

6/24/14 Workshop Results

Highlights:

Who was there?

- Usual suspects in terms of age
- More Tualatin residents (45%) than Wilsonville residents (20%)
- A quarter (25%) of participants live in the planning area
- Most heard about the workshop via email (62%)

Retail

- Large majority (93%) against big box retail, not many supported corner/convenience retail
- Most supported retail types were neighborhood and internally oriented to campus employees – though internally – oriented retail also had the largest number of neutral responses, maybe because people are not familiar with this type of retail
- Slightly over half supported mixed-use (54%)
- Some support for retail in the area overall; more thought it was important than unimportant, but not by a large margin (40% vs. 37%)

Other Commercial

- Strong support for coffee shops and food stands
- Mixed opinions on restaurants and supermarket (about half and half)
- Under half (45%) supported medical services, though this type also received the largest number of neutral votes (19%) out of “other commercial” category

Employment

- The top three employment types considered somewhat or very appropriate for Basalt Creek were industrial flex space (79%), office (75%) and small-scale retail (74%).
- Both light industrial and warehousing were deemed generally appropriate as well by most participants (66 and 55% respectively)

Plan Focus

- Almost all of the themes presented were seen by most participants as somewhat or very important. The top rated were housing (88%), jobs (87%), and parks (81%).
- Transportation choices (80%) and protecting natural resources (79%) were not far behind
- Protection of/access to historic resources and public access to Coffee Creek Lake and Basalt Creek were 59% and 54%, respectively

Level of Agreement, proportionately (in order of most to least)

- No big box retail (93%)
- Housing important (88%)

- Jobs important (87%)
- Park important (51%)
- Transportation choice important (80%)
- Support for industrial flex space employment (79%)
- Protection of natural resources important (79%)
- Support for office employment (75%)
- Support for small-scale retail employment (74%)
- Support for Coffee shops (71%) and Farm Stands (68%)
- Support for light manufacturing employment (66%)
- Support for retail internally oriented to employees on a campus (64%)
- No corner/convenience retail (59%)
- Support for neighborhood retail (59%)
- Support for restaurants (55%)
- Support for warehousing employment (55%)
- Support for public access to Coffee Lake and Basalt Creek (54)
- Support for mixed use retail (54%)
- No supermarket (50%)
- Support for overall retail in Basalt Creek (47%)
- Support for medical services (45%)
- Support for restaurants (43%)
- Support for strip retail (38%)
- Support for a mix of all employment types (38%)
- No restaurants (38%)
- Medical services not appropriate (36%)
- Retail services not important (30%)
- No strip retail (28%)

Most high/low responses (proportionately)

- Housing very important (65%)
- Protection of natural resources very important (61%)
- Jobs very important (55%)
- Parks very important (51%)
- Industrial Flex Space Employment very appropriate (48%)
- Transpo choice very important (42%)
- Light manufacturing employment very important (38%)
- Warehousing employment very appropriate (35%)

Most Very Unimportant/Very Inappropriate Responses (proportionately)

- Retail services – very unimportant (22%)
- Publi access to coffee lake and basalt creek – very unimportant (20%)

- Protection of/access to historic resources – very unimportant (17%)
- Environmental protection – very unimportant (14%)
- Light manufacturing – very inappropriate (12%)

Detailed Results

WHO WAS THERE

- Almost half (46%) of participants (42 answered the age question) were between ages of 56 and 70. According to the polling, there was no one under 30 present at the workshop. 15% were older than 70, and the rest (39%) were between 31 and 55.
- Most (62%) had participated in a public workshop before (however, only 39 answered this question, though ultimately there were at least 45 participants – it is unclear because there were a few attendees that did not sign the sign-in sheet).
- Most heard about the workshop via email (62%). 19% heard about it through the project or city website. Only 2% heard about the workshop via social media (Facebook or Twitter). 5% saw a flyer that alerted them to the workshop.
- 29% of workshop attendees said they own property in the area, 10% said they live in the area, and 5% said they work in the area. However, it is possible that more people do each of these things in the area, as 44% selected the answer “I do more than one of the above near the area” (in retrospect, this was a poorly worded question and is minimally useful for analysis).
- The most participants live in Tualatin (45%), while 25% live in the Basalt Creek planning area (currently unincorporated Washington County). Only 20% were residents of Wilsonville, while 10% live in a different city/area.

