

Supporting Resources

- Akten, M., & Çelik, M. (2013). Evaluation of visual landscape perception for Incilipinar and Adalet Park cases. *Journal of Food, Agriculture & Environment*, 11(2), 1532-1538.
- Clay, G. R., & Smidt, R. K. (2004). Assessing the validity and reliability of descriptor variables used in scenic highway analysis. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 66(4), 239-255.
- Daniel, T. C., & Vining, J. (1983). Methodological issues in the assessment of landscape quality. In *Behavior and the natural environment* (pp. 39-84). Springer US.
- East Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District (EMSWCD). (2013). Douglas Fir. Retrieved March 27, 2015 from: <http://emswcd.org/douglas-fir/>
- Ewing, R., Handy, S., Brownson, R. C., Clemente, O., & Winston, E. (2006). Identifying and measuring urban design qualities related to walkability. *Journal of Physical Activity & Health*, 3, S223.
- Hull, R.B., Buhyoff, G.J., (1984). Individual and group reliability of landscape assessments. *Landscape Planning*, 11(1), 67-71.
- McNicol, Don. A primer of signal detection theory. Psychology Press, 2005.
- Otero Pastor, I., Casermeiro Martínez, M. A., Ezquerro Canalejo, A., & Esparcia Mariño, P. (2007). Landscape evaluation: comparison of evaluation methods in a region of Spain. *Journal of environmental management*, 85(1), 204-214.
- Palmer, J. F. (2000). Reliability of rating visible landscape qualities. *Landscape Journal*, 19(1-2), 166-178.
- Preston, C. C., & Colman, A. M. (2000). Optimal number of response categories in rating scales: reliability, validity, discriminating power, and respondent preferences. *Acta psychologica*, 104(1), 1-15.
- Roth, M. (2006). Validating the use of Internet survey techniques in visual landscape assessment—An empirical study from Germany. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 78(3), 179-192.
- Swets, John A. *Signal detection theory and ROC analysis in psychology and diagnostics: Collected papers*. Psychology Press, 2014.
- Vining, J. and Stevens, J. J. 1986. The assessment of landscape quality: major methodological considerations. In Sardon, R. C., Palmer, J. F. and Felleman, J. P. (Eds.), *Foundations for visual project analysis*. Wiley, New York, pp. 167-186.

Background Documents and Related Project Reports

- City of Portland Bureau of Planning. *Central City Plan*. March 1988.
- City of Portland Bureau of Planning. *Central City Plan District*. 1988.
- City of Portland Bureau of Planning. *Scenic Resources Inventory Map*. March 1989.
- City of Portland Bureau of Planning. *Scenic Resources Protection Plan*. April 1991.

City of Portland Bureau of Planning. *Scenic Views, Sites and Drives Inventory*. March 1989.

City of Portland Bureau of Planning. *Terwilliger Parkway Corridor Plan*. October 1983.

City of Portland Bureau of Planning. *Willamette Greenway Plan*. October 1987.

City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability. *South Waterfront Plan*. 2002.

City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability. *South Waterfront Public Views and Visual Permeability Assessment*. 2006.

City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability. *Union Station Clock Tower-related FAR and Height Limitations Study*. 2000.

Case Study Resources

Ithaca, New York

- <http://www.town.ithaca.ny.us/conservation-board>
- Smith, M. Personal contact

London, United Kingdom

- Regional Planning Guidance Note 3: Supplementary Guidance for London Strategic Planning Advice on High Buildings and Strategic Views in London, 1999

National Park Service Scenery Conservation Program

- Meyer, M. Personal contact

Cincinnati, Ohio

- <http://www.cincinnati-oh.gov/planning/linkservid/F9A7EE5B-D7B2-2156-2C9B2E720E725B56/showMeta/0/>

Vancouver, British Columbia

- <http://vancouver.ca/home-property-development/protecting-vancouvers-views.aspx>
- <http://vancouver.ca/docs/planning/view-protection-guidelines.pdf>
- Bringham, S. 2012. *The Cult Of The View: Comparing and Evaluating the Effectiveness of View Corridor Protection in Montréal and Vancouver*. Master's Thesis, Urban and Regional Planning, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario

Seattle, Washington

- Seattle Code: <http://cleark.ci.seattle.wa.us/~public/toc/25-05.htm>
- Overview: http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/View_Protection/Overview/

Edinburgh, Scotland

- http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/info/20065/conservation/249/the_skyline_study

Valencia, Spain

- Steinitz, C. 2010. An assessment of the visual landscape of the autonomous region of Valencia, Spain: A case study in linking research, teaching and landscape planning. Landscape 21:14-33. Journal published by the University of Ljubljana, Slovenia.

San Francisco, California

- http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/general_plan/15_Urban_Design.htm#URB_CPN_1_1
- Perry, N. Personal contact

Denver, Colorado

- <https://www.denvergov.org/zoning/OtherRegulations/ViewPlanes/tabid/432623/Default.aspx>

Napa County, California

- <http://www.countyofnapa.org/planning/>
- Planning@countyofnapa.org. Personal contact

Austin, Texas

- <ftp://ftp.ci.austin.tx.us/LURTraining/Capitol%20View%20Corridors.pdf>
- <http://www.preservationaustin.org/advocacy/capitol-view-corridors/>
- http://www.preservationaustin.org/uploads/Capitol_View_Corridors_map1.pdf

Honolulu, Hawaii

- Honolulu Department of Planning and Permitting. Personal contact

Auckland, New Zealand

Mississippi National River Park and Recreation Area

- Mississippi National River and Recreation Area Visual Resource Viewshed Analysis NPS, February 14
- Schwarzler, K. Personal contact