new energy policy went directly into effect between 1970 and 1980. Otherwise plans in process at the time for atomic power plants, large leapfrogging housing developments, influxes of industry, and bigger and better road systems would have prevented it from having the desired effect of slowing growth and promoting a more desirable environment for everyone in the Willamette Valley.

An example of ecological land-use planning in the siting of the Trojan Nuclear Power Plant.
Between 1975 and 1980 a new energy policy was established in Oregon. The objectives of this policy were to limit the per capita use of energy; to use energy more efficiently; and to conserve irreplaceable natural fuels.

In 1982, a ceiling of 370 million BTU's per capita per year was set. Actual use declined during the 1980's to less than half that amount. The widespread rise in energy use was reversed in households, neighborhoods and communities.

Because new communities are "clustering" together instead of spreading across the open land, there has been less need for massive power generation all over the Valley. People are using their cars less in favor of the modern public transit system - thus lowering the consumption of fossil fuels.

In 2002, we have a radically changed energy policy. People use energy judiciously because of high taxes on energy consumption - particularly on high energy users. These tax moneys provide funding for comprehensive land use development and public transit systems.
It is easy to see on the map how consumption of energy in 2002 reflects new development patterns in the Valley.

Comprehensive planning of cities, suburbs and new communities has "paid off" in reduced energy use. Residents of the Valley have used an integrated approach in tackling their problems. By building a public transit system, they have reduced the need for cars and new roads. Fewer fossil fuels are used. There is less air and noise pollution.

Gas taxes and fuel taxes have been used to improve the environment and support comprehensive planning. In turn, comprehensive planning creates many varied choices of living and working styles for people of all interests and income levels.

In this way, a new energy policy has dove-tailed with the overall comprehensive planning for the Valley's future.
SCENARIO 2: GOVERNMENTAL INTERRELATIONSHIPS

In the thirty years between 1972 and 2002, there has been a major change in governmental interrelationships in the Willamette Valley. Citizens and public officials have tended increasingly to treat Valley-wide problems on a Valley-wide basis.

The present governmental structure reflects a new understanding that certain problems have implications far beyond any single city, county, or regional Council of Governments. People now realize that actions taken in one part of the Valley may very well affect -- or even predetermine -- actions taken in other parts of the Valley.

State-wide decision-making processes were thoroughly reconsidered in the 1970's. Citizens and public officials examined which decisions should be made at the different levels of government (local, regional, and state). Guidelines were established defining what constitutes a local, regional, or state matter. Since that time, actions with ramifications beyond local boundaries, such as major developments, have been reviewed at the state or regional level. Local governments have been left with only decisions having a minimal effect on areas outside their localities.

The state now directly controls lands that were earlier determined to be of critical state interest, including areas of recreational and scenic value to the entire state and developments that are by their nature or scale of state-wide interest. The state has also set minimum standards for the quality of local comprehensive plans.

Federal legislation in the 1970's provided funding to encourage state regulation of land-use planning. The state delegated first-line authority for this to the Councils of Governments (COG's), subject to state review. The COG's consequently developed greater planning capability. More and more the COG's began contracting with cities and counties to provide planning, zoning, administration, and other technical services. This, in turn, tended to improve communication between the COG's and local governments. It also improved the quality of local planning.

In the 1970's, COG's in the Valley began planning together for services that extended beyond the boundaries of the individual councils - such as Valley-wide mass transit. Since the COG's were comprehensive planning agencies, mass transit planning was coordinated with other transportation planning. This made it easier to achieve a balanced transportation system.

The role of the Boundary Review Commissions has been strengthened. Some time ago, they were given greater authority to initiate as well as review changes in the boundaries of cities and special purpose districts.

Through the years the Legislature required that boundary commissions reduce the number of special purpose districts and municipalities and rationalize their boundaries. As a result, there has been a decrease in the number of such governmental units since 1972. There has been a substantial reduction in the problems of duplication, overlapping, and uncoordinated provision of urban services -- problems that were pronounced in the 60's and 70's. Since the number of governments providing services is smaller than in 1972, the implementation of comprehensive planning has become easier.

Decision-making is more informed today because of the development of broader concepts of cost-benefit analysis. There are more effective techniques of carrying out such analysis (involving the use of computers). There is a greater willingness to use it at
all levels of government. Cost-benefit analysis is broader in 2002 because it includes a consideration of social costs and benefits involved in any decision -- such things as aesthetic values, environmental impacts and effects on income levels. Long-range costs and benefits of proposed actions are now more fully identified.

At the local level, neighborhood organizations have become actual partners in the process of planning for their communities. In many cases, they have been given the option of planning their neighborhoods subject to review by the county or municipality in which they are located. The county or city adopts and enforces these plans as long as they pose no adverse effects for the rest of the city or county.
The large number of local, regional, state, and Federal agencies making plans and legislation in the 1970's was reviewed almost 30 years ago, and state-wide decision-making policies were completely reconsidered. Guidelines were established defining what constitutes a local, regional, or state matter.

The process was well under way by 1982. Councils of Government took on greater land-use planning authority, with state review in cases where consequences went beyond the boundaries of a COG district. The Boundary Review Commissions had more influence, with power to initiate as well as review sub-regional boundary changes.

All large-scale plans receive review at the state level. The state has asserted control over special lands deemed necessary for conservation of open space and provision of public recreation. Minimum quality standards have been established for local plans.

Cost-benefit analysis today includes the social costs and benefits in any decision. The public now is involved in the planning process, making plans for its own cities, towns, and neighborhoods.
The levels of government that affect the Valley in 2002 are smoothly integrated so that what is decided at the local level is a part of what is planned at the regional or state level.

At the most active level, the sub-regional level, the COG's in the Valley now plan together for all services and future development that extend beyond their individual boundaries. Having become comprehensive planning agencies -- with ultimate review at state level -- the COG's now can coordinate the Valley-wide public transit system with other transportation planning such as air travel and the diminished roads program. Quality and quantity review of any proposal having environmental or social impact is lodged with the COG's or, if the scale is sufficiently large, with the state.