RETAIL

- General: About a third of participants thought having retail services in Basalt Creek for existing and future neighborhoods was somewhat important, while 17% said it was very important. Overall, 49% thought retail for neighborhoods had some level of importance, while 37% thought it was somewhat or very unimportant. 15% were neutral.
- Strip Retail: Asked whether strip retail was appropriate for the Basalt Creek area, opinions were fairly evenly divided between yes (38%), no (28%) and neutral (26%). Only 8% were not sure.
- Neighborhood Retail: Most people thought neighborhood retail was appropriate for Basalt Creek (59%). 27% said it was not appropriate and 15% were neutral.
- Convenience/Corner Stores: Most (59%) said convenience or corner stores were not appropriate for Basalt Creek. 32% thought it was appropriate, 10% were neutral.
- Big Box: An overwhelming majority (93%) of participants did not think big box retail was appropriate for Basalt Creek.
- Internally oriented to employees on a campus: Most thought this type of retail was appropriate for Basalt Creek (64%). Only 13% said it was not, while 23% were neutral. The concept may have not been very familiar to many workshop participants.

- Mixed-Use (ground floor retail with office or housing above): A slight majority said mixed use was appropriate for Basalt Creek (54%), while 34% said it was not appropriate. 10% were neutral and 2% were not sure.

OTHER COMMERCIAL

- Supermarket: Half (50%) of workshop participants said a supermarket was not appropriate for Basalt Creek. 43% thought that it was, while 5% were neutral.
- Restaurants: 55% of participants thought restaurants were appropriate for Basalt Creek, while 38% said they were not and 7% were neutral.
- Medical Services: 45% thought medical services were appropriate for the area, 36% said they were not, and 19% were neutral.
- Farm Stands: There was strong support for farm stands, with 68% of participants agreeing they were appropriate for Basalt Creek. 23% thought they were not, while 7% were neutral and 2% were unsure.
- Coffee Shops: A large majority (71%) thought coffee shops were appropriate for the Basalt Creek area.
- Contractor's Supplies and Services: 56% did not think this was an appropriate commercial use for Basalt Creek, while 33% thought it was. 9% were neutral

EMPLOYMENT

- Industrial Flex Space: 48% thought this was very appropriate, and 31% thought it was somewhat appropriate. Only 17% thought it was very or somewhat inappropriate (10 and 7%, respectively).
- Office: The most participants thought office employment was somewhat appropriate for the area (49%) while 26% thought it was very appropriate. Only 11% thought it was somewhat or very inappropriate for the area.
- Small-Scale Retail: 74% thought this employment type was appropriate, though more chose somewhat appropriate (51%) than very appropriate (23%).
- Light Manufacturing: 66% thought this employment type was very or somewhat appropriate. 27% thought it was inappropriate. 8% were neutral.
- Warehousing: 55% thought this type of employment was either somewhat or very appropriate; with more saying they thought it was very appropriate (35%). 35% thought it was somewhat or very inappropriate, with only 10% saying it was very inappropriate. 10% were neutral.
- Mix of All: Responses were evenly split between appropriate (38%), inappropriate (35%) and neutral (27%).

PLAN FOCUS

- 88 Housing: 65% said this was very important, and 23% said it was somewhat important. Only 4% thought it was somewhat or very unimportant.
- Jobs: 87% said somewhat or very important, with over half overall saying it was very important (55%). 9% were neutral, while only 4% said it was somewhat or very unimportant.

- Parks: 81% said this was somewhat or very important, with over half of participants saying it was very important (note that only 37 participants responded to this question, as it was worded incorrectly and a bit hard to understand)
- 80 Transportation Choices: 42% said very important and 38% said somewhat important. 16% were neutral. Only 4% thought this theme was somewhat or very unimportant.
- 79 Protect natural resources: 61% said very important and 18% said somewhat important. 11% were neutral, while only 9% said somewhat or very unimportant
- Environmental protection: 72% said somewhat or very important, about evenly split between the two (35 and 37%, respectively). 9% were neutral and 19% said this was somewhat or very unimportant (5 and 14% respectively).
- Protection of/access to historic resources in Basalt Creek: 59% thought this theme was somewhat or very important, with slightly less saying very (27%) than somewhat (32%). 17% were neutral, and another 17% thought this was very unimportant. 7% thought it was somewhat important.
- Public Access to Coffee Lake and Basalt Creek: 54% thought this was either somewhat or very important. 25% thought it was somewhat or very unimportant. 20% were neutral.