

**STAFF REPORT FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION BRIEFING
AUGUST 3, 2015**

**Sauvie Island / Multnomah Channel Rural Area Plan Code Drafting Priorities
(Project Case PC-2013-2931)**

1.0 INTRODUCTION

On June 1, 2015 the Multnomah County Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of a 2015 draft Sauvie Island / Multnomah Channel Rural Area Plan to the Board of County Commissioners. The 2015 draft plan is intended to repeal and replace the existing Plan, which was adopted by Ordinance No. 887 in 1997 and is currently in effect. A copy of the 2015 draft Plan and a link to the project's full document library can be accessed on-line:

<https://multco.us/landuse/sauvie-islandmultnomah-channel-plan-update>

A public hearing with the Board of County Commissioners to consider the 2015 draft Plan is being targeted for late August, 2015. More detailed information about the hearing will be released once those details are known.

The purpose of this briefing report is to communicate to the Planning Commission which policies staff projects the Land Use Planning Division will begin working on first assuming the plan is approved by the Board. Although project priority will ultimately be a Department decision; staff would appreciate feedback from the Planning Commission to help inform options.

It is important to recall that Multnomah County is engaged in an update to the Multnomah County Comprehensive Framework Plan which provides county wide land use policy direction. Policy discussions by that project's Community Advisory Group is on-going and the Planning Commission should be careful not to unknowingly embark on code changes applicable county wide if there is potential for that topic to be considered as part of the Comprehensive Plan work. Additionally, the Division's staffing resources are not unlimited which is a factor to consider for project prioritization.

One logical approach would be to begin code development work on policies which are unique to the Sauvie Island / Multnomah Channel Plan Area, those which have wide community support and/or have a health and safety component. This approach will reduce the potential of getting ahead of the Comprehensive Plan Update policy discussions and help the Division address important issues for the island and channel as soon as possible.

Staff Contact: Adam Barber

2.0 PROPOSED PRIORITIES

Priority 1 projects are thought to be those most unique to SIMC geographic area, projects with community support, those that appear to be primed for implementation and/or have health and safety component. Priority 2 projects may require more agency coordination or additional scoping as compared to Priority 1 projects and therefore may be slower to get off the ground. Timelines related to Priority 3 projects may be the hardest to predict due to technical or legal complexities and anticipated levels of public involvement.

The location of each project topic within each priority section has no relevance and projects towards the top of Priority 1, for example, would not necessarily be tackled before projects towards the bottom of the Priority 1 list. However, projects in the Priority 1 list will more than likely be started before projects in the Priority 2 or 3 lists.

Finally projects may, and more than likely will, be broken out differently than the groupings shown below which is intended as a very rough projection. For instance, a number of moorage related projects have been combined into one row capturing policy 2.1 and 2.3 in the Priority 1 list. It may be more efficient to tackle these two policies as one project or multiple small projects and that determination will be made as project topics are scoped.

	Topic	SIMC Plan Policy #	Estimated Project Size
Priority 1	Apply equity lens to all legislative decisions (on-going)	1.0	Variable
	Wildlife tax deferral extension to MUA-20	3.2	Small
	Dark Sky	3.7	Small
	Moorage reconfiguration threshold; 1:50 density review	2.1(a)	Medium
	Moorage projects – Combined: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moorage Reconfigurations • Definition Consistency • Building permits for floating structures 	2.1, 2.3	Large
	Allow live-aboards full time and/or temporary uses	2.4 - 2.6	Large
	Large Fill Restrictions on High Value farmlands and wetlands	3.15	Small
	Coordination for safe rail crossings	5.5	Small
	Implement Transportation Demand Management policies	5.9	Large
	Encourage County Sheriff's Office to explore increased patrols (<i>Note: This may not involve land use code changes but was marked as a PC Work Program item in SIMC</i>)	5.13	Small

	<i>Chapter 6 table)</i>		
Priority 2	Mass gatherings – Phase I (Process Development)	1.5	Medium
	Streamline and Simplify Process - Exemptions for public agency habitat restoration projects	3.5	Medium
	Update Willamette River Greenway (WRG) Overlay – salmon/riparian protections	2.1(b) & 3.3; 3.17	Large
	Wildlife Education & Cultural Coordination	3.8 – 3.12	Large
	Farming Deed Restrictions in MUA-20	1.4	Small
Priority 3	Farm stand / Ag Tourism Policy development	1.1 – 1.3, 1.7, 1.8	Large
	Mass Gathering Phase II-III	1.5, 1.10	Large
	Update surface water inventories / maps (scope to be better defined during Comprehensive Framework Plan Project)	3.4	?

Commissioners who have served more than one year may recall that staff presents an annual work program to the Planning Commission towards the end of every calendar year so that we can discuss what the Division hopes to accomplish the next calendar year. Staff will plan do the same for the 2016 work program and will include projects from the list above in that discussion. As a reminder, approval of an annual work program helps the Land Use Planning Division prioritize work. It does not mandate project completion, nor does it preclude work on other projects not identified. We believe having this flexibility, together with support from the Commission on work program priorities, helps the Division best serve the community.

Also, typically more work is identified on a work program than can be accomplished in any given year. The reason is because sometimes we can complete projects faster than anticipated. Other times, projects we thought might be viable turn out after scoping the issues to not be good candidates for legislative changes. Additionally, staff needs a range of small, medium and large projects in order to hold regular meetings.

The table above is not a work program and does not reflect what will be recommended on the 2016 work program. It simply outlines the current thinking for what staff may tackle first, and we thought it would be helpful to communicate this to the community and Planning Commission during this briefing. The 2016 work program will likely also include projects not related to the SIMC Plan.

3.0 EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1 SIMC Policy Task Table from 2015 SIMC Plan (a.k.a. the “next steps” table.)