By planning comprehensively on a regional and sub-regional basis, there has been a substantial reduction in problems of duplication, overlapping, and uncoordinated provision of public services.
HOW TO MAKE YOUR OWN SCENARIOS

One way for people to really understand how profoundly their actions affect their environment is to make their own scenarios for the future.

In this section we will show you ways to develop and write your own scenarios. This can be fun, but it is really a very serious process. Babies born as you read this will be experiencing the consequences of your decisions by the time they reach 30 years of age.

Let's have a look at some other possible alternatives for the Valley and see how you can make your own choices and work with other citizens and legislators to realize them. These are nine mini-scenarios for the future. Following them, we will see four more full-scale scenario alternatives covering all the issue areas.

1. ALTERNATIVE: Open Space and Recreation

A decision might be made to extend the present Greenway park system on the Willamette River to include the entire river and all its tributaries. This open space would not be a slim strip along the river banks with occasional parks along the way, but a generous network of public open space with access from transit flung up and down and across the Valley and penetrating up into river valleys east and west. The Greenways would extend for one-quarter mile inland from both banks of the rivers at all points, creating a skein of one-half-mile-wide linear parks converging on the Willamette all along the Valley.

2. ALTERNATIVE: Population

One alternative to a population of 2,500,000 in the Valley 30 years from now is to place restrictions on immigration.

Immigration controls and disincentives might bring the year 2002 population down by about a quarter of a million people.

For instance, if the state decided to de-emphasize heavy industry and institute more energy-consumption controls, it would likely mean fewer job opportunities and less immigration. With a comprehensive program of on-the-job training and up-grading the native labor force it would also mean jobs for the people who are here.

There are alternatives to this.

A lottery for prospective immigrants may sound quixotic. But it could be effective and it is no respecter of persons. It would mean that no-one would be excluded on the basis of education, skills, or social or economic "status."
3. ALTERNATIVE: Transportation

One of the great attributes of the Willamette Valley is its variety of environmental conditions and spectacular natural scenery.

What about an electric mini-rail system that would ring the Valley above the foothills? It would be connected to the mass transit system at various links, giving access to hiking, camping and rock climbing plus giving incredible views of the Valley below as you traveled along it at a leisurely speed. At each end of the loop—Portland and Eugene—there would be opportunities for more imaginative urban development. People could climb down into the Valley and the river-park network as well as up to the mountains. This system would be a strong tourist attraction as well as a way for Valley residents to leave their cars behind and reach recreation and open space around the Valley without bother to themselves or their environment.

4. ALTERNATIVE: Land Use

Between Eugene and Salem the otherwise flat landscape on either side of Highway I-5 is dotted with dome-like hills that are, in actuality, volcanic buttes.

One way to provide people with a chance to live outside the city with great views of open space and a unique "village" environment would be to develop these buttes as miniature hill-towns. People could live here in easy commuting distance to Salem or Eugene. Thus, open farm land would be saved for agriculture and for its visual beauty. Yet there would still be a profit for land-owners and developers.

This alternative might sound far out, but historic precedents exist in monastery towns such as Mont St. Michel, a complete town built on a domed island around a church and monastery in the 12th Century. And, many people have visited the Montmartre district of Paris without realizing it was once a suburb of the city built on a butte!

5. ALTERNATIVE: Employment and Income

There were 2,848,000 tourist autos visiting Oregon for more than 24 hours in 1969. (That's a standard measurement for tourism, and usually indicates a longer stay by one automobile and its passengers.) Tourists spent $326,435,000 in Oregon that year. It is safe to assume that a good portion of that amount was spent in the Valley, but undoubtedly a lot went to developed tourist centers on the coast, in the Columbia and Rogue River gorges, in national parks and forests, and at other resorts and recreational areas.

An alternative for Recreation and one that would spell more Employment and Income too, would be to mount an intensive development of tourist-oriented cities and facilities. Such places would be located where the most opportunities for recreation exist—and the Valley possesses many such opportunities. To take just one example, Junction City in Lane County lies right at the "crossroads" of many of Oregon's prime attractions. Both river, Valley and mountains are accessible. The Siuslaw National Forest is right above. A trip over to the Pacific Coast is easily made. The cosmopolitan university city of Eugene can offer entertainment and cultural opportunities. Junction City even has an annual Scandinavian Festival that could be capitalized on.
There are towns and small cities all over the Valley that can offer visitors unique experiences. There are rodeos in St. Paul and other towns; the annual state fair in Salem; the Willamette Falls; the locks; nearby state, county, and Federal parks. People could visit lumber camps, the State Capitol, see buildings that trace the development of the whole area (barns, silos, Victorian houses, forts), and most of all, absorb the glorious Valley scenery.

They could even do it all on the Valley mini-rail mentioned in the Transportation Alternative above.

6. ALTERNATIVE: Governmental Interrelationships

Everyone concerned with the Valley—from the Governor to the farmer who is wondering how much longer he can hold on to his farm—feels there should be a way for people and their officials to make decisions about the future in a spirit of mutual understanding and mutual concern for one another.

One idea is to hold a convention to which delegates would be elected by the public. Representatives of many localities and interests in the Valley would hammer out agreement on:

1. major objectives for the future of the Valley environment, and
2. guidelines on how to make environmental decisions in the future to attain those objectives.

Many people could participate in the convention, and it would be thoroughly covered by the news media. Public participation would be guaranteed by having delegates campaign for their posts. They would be elected or rejected by their fellow Oregonians on the basis of their beliefs for the future of the Valley.

7. ALTERNATIVE: Land Use

If comprehensive planning is to work on a full-scale basis, statewide zoning will become normal in the next 30 years, as it is in Hawaii today (see "Background Information, Land Use Legislation").

People have learned that actions taken in one part of the Valley have consequences in other parts. On a state-wide basis, this is also true. What people do on the coast, in central Oregon or eastern Oregon influences the state's economy and environment.

A central structure is needed to prevent adverse affects of new development on the environment.

Statewide zoning will provide such a structure. It will include basic measures such as densities, uses and site sizes. It will also balance out different types of land use, the protection of open space and the most efficient transportation routes.

