

FARM/FOREST AND RURAL ECONOMY SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
ROOM 126 MULTNOMAH BUILDING
501 SE HAWTHORNE BLVD, PORTLAND OR
JUNE 24, 2015 3:00-5:00 PM

MEETING SUMMARY

I. Welcome, Introductions and Announcements

In attendance:

CAC members

Aaron Blake
George Sowder
Paula Sauvageau
Linden Burk

Project Team

Rich Faith
Rithy Khut
Kevin Cook
Matt Hastie

Two members of the public attended.

Rich Faith welcomed everyone and briefly explained the agenda items for today's meeting.

II. Forest Dwellings Policy

Rich provided the background on this policy and the changes that have been made in response to the subcommittee's direction from the previous meeting. Discussion on the policy language resulted in the following additional revisions or comments.

Policy 1. Insert the words "subject to" after Oregon Administrative Rules in the first sentence for clarity.

Policy 2. Should "rural community character" be changed to "rural community values"? After much discussion about the differences between character and values in the context of this policy, no change was recommended.

Policy 3. There was some confusion about the policy language. Rich explained that the new language attempts to recognize there are differences among the various CFU zones in terms of allowed residences. If we do end up with multiple CFU zones then the proposed policy language provides flexibility in what type of dwellings the various zones could allow. It allows for differences among the zones. The subcommittee asked that the policy be revised to better explain this. Staff agreed to include language to clarify and better express the intent of the policy.

Policy 4. No changes.

Policy 5. Change “rural community values” to “rural community character” to be consistent with Policy 2. Change “agricultural practices” to “forestry practices” since this policy pertains to the commercial forest use zoned areas of the county.

Action: The subcommittee approved the policies on Forest Dwellings with the changes noted above.

Forest Practices Setbacks and Clustering Dwellings

Rithy Khut summarized his memorandum on Forest Practices Setbacks and how this relates to the policy question of clustering dwellings and accessory buildings in the CFU zone. The following major points were raised during discussion of this issue.

- Although it’s a good idea, It’s not always possible to place a dwelling within a certain distance of other dwellings or within a certain location on the property because of topographic and other conditions. There needs to be some flexibility.
- One member would like to see a policy that prevents someone from building a replacement dwelling other than in the location of the existing dwelling being replaced.
- The wildlife habitat overlay (SEC-h) already requires clustering unless a wildlife biologist report provides solid reasons for not doing so.
- The policy should provide an incentive for clustering.
- The proposed policies are consistent with the County’s values.
- Revise the first policy to add “natural and environmental resources” after “wildlife”.
- Add the following sentence to the first policy: “Allow for exceptions based on topographical and other unique constraints of the property.”
- There was little discussion and no changes to the second policy.

Action: The subcommittee approved the policies on Clustering Development in the CFU zones with the changes to the first policy as noted above.

III. Existing Farm and Forest Related Policies

Multiple Use Agricultural Land Area

A subcommittee member had a list of requested changes to the existing policies pertaining to the Multiple Use Agricultural Land Area (MUA-20 Zone) as follows.

- Remove “heavily” from the first sentence of the introduction.
- Remove “outdoor recreation” from the last sentence of the introduction.
- Remove “small scale” in policy A.1.
- Change “encroachment by” with “adverse impacts from” in policy C.
- Add “and forestry” after “surrounding agricultural” in policy D.
- Add “on MUA zoned lands” after “expanding uses” in strategy 2.

- Change the last part of strategy 2 to say "... farm managers and foresters to farm and practice forestry on their land."

Action: The subcommittee approved the policies on Multiple Use Agricultural Land Area (MUA-20 zone) with the changes as noted above.

Commercial Forest Land Area (CFU)

A subcommittee member had some requested changes to the existing policies pertaining to the Commercial Forest Land Area (CFU Zone) that generated the following discussion points.

- Include a policy about forestry being the primary allowed use in the CFU areas similar to the policy about agriculture being the primary allowed use in the EFU areas.
- Both policies D1 and D2 can be deleted because the forest dwellings policy has similar language already.
- Policy E can be deleted because the forest dwellings policy has similar language already.
- Strategy 5 can be deleted because the forest dwellings policy has language that addresses disaggregation in the East of Sandy River area.
- Consistent with what has already been approved as part of the farm dwelling policy, policies 8A and 8B should be carried forward, while policy 8C can be deleted.
- Regarding existing policies being proposed for deletion, it was pointed out that policies that cite statute on farm income necessary to qualify for a new dwelling or cite statute for farm size limitations, hopefully would have these income and size limitation written into the code so a person does not have to look them up in statute. The answer is that they are contained in the code.

Action: The subcommittee approved the policies on Commercial Forest Land Area (CFU zone) with the changes as noted above.

IV. Wineries Policy

Kevin Cook summarized his memorandum on wineries and pointed out that the statutes on wineries are a bit more complicated than farm stands and agri-tourism and make it more difficult to sort out what discretion the County has in regulating them. The policies he has drafted on based on those pertaining to farm stands from the Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel Rural Area Plan now up for adoption. The one change he thinks needs to be made is to delete the reference to September and October in policy (d) (3) because this was tied to Sauvie Island farm stands and does not necessarily fit wineries.

The biggest concern to the subcommittee was whether the County can limit the number and size of events that a winery can have. Kevin's short answer was yes, but with qualifications as prescribed by state law.

Action: The subcommittee approved the policies on wineries with the only change to delete the words "during September and October of a calendar year" from policy (d)(3).

V. Meeting Wrap up

Matt Hastie pointed out that the subcommittee has now completed all the tasks intended for them so there are no further meetings of this subcommittee scheduled. However, there may be need to meet again if new policy issues arise further down the road that pertain to farm, forestry and rural economy. There may also be a need to meet on code language that might be drafted to implement one or more of the policies that have been recommended by this subcommittee and the full CAC. Each person's involvement in future meetings will be entirely your choice.

VI. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:02 pm.