8. ALTERNATIVE: Energy/Pollution

To preserve the visual beauty of the Valley and to protect open space, all power lines will be placed underground throughout the Valley. The "undergrounding" takes place in the 1970's because public officials and citizens realize that the longer they wait, the more expensive and time-consuming it will become. All continuing construction of utility lines in rural, urban and even wild areas comes under this new ruling at one time.

9. ALTERNATIVE: Energy and Power

New sources of power become increasingly available. The Valley no longer needs to search for power from its present sources. As we have seen, hydroelectric power will peak out by 1980. Fossil fuels are becoming increasingly expensive. Nuclear fission reactors have a relatively short life.

One alternative source is solar energy. It is being investigated now and should be in full use by the turn of the century.

Solar energy is inexhaustible, universal and clean. Solar generating plants will not even be located in the Valley. Some might be in the desert areas in eastern Oregon. Others might be in the deserts of the Southwest, on solar islands in the Pacific Ocean and in solar satellites circling the earth.

Together with collector systems and storage systems, these solar energy stations will be able to provide plentiful energy to vast areas of the world, including the Willamette Valley.
MORE ALTERNATIVES: Scenarios III, IV, V, VI....

What might alternative scenarios look like as they cover the whole range of interconnected environmental issues we have discussed in Scenarios I and II?

Scenario III: Land can be developed in east-west "sectors" extending from established centers in the Valley. These sectors would be served by a north-south road spine connecting them. A major east-west transit system in each sector would take people to home, work, and recreation. Generous bands of open space, agricultural land, and recreational areas would occur between the developed sectors. Employment for the most part would be centralized around nodes in the sectors. Emphasis would be on sub-regional government making most of the decisions affecting the environment.

Scenario IV: Another possibility is for development to occur in a contained linear pattern extending north-south along the Valley. This linear development would connect with existing centers. Movement systems would be directly integrated with the linear development, with roads and the main public transit route running north-south. Open space in this scenario would stretch out from the linear occupied areas and penetrate in between existing urban centers. Opportunities for employment would be distributed in communities along the linear development and also in existing cities. Governmental interrelationships would tend to emanate from a strong central authority in Salem.

Scenario V: This alternative would see the precise containment of existing urban centers under urban growth limits, and all other development taking place in new communities. This would eliminate suburban development for the most part. A circular public transit loop would connect the new communities and relate them to the established centers. A north-south road system would accommodate cars and trucking. Much commercial and industrial development would be redistributed into new communities. Governmental decisions affecting the environment would be made on a regional basis by agencies specializing in specific concerns.

Scenario VI: Still another idea is to have much of the new development and growth take place in a number of smaller communities dotted around the Valley. These communities would be developed on a contained basis, as would existing centers. To serve existing cities and new small communities there would be a north-south transit and road spine planned with sub-regional loop transit systems serving the communities. Open space and recreation potentials would be distributed between and close to these cities and communities. There would be just about as much open space as in some of the other alternatives, but it would be in smaller areas more directly in relation to the community served. Much of the employment will still be centered around the cities, but there would also be considerable local employment related to the newer communities. Government might take the form of "city states," or local authorities making decisions within a framework of mutual concern and respect for the Valley environment.
SCENARIO III

SCENARIO IV

SCENARIO V

SCENARIO VI

LAND USE

TRANSPORTATION

OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION
MAKE YOUR OWN SCENARIOS:

As we said at the beginning of this chapter, these are just a few alternatives we illustrate for you. There are many, many more.

These are all Valley-wide scenarios. But scenarios can deal with cities, towns, counties...even with your own neighborhood or the block on which you live.

We suggest now that you make your own alternative scenarios for the future, and see what the consequences might be.

Printed on the opposite page is a copy of the Guide Chart to the Future from the inside cover of this book. There is one difference.

It's empty.

We urge you to make future choices for yourself and the Valley environment, write them down in the chart, and see what the consequences might be. If you decide on a particular way to live, how will you fill in the cross-influence block between land use and transportation? If you decide to limit energy and migration into the Valley, how might that affect your children under Employment and Income in 30 years?

You can see how the interrelated consequences affect each other as you make your choices and decide on the future.

We think that you will get both pleasure and information from developing these charts with other people, and comparing the results. Perhaps you can involve legislators and state officials and share your discoveries. The Project "Foresight" people are obviously interested, or this book would never have been printed. But contact people at all levels: local officials, members of your subregional Council of Governments, and officials in Salem.

We hope that this book has given you some ideas about causes and consequences in the environment. We hope you see the realm of choices that lies open for people. We hope you'll share your ideas with others.

If many people and their officials can get into the process of environmental change together, it will be an all new American approach.

Chances are that the environment of the Willamette Valley will become what the people want it to be!
WILLAMETTE VALLEY POPULATION PROJECTIONS

### TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60-64</th>
<th>65-69</th>
<th>70-74</th>
<th>75-79</th>
<th>80-84</th>
<th>85-89</th>
<th>90-94</th>
<th>95 &amp; Older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1,232,000</td>
<td>121,5</td>
<td>103,2</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1,480,000</td>
<td>121,5</td>
<td>103,2</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,728,000</td>
<td>121,5</td>
<td>103,2</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INFORMATION

#### Background

The population projections for the Willamette Valley are presented in Table A, showing the projected population for the years 1980, 1990, and 2000. The projections are divided by age groups and gender, with specific focus on the 55-89 age range. The data is presented as a table with columns for different age groups and rows for each year. The projections include total population, as well as the population for specific age categories such as 55-59, 60-64, and so on. The table also separates the data by sex, with columns for males and females. The projections are based on the Economic Task Force Projections, May 1972. The data is updated for the years 1980, 1990, and 2000, with the population increasing from 1,232,000 in 1980 to 1,480,000 in 1990 and 1,728,000 in 2000. The population projections for the future years are also available in Table B, C, D, and E.
## BACKGROUND INFORMATION: LAND USE

### TABLE A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Summary Description</th>
<th>Basin Acreage (in 1,000 ft$^2$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>Few or no limitations or hazards.</td>
<td>171.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>Few limitations or hazards; simple conservation practices are needed when cultivated.</td>
<td>906.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>Have more limitations and hazards than Class II; require more difficult or complex conservation practices when cultivated.</td>
<td>511.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class IV</td>
<td>Have greater limitations and hazards than Class III; very difficult or complex measures are needed.</td>
<td>973.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class V-VIII</td>
<td>Land limited in use, generally not suited for cultivation.</td>
<td>4,800.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total land area</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,662.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water area</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total basin area</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,763.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WILLAMETTE VALLEY SOIL CATEGORIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Summary Description</th>
<th>(in 1,000) tons of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>Few or no limitations or hazards.</td>
<td>171.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>Few limitations or hazards; simple conservation practices are needed when cultivated.</td>
<td>906.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>Have more limitations and hazards than Class II; require more difficult or complex conservation practices when cultivated.</td>
<td>511.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class IV</td>
<td>Have greater limitations and hazards than Class III; very difficult or complex measures are needed.</td>
<td>973.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class V-VIII</td>
<td>Land limited in use, generally not suited for cultivation.</td>
<td>4,800.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total land area</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,662.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water area</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total basin area</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,763.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECTED LAND USE ACREAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dryland Crop</td>
<td>1,005,000</td>
<td>571,000</td>
<td>372,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated Crop</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cropland</td>
<td>1,435,000</td>
<td>1,421,000</td>
<td>1,372,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Pasture</td>
<td>202,000</td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>313,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>5,054,300</td>
<td>4,982,600</td>
<td>4,885,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>433,700</td>
<td>598,400</td>
<td>777,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>584,000</td>
<td>553,000</td>
<td>569,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,709,000</td>
<td>7,709,000</td>
<td>7,709,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECTED PRODUCTION OF SAND AND GRAVEL IN THE WILLAMETTE VALLEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>1970-80</th>
<th>1980-90</th>
<th>1990-00</th>
<th>2000-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970-80</td>
<td>1,604,191</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-90</td>
<td>1,907,560</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-00</td>
<td>2,570,880</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-10</td>
<td>2,801,288</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 12 tons per capita x 10 years (in decade) = 120.
* 42,500 x 1 ft. (deep) = 42,500 cu. ft./acre |
* 17 = 16,000 cu. yds./acre |
* 18 = 35,000 tons/acre.

**PROJECTED QUANTIFICATION IN THE WILLAMETTE VALLEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>1970-80</th>
<th>1980-90</th>
<th>1990-00</th>
<th>2000-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970-80</td>
<td>7,410</td>
<td>7,410</td>
<td>7,410</td>
<td>7,410</td>
<td>7,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-90</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>17,010</td>
<td>17,010</td>
<td>17,010</td>
<td>17,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-00</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>28,710</td>
<td>28,710</td>
<td>28,710</td>
<td>28,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-10</td>
<td>13,700</td>
<td>42,410</td>
<td>42,410</td>
<td>42,410</td>
<td>42,410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WILLAMETTE BASIN STUDY: Pacific Northwest River Basin Commission**

**PROJECTED PRODUCTION OF SAND AND GRAVEL IN THE WILLAMETTE VALLEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>1970-80</th>
<th>1980-90</th>
<th>1990-00</th>
<th>2000-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970-80</td>
<td>7,410</td>
<td>7,410</td>
<td>7,410</td>
<td>7,410</td>
<td>7,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-90</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>17,010</td>
<td>17,010</td>
<td>17,010</td>
<td>17,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-00</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>28,710</td>
<td>28,710</td>
<td>28,710</td>
<td>28,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-10</td>
<td>13,700</td>
<td>42,410</td>
<td>42,410</td>
<td>42,410</td>
<td>42,410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WILLAMETTE BASIN STUDY: Pacific Northwest River Basin Commission**

**PROJECTED QUANTIFICATION IN THE WILLAMETTE VALLEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>1970-80</th>
<th>1980-90</th>
<th>1990-00</th>
<th>2000-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970-80</td>
<td>7,410</td>
<td>7,410</td>
<td>7,410</td>
<td>7,410</td>
<td>7,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-90</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>17,010</td>
<td>17,010</td>
<td>17,010</td>
<td>17,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-00</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>28,710</td>
<td>28,710</td>
<td>28,710</td>
<td>28,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-10</td>
<td>13,700</td>
<td>42,410</td>
<td>42,410</td>
<td>42,410</td>
<td>42,410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BACKGROUND INFORMATION: LAND USE

LAND USE LEGISLATION

ON THE ISSUE

Basically, three methods to regulate land use exist: regulation in whole or part; police power regulation; and non-enacted regulations.

Most states use a combination of the three, whereas California relies heavily on contracts (Williamson Act).

Assessment is based on either market value or value relating to income-producing capability, resulting in more uniformity of assessment standards.

Fundamental assessment is lower than the highest and best use value. It is related to actual agricultural or open space use.

Reverted land occurs when land must be subjected to land-use restrictions as a condition precedent to non-value assessment.

New land is only state with positive comprehensive state programs of land-use control. Act 182, Wilson Land Bank Act, 1961, provides for:

- A state land use commission of seven members, for administrative purposes, part of the Department of Planning and Economic Development.

- The commission plans all state lands into urban, rural, agricultural, or conservation use districts. Rules are established by the commission for each with consideration given to county master plans.

- Any proposed changes in land use are submitted to a county planning commission subject to a hearing composed by the petitioner and the county land-use board. This section has seen "tougher" provisions since 1960.

- Except in conservation districts, counties do the zoning.

- There are use restrictions in agricultural and rural districts. There are stereotypical assessments.

- There is "dedicated" land (like contracts) in all the districts, including urban.

- "Open space" land outside the farm use zone is also eligible (with the deferred tax procedure).

- California (450,000 acres) - "Agricultural Preserve" land outside the farm use zone also may be eligible (with the deferred tax procedure). When land is converted, the owner pays a contract penalty of 50% of the new (restricted) assessment.

- There are some ties to local land-use planning through eminent domain. A state open space policy is being developed, involving state police powers (e.g. Lake Tahoe and Mono Lake) to regulate land use.

- Indiana gives preferential assessment for timber land. There is some tax deferral payment on conversion of developed land.

- Connecticut and New Jersey have preferential assessment and deferred taxes.

- New Jersey has a preferred assessment and deferred taxes.

- Oregon has a complex system of preferred assessment, deferred taxation, and phased development.

- Regulations are layered to agricultural land. There is in the only restriction. If land is in a "farm use area" it is used for special development. Agricultural land outside the farm use area also may be eligible (with the deferred tax procedure). When land is converted, the owner pays a contract penalty of 50% of the new (restricted) assessment.

- There are some ties to local land-use planning through eminent domain. A state open space policy is being developed, involving state police powers (e.g. Lake Tahoe and Mono Lake) to regulate land use.

- Connecticut and New Jersey have preferential assessment and deferred taxes.

- Oregon has a complex system of preferred assessment, deferred taxation, and phased development.

- Regulations are layered to agricultural land. There is in the only restriction. If land is in a "farm use area" it is used for special development. Agricultural land outside the farm use area also may be eligible (with the deferred tax procedure). When land is converted, the owner pays a contract penalty of 50% of the new (restricted) assessment.

- There are some ties to local land-use planning through eminent domain. A state open space policy is being developed, involving state police powers (e.g. Lake Tahoe and Mono Lake) to regulate land use.

- Connecticut and New Jersey have preferential assessment and deferred taxes.

- Oregon has a complex system of preferred assessment, deferred taxation, and phased development.

- Regulations are layered to agricultural land. There is in the only restriction. If land is in a "farm use area" it is used for special development. Agricultural land outside the farm use area also may be eligible (with the deferred tax procedure). When land is converted, the owner pays a contract penalty of 50% of the new (restricted) assessment.

- There are some ties to local land-use planning through eminent domain. A state open space policy is being developed, involving state police powers (e.g. Lake Tahoe and Mono Lake) to regulate land use.

- Connecticut and New Jersey have preferential assessment and deferred taxes.

- Oregon has a complex system of preferred assessment, deferred taxation, and phased development.

- Regulations are layered to agricultural land. There is in the only restriction. If land is in a "farm use area" it is used for special development. Agricultural land outside the farm use area also may be eligible (with the deferred tax procedure). When land is converted, the owner pays a contract penalty of 50% of the new (restricted) assessment.

- There are some ties to local land-use planning through eminent domain. A state open space policy is being developed, involving state police powers (e.g. Lake Tahoe and Mono Lake) to regulate land use.

- Connecticut and New Jersey have preferential assessment and deferred taxes.

- Oregon has a complex system of preferred assessment, deferred taxation, and phased development.

- Regulations are layered to agricultural land. There is in the only restriction. If land is in a "farm use area" it is used for special development. Agricultural land outside the farm use area also may be eligible (with the deferred tax procedure). When land is converted, the owner pays a contract penalty of 50% of the new (restricted) assessment.

- There are some ties to local land-use planning through eminent domain. A state open space policy is being developed, involving state police powers (e.g. Lake Tahoe and Mono Lake) to regulate land use.

- Connecticut and New Jersey have preferential assessment and deferred taxes.

- Oregon has a complex system of preferred assessment, deferred taxation, and phased development.

- Regulations are layered to agricultural land. There is in the only restriction. If land is in a "farm use area" it is used for special development. Agricultural land outside the farm use area also may be eligible (with the deferred tax procedure). When land is converted, the owner pays a contract penalty of 50% of the new (restricted) assessment.

- There are some ties to local land-use planning through eminent domain. A state open space policy is being developed, involving state police powers (e.g. Lake Tahoe and Mono Lake) to regulate land use.

- Connecticut and New Jersey have preferential assessment and deferred taxes.

- Oregon has a complex system of preferred assessment, deferred taxation, and phased development.

- Regulations are layered to agricultural land. There is in the only restriction. If land is in a "farm use area" it is used for special development. Agricultural land outside the farm use area also may be eligible (with the deferred tax procedure). When land is converted, the owner pays a contract penalty of 50% of the new (restricted) assessment.

- There are some ties to local land-use planning through eminent domain. A state open space policy is being developed, involving state police powers (e.g. Lake Tahoe and Mono Lake) to regulate land use.

- Connecticut and New Jersey have preferential assessment and deferred taxes.

- Oregon has a complex system of preferred assessment, deferred taxation, and phased development.

- Regulations are layered to agricultural land. There is in the only restriction. If land is in a "farm use area" it is used for special development. Agricultural land outside the farm use area also may be eligible (with the deferred tax procedure). When land is converted, the owner pays a contract penalty of 50% of the new (restricted) assessment.

- There are some ties to local land-use planning through eminent domain. A state open space policy is being developed, involving state police powers (e.g. Lake Tahoe and Mono Lake) to regulate land use.

- Connecticut and New Jersey have preferential assessment and deferred taxes.

- Oregon has a complex system of preferred assessment, deferred taxation, and phased development.

- Regulations are layered to agricultural land. There is in the only restriction. If land is in a "farm use area" it is used for special development. Agricultural land outside the farm use area also may be eligible (with the deferred tax procedure). When land is converted, the owner pays a contract penalty of 50% of the new (restricted) assessment.

- There are some ties to local land-use planning through eminent domain. A state open space policy is being developed, involving state police powers (e.g. Lake Tahoe and Mono Lake) to regulate land use.

- Connecticut and New Jersey have preferential assessment and deferred taxes.

- Oregon has a complex system of preferred assessment, deferred taxation, and phased development.

- Regulations are layered to agricultural land. There is in the only restriction. If land is in a "farm use area" it is used for special development. Agricultural land outside the farm use area also may be eligible (with the deferred tax procedure). When land is converted, the owner pays a contract penalty of 50% of the new (restricted) assessment.

- There are some ties to local land-use planning through eminent domain. A state open space policy is being developed, involving state police powers (e.g. Lake Tahoe and Mono Lake) to regulate land use.

- Connecticut and New Jersey have preferential assessment and deferred taxes.

- Oregon has a complex system of preferred assessment, deferred taxation, and phased development.

- Regulations are layered to agricultural land. There is in the only restriction. If land is in a "farm use area" it is used for special development. Agricultural land outside the farm use area also may be eligible (with the deferred tax procedure). When land is converted, the owner pays a contract penalty of 50% of the new (restricted) assessment.

- There are some ties to local land-use planning through eminent domain. A state open space policy is being developed, involving state police powers (e.g. Lake Tahoe and Mono Lake) to regulate land use.

- Connecticut and New Jersey have preferential assessment and deferred taxes.

- Oregon has a complex system of preferred assessment, deferred taxation, and phased development.

- Regulations are layered to agricultural land. There is in the only restriction. If land is in a "farm use area" it is used for special development. Agricultural land outside the farm use area also may be eligible (with the deferred tax procedure). When land is converted, the owner pays a contract penalty of 50% of the new (restricted) assessment.

- There are some ties to local land-use planning through eminent domain. A state open space policy is being developed, involving state police powers (e.g. Lake Tahoe and Mono Lake) to regulate land use.

- Connecticut and New Jersey have preferential assessment and deferred taxes.

- Oregon has a complex system of preferred assessment, deferred taxation, and phased development.

- Regulations are layered to agricultural land. There is in the only restriction. If land is in a "farm use area" it is used for special development. Agricultural land outside the farm use area also may be eligible (with the deferred tax procedure). When land is converted, the owner pays a contract penalty of 50% of the new (restricted) assessment.

- There are some ties to local land-use planning through eminent domain. A state open space policy is being developed, involving state police powers (e.g. Lake Tahoe and Mono Lake) to regulate land use.
## BACKGROUND INFORMATION: TRANSPORTATION

### TABLE A
ESTIMATED MILEAGE AND RIGHT-OF-WAY ACRES FOR TEN WILLAMETTE VALLEY COUNTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>10,500,000</td>
<td>13,650,000</td>
<td>17,015,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanized Area</td>
<td>2,975,000</td>
<td>3,575,000</td>
<td>4,725,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>1,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,370,000</td>
<td>15,240,000</td>
<td>19,360,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE B
MILEAGE, VEHICLE MILES AND ACREAGE BY CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>10,500,000</td>
<td>13,650,000</td>
<td>17,015,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanized Area</td>
<td>2,975,000</td>
<td>3,575,000</td>
<td>4,725,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>1,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,370,000</td>
<td>15,240,000</td>
<td>19,360,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE C
MILEAGE AND TRAFFIC FOR TEN WILLAMETTE VALLEY COUNTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>10,500,000</td>
<td>13,650,000</td>
<td>17,015,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanized Area</td>
<td>2,975,000</td>
<td>3,575,000</td>
<td>4,725,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>1,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,370,000</td>
<td>15,240,000</td>
<td>19,360,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE D
COLLECTOR, LOCAL, AND TOTAL MILEAGE AND TRAFFIC FOR TEN WILLAMETTE VALLEY COUNTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>10,500,000</td>
<td>13,650,000</td>
<td>17,015,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>2,975,000</td>
<td>3,575,000</td>
<td>4,725,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,370,000</td>
<td>15,240,000</td>
<td>19,360,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 State Highway Department
BACKGROUND INFORMATION: TRANSPORTATION

DAILY VEHICLE-MILES OF TRAVEL ON STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM IN WILLAMETTE VALLEY

VALLEY URBANIZED AREAS
URBAN MASS TRANSIT-ANNUAL RIDERSHIP 1970-2000

WILLAMETTE VALLEY
ESTIMATED MILEAGE AND ACRES OF RIGHT OF WAY
ALL SURFACED HIGHWAYS, ROADS & STREETS
BACKGROUND INFORMATION: OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION

DEFINITION OF CLASSES OF PARK LANDS

Class I - High density recreation areas usually located within or near urban centers, primarily for intensive day use, but including specialized overnight facilities.

Class II-A - Generally developed recreation areas within 25 miles of communities of 10,000 or more; regional, for less intensive day, overnight and weekend use.

Class II-BC, III and IV - Class II-BC areas more than 25 miles from population centers of 1970, or from areas in large natural environments with minimal development and areas in outstanding natural areas.

Class II-A - Generally developed recreation areas within 25 miles of communities of 10,000 or more; regional, for less intensive day, overnight and weekend use.

Class I - High density recreation areas usually located within or near urban centers, primarily for intensive day use, but including specialized overnight facilities.

Class II-A - Generally developed recreation areas within 25 miles of communities of 10,000 or more; regional, for less intensive day, overnight and weekend use.

Class II-BC, III and IV - Class II-BC areas more than 25 miles from population centers of 1970, or from areas in large natural environments with minimal development and areas in outstanding natural areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS / YEAR</th>
<th>NO. OF ACRES/1000 POPULATION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>4,520</td>
<td>6,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II-A</td>
<td>6,493</td>
<td>8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II-BC, III and IV</td>
<td>10,390</td>
<td>12,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21,330</td>
<td>29,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Additional required = additional required - over 1970 acres.

Table A

PROJECT FORESIGHT, FIRST PHASE REPORT, DECEMBER 9, 1971.

FISH AND GAME PROJECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>ANGLERS</th>
<th>RECREATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>260,778</td>
<td>3,167,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>510,600</td>
<td>5,610,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>811,700</td>
<td>7,835,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

ADDITIONAL SPORT FISHERY NEEDS

The recreation listed in the above table can more nearly be realized by developing alternative fish production as listed beginning of page 104-2, Appendix D, Willamette Basin Study. Also, much of the additional trout recreation will depend upon hatchery fishing and legal production.

Table C

WILLAMETTE BASIN LICENSED ANGLER PROJECTIONS AND POSSIBLE RECREATION DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>ANGLERS</th>
<th>RECREATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>260,778</td>
<td>3,167,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>510,600</td>
<td>5,610,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>811,700</td>
<td>7,835,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

WILLAMETTE BASIN SPORT CATCH DEMAND, SUPPLY, AND UNSATISIFIED CATCH DEMAND (THOUSANDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andromous</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout</td>
<td>3,214</td>
<td>6,502</td>
<td>7,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm Water Game Fish</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,442</td>
<td>7,160</td>
<td>8,660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

WILLAMETTE BASIN ANGLER DAYS ON PROJECTED CATCH DEMAND AND FISH SUPPLY (THOUSANDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>ANGLER-DAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2,347,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3,088,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3,694,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

PROJECT FORESIGHT, FIRST PHASE REPORT, DECEMBER 9, 1971.

The average resident angler fished nine days per year according to the 1965 survey.

---

Notes:


---

In Willamette Basin, 9 percent of population was licensed in 1970. This is increased by 0.7 percent per 10-year period to coincide with statewide growth rate of anglers.
### Table 8 - Projected Wildlife Use Willamette Basin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Population</td>
<td>1,472,386</td>
<td>1,757,000</td>
<td>2,082,730</td>
<td>2,515,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting License Holders</td>
<td>228,860</td>
<td>292,500</td>
<td>376,360</td>
<td>459,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hunters Using Areas</td>
<td>133,114</td>
<td>194,100</td>
<td>273,000</td>
<td>351,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bass |**

- **Bass Total Demand:** 2,600
- **Bass Total Supply:** 1,250

**Hunters**

- 1970 | 2,793 | 58,060 | 63,600 | 67,400 |
- 1980 | 1,398 | 36,000 | 30,608 | 30,500 |

**Non-Take**

- 1970 | 2,793 | 58,060 | 63,600 | 67,400 |
- 1980 | 1,398 | 36,000 | 30,608 | 30,500 |

### Table 2 - Land Area Required to Achieve "1985 Standard" Based upon "1985 Standard" Base Land per 1,000 Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class I - No. of acres required</td>
<td>16,135</td>
<td>22,510</td>
<td>31,170</td>
<td>42,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Additional required over 1970 actual acres</td>
<td>+ 11,585</td>
<td>+ 17,960</td>
<td>+ 26,620</td>
<td>+ 38,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II-A - No. of acres required</td>
<td>19,545</td>
<td>26,475</td>
<td>35,925</td>
<td>48,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Additional required over 1970 actual acres</td>
<td>+ 13,150</td>
<td>+ 20,080</td>
<td>+ 29,530</td>
<td>+ 49,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II-B, III and IV - No. of acres required</td>
<td>73,775</td>
<td>102,250</td>
<td>141,580</td>
<td>193,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Additional required over 1970 actual acres</td>
<td>+ 44,035</td>
<td>+ 72,510</td>
<td>+ 111,840</td>
<td>+ 163,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Class II</td>
<td>109,455</td>
<td>152,235</td>
<td>197,925</td>
<td>252,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Additional required over 1970 actual acres</td>
<td>+ 68,770</td>
<td>+ 110,550</td>
<td>+ 167,990</td>
<td>+ 243,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The standard used for this analysis is the national recreation standard modified to meet the needs of the Willamette Valley. This standard is based on the National Recreation Research and Development Commission's report, "Recreational Facilities Required Based upon "1985 Standard" Base Land per 1,000 Population."
BACKGROUND INFORMATION: EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME

TABLE A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td>9,757</td>
<td>15,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita</td>
<td>2,668</td>
<td>3,636</td>
<td>4,662</td>
<td>6,199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,720</td>
<td>10,684</td>
<td>20,928</td>
<td>39,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita</td>
<td>3,577</td>
<td>6,086</td>
<td>9,661</td>
<td>15,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>379,257</td>
<td>581,370</td>
<td>328,120</td>
<td>596,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per Capita</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>2,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>3,340</td>
<td>108,100</td>
<td>119,250</td>
<td>227,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Govt.</td>
<td>15,612</td>
<td>18,480</td>
<td>22,520</td>
<td>27,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>20,262</td>
<td>34,140</td>
<td>52,390</td>
<td>107,070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Multiplier       | 1.47| 3.75| 5.52| 8.79|

| Total Employment | 652,185| 755,880| 1,116,750| 1,166,750|
| Per Capita       | 3,340| 1,773| 1,420| 2,475|

| Population       | 1,415,358| 1,755,351| 3,091,750| 3,475,924|
| per Capita       | 3,977| 6,086| 9,661| 15,800|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,720</td>
<td>10,684</td>
<td>20,928</td>
<td>39,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per Capita</td>
<td>3,577</td>
<td>6,086</td>
<td>9,661</td>
<td>15,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td>9,757</td>
<td>15,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per Capita</td>
<td>2,668</td>
<td>3,636</td>
<td>4,662</td>
<td>6,199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Millions dollars
** 1967 dollars
## Projected Emissions for the Willamette Valley

### TABLE A

---|---|---|---|---
Residential Fuel Cabs | 594 | 1145 | 1374 | 1649
Commercial Fuel Cabs | 1394 | 1764 | 1938 | 1941
Industrial Fuel Cabs | 10187 | 1572 | 7888 | 9468

### Total Fuel Cabs

12265 | 9067 | 10580 | 13019

### Chemical Industry

331 | 125 | 40 | 41

### Fuel/Agric. Industry

5825 | 1392 | 1422 | 1730

### Metallurgical Industry

2190 | 1062 | 1120 | 1775

### Mineral Prod. Industry

3475 | 2215 | 2076 | 2347

### Petrochemical Industry

355 | 214 | 161 | 121

### Wood Processing Industry

459 | 201 | 205 | 218

### Other Industries

249 | 201 | 205 | 218

### Total Process Loss

46972 | 11657 | 11796 | 11555

### Incineration

514 | 123 | 133 | 124

### Open Burning

147 | 146 | 1000 | 1059

### Vigint Burners

2982 | 0 | 0 | 0

### Total Solid Waste

7665 | 1599 | 1311 | 1171

### Motor Vehicles

3165 | 4599 | 9526 | 7344

### Total Transportation

4779 | 5598 | 8729 | 11978

### Field Burning

3760 | 2800 | 2706 | 1800

### Forest Fires

772 | 727 | 727 | 727

### Slash Burning

5975 | 4445 | 374 | 1689

### Total Miscellaneous

12066 | 9218 | 9427 | 10680

### Total Valley

89117 | 12668 | 42453 | 54024

---

*Project Oversight, First Phase Report, December 9, 1971*

### TABLE B

---|---|---|---|---
Residential Fuel Cabs | 594 | 1145 | 1374 | 1649
Commercial Fuel Cabs | 1394 | 1764 | 1938 | 1941
Industrial Fuel Cabs | 10187 | 1572 | 7888 | 9468

### Total Fuel Cabs

12265 | 9067 | 10580 | 13019

### Chemical Industry

331 | 125 | 40 | 41

### Fuel/Agric. Industry

5825 | 1392 | 1422 | 1730

### Metallurgical Industry

2190 | 1062 | 1120 | 1775

### Mineral Prod. Industry

3475 | 2215 | 2076 | 2347

### Petrochemical Industry

355 | 214 | 161 | 121

### Wood Processing Industry

459 | 201 | 205 | 218

### Other Industries

249 | 201 | 205 | 218

### Total Process Loss

46972 | 11657 | 11796 | 11555

### Incineration

514 | 123 | 133 | 124

### Open Burning

147 | 146 | 1000 | 1059

### Vigint Burners

2982 | 0 | 0 | 0

### Total Solid Waste

7665 | 1599 | 1311 | 1171

### Motor Vehicles

3165 | 4599 | 9526 | 7344

### Total Transportation

4779 | 5598 | 8729 | 11978

### Field Burning

3760 | 2800 | 2706 | 1800

### Forest Fires

772 | 727 | 727 | 727

### Slash Burning

5975 | 4445 | 374 | 1689

### Total Miscellaneous

12066 | 9218 | 9427 | 10680

### Total Valley

89117 | 12668 | 42453 | 54024

---

*Project Oversight, First Phase Report, December 9, 1973*
BACKGROUND INFORMATION: POLLUTION

PROJECTED EMISSIONS FOR THE WILLAMETTE VALLEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Fuel Cabs</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>4653</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Fuel Cabs</td>
<td>4052</td>
<td>2527</td>
<td>3844</td>
<td>5129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fuel Cabs</td>
<td>6082</td>
<td>3644</td>
<td>16752</td>
<td>8569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Industry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/Agric. Industry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metallurgical Industry</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>2760</td>
<td>2576</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Prod. Industry</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrochemical Industry</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper &amp; Allied Products Industry</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>2358</td>
<td>3046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Industries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Process Loss</td>
<td>7105</td>
<td>4064</td>
<td>4977</td>
<td>5852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incineration</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Burning</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incineration</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Solid Waste</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicles</td>
<td>2703</td>
<td>3845</td>
<td>5257</td>
<td>7044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Transportation</td>
<td>4201</td>
<td>5643</td>
<td>7051</td>
<td>10494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Burning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Fires</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valley</td>
<td>25109</td>
<td>65000</td>
<td>112130</td>
<td>46069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WILLAMETTE VALLEY SOLID WASTE PROJECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic - Commercial</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Daily Tonnage</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: ENERGY AND POWER

PER CAPITA ENERGY USE

PER CAPITA ENERGY USE
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The report, entitled The Willamette Valley - Choices for the Future, is an environmental primer for Valley residents. It sets forth basic principles showing how men's actions cause future consequences in the environment. The report has eight elements: (1) "Guide to the Future," a digest of how environmental changes affect each other. (2) "How to Use This Book." (3) "How This Book Came About." (4) "How the Valley Developed Until 1972." (5) "Scenario I," showing how the Valley will be in the year 2002 if people continue making decisions based on current trends. (6) "Scenario II," showing the Valley in 2002 based on changed assumptions about more density of urban development and that development decisions will be made largely in favor of environmental concerns. (7) "How to Make Your Own Scenarios." (8) "Background Information." Seven impact areas in the environment are analyzed: land use, transportation, open space and recreation, employment and income, pollution, energy and power, and governmental interrelationships.
To Thos Jefferson Esq. his obidt servt
M. Lewis: Captm: detached:

Sir:

Having in mind your repeated commands in this matter,
And the want half of it done, and the steams mapped,
And we here on the back of this beach beholding the
Other ocean - two years gone, and the cold
Breaking with rain for the third spring since St. Louis,
The Crows at the firebox on the frozen dunes
The first cranes going over from south north,
And the swan down by a mark of the pole since the morning,
And time near to return, and a Ship (Spanish)
Lying on for the salmon: and fearing chance on the
Drought for the Sioux should deprive you of these discoveries -
Therefore we send by sea in this writing.

Above the
Platte there were long plains and a clay country:
Rim of the sky far off, grass under it,
Dung for the cock-necks by the sulphur licks.
After that there were low hills and the sycamores,
And we posted up by the Great Bend in the skiffs:
The honey bees left us by the Osage River.
The wind was west in the evenings, and no dew and the
Morning star larger & whiter than usual -
The winter rattling in the brittle haws.
The second year there was sage, and the quail calling.
All that valley is good land by the river.
Three thousand miles and the clay cliffs and
Rice and beargrass by the water banks.
And many kinds and the brant going over and tracks of
Bear, etc, wolves, martien: - The buffalo
Numberless so that the cloud of their size covers them:
The antelope fording the fall-trees, and the mountains
Grazing lands and the marsh lands and the ground
Sweet and open and well drained.

We advise you to
Settle troops at the forks and to issue licenses:
Many men will have living on these lands,
There is wealth in the earth for them all & the wood standing
And wild birds on the water where they sleep.
There is stone in the hills for the towns of a great people......

ARCHIBALD MACLEISH
THE WILLAMETTE VALLEY
CHOICES FOR THE FUTURE

ILLUSTRATED SCENARIOS SHOWING CONSEQUENCES OF ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO DEVELOPMENT IN THE VALLEY FOR THE NEXT THIRTY YEARS

AUTUMN