

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY SERVICES
LAND USE PLANNING DIVISION
MULTNOMAH COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES OF AUGUST 3, 2015

- I. **Call to Order:** Chair John Ingle called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. on Monday, August 3, 2015 at the Multnomah Building, Room 101, located at 501 SE Hawthorne Blvd., Portland, OR.
- II. **Roll Call:** Present - Ingle, Vice-Chair Jim Kessinger, Paul DeBoni, Chris Foster, Alicia Denney, Susan Silodor, Bill Kabeiseman
Absent - Katharina Lorenz, Jeremy Sievert
- III. **Approval of Minutes: June 1, 2015.**
Motion by Kabeiseman; seconded by Silodor.
Motion passed.
- IV. **Opportunity to Comment on Non-Agenda Items:**
None.
- V. **Hearing: Westside Rural Multnomah County Transportation System Plan Update: Sauvie Island / Multnomah Channel Areas (PC-2013-2931)**
Ingle read into the record the Legislative Hearing Process for the Planning Commission for a public hearing, and the process to present public testimony. The Commissioners disclosed no actual or potential financial or other interests which would lead to a member's partiality. There were no objections to the Planning Commission hearing the matter. This is a legislative hearing for the purpose of considering amendments to a policy document that affects a large area in Multnomah County.

Adam Barber, Interim Planning Director and Senior Planner, introduced Joanna Valencia, Senior Transportation Planner and Project Manager for this project. He said that this plan is the transportation portion of the Sauvie Island / Multnomah Channel Rural Area Plan. He noted that in June, the Planning Commission voted on the draft Land Use policies, and tonight is the hearing on the draft Transportation Planning policies. We held one briefing on these policies. Multnomah County's Comprehensive plan consists of a number of plans. They include general land use policies that apply countywide, as well as those that apply to specific areas of Multnomah County, such as Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel, the West Hills, East and West of Sandy River and the Columbia River Gorge. We also have a Westside and an Eastside Transportation System Plan (TSP), which have been separated into different documents. Like the Rural Area Plan, the TSP looks out into the future and asks the community what they envision the transportation system master plan being over the next twenty years. Although there were transportation policies in the Rural Area Plan that were very general in nature, the TSP scope is more focused and detailed with some very specific measures and actions. One of the questions contemplated by the community was how to reduce conflicts between different types of transportation users, especially considering the two lane, narrow roadway system in the plan area. When we started this scoping process, we had a holistic conversation where we heard about land use issues and transportation issues and they are very much related. We envisioned both of these plans being updated in tandem as we went through the process, however, we experienced a project delay in getting a consultant on board for the transportation planning effort, which is why we are bringing this to you tonight. Our

plan is to take both of these before the Board of County Commissioners on Thursday, August 27 at 9:30am. We would appreciate any participation from members of the Planning Commission to give the Board your opinion of the Plan.

Joanna Valencia introduced comments submitted from Mark Greenfield and Carol Chesarek for the record. Valencia then gave a PowerPoint presentation of the Transportation System Plan update. Valencia shared with the Commissioners that the plan before them this evening reflects the changes that came out of the Land Use portion of the prior hearings that were approved to forward on to the County Commissioners. After her presentation, she asked if the Commissioners had any questions.

Silodor said she agrees with Mark Greenfield's comments, and would like to see the wording changes he suggested for clarification. She also read Carol Chesarek's comments and hadn't thought about the Climate Action Plan in conjunction with all of this. She felt that it makes sense to look at that and see if it should be incorporated. Also, as she was reading the whole report, she was looking at the signage and reflected that she doesn't want every inch of the Island to be covered with signs. It appears there is a lot of emphasis on drivers being the responsible party in the driver/bicycle conflict. Commissioner Silodor thought it would be really helpful if bikes are targeted as well, because it's not just the cars that need to look out for bikes, the bikes have some responsibility.

Chair Ingle followed up on Commissioner Silodor's comments stating that Mark's comments were incorporated into the draft that we're looking at this evening, but Carol's had not been incorporated yet. Valencia stated that is correct. Ingle asked if it would be as simple as referencing the language we've been using recently using a climate lens? If it's going to require a great deal of staff time, would that be an alternative and still get at what Carol is suggesting? Valencia said yes, we can include it as part of the implementation strategy. She also added that as part of the Comprehensive Plan update, the Climate Action Plan is being reviewed similarly to how we were looking at the equity lens under the guise of the transportation policies, but as an overall plan. As part of the Comprehensive Plan update, we are working with our Sustainability office to make sure the County's Climate Action Plan is reflected as well.

Ingle said I thought it would make some sense to also include, either in the introduction or key transportation issues, the idea of wildlife movement. He felt that it ties that section into the introduction. Also, on page 10, you talk about 17,000 vehicles per day on Sauvie Island Road and 1,800 cyclists, I think 1,800 cyclists is a bit of an overstatement. I think that was in the month of October, so you might want to revise that. Also, I didn't know if ODFW (Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife) had any parking counts, but what are the demand generators for ODFW; what resources are generating the most traffic demand on the Island? Is that who we need to target our activities or is it farm stand operations, is it half marathons, is it bicycle clubs? Valencia said ODFW conducts annual traffic counts and those are included in the appendices document for the baseline information. One of the main traffic generators are the beaches and the wildlife areas that ODFW manages. The Wildlife Management Plan of ODFW is trying to tackle some of this parking management. Also, for the past four years, the County has been collecting data for the October peak season time, and that's where the numbers you're seeing come from. The 17,000 vehicles and 1,800 cyclists was part of the last count that the County conducted. The 1,800 cyclists were, I believe, throughout the month of October, so we will clarify that.

Ingle said also, on page 37, you talk about coordinating with ODOT to reduce speeds on rural roadways; I thought ODOT only had jurisdiction over Highway 30. Valencia clarified that ODOT ultimately gets to issue the final speed zone order, so the County has to request it through ODOT, submit the counts and studies and ODOT either concurs with the findings, or doesn't concur and ODOT conducts their own analysis.

Foster said I'm fine with Mr. Greenfield's suggested changes, particularly six, because I think the way it was originally written really didn't capture any intention. Also, on Carol Chesarek's comments on page 2, where she suggests adding a comma, I could see that as maybe changing the intent a little bit. I'm fine with adding a comma. I think it just expands the scope a little.

Ingle opened the hearing to public testimony.

Bill Nicholson, said I live at Channel Island Marina, which is a floating home community immediately north of the Sauvie Island Bridge on the Highway 30 side of the channel. My comments reflect the recommendations on safety. There is a recommendation about railroad crossing improvements and to conduct a study to find feasible local street connections and railroad crossing consolidation and upgrades. We share a concern about access, especially leaving a marina in an emergency when the trains are frequently stopped and you don't have access. So we certainly support that. What caught my eye is Policy 5.15 that says, "explore opportunities to connect Marina Way to Larson Road and extend Larson Road north of Sauvie Island Bridge to provide safer and more convenient access for marina residents and patrons along Multnomah Channel". For those of you who don't know this area, our marina and another marina are on Larson Road, and Marina Way connects Fred's Marina and a half dozen other floating home and boat marinas. It makes sense to consider ways to connect Larson Road and Marina Way, because there is already a gravel road connecting them. What I was confused about is the second part of Policy 5.15 which states "extend Larson Road north of Sauvie Island Bridge". There is currently marina there that has landscaping and no capability of adding a road. Maybe the thought was to extend it to Bridgeview Marina, which is a quarter mile or so down, but to do that, you'd have to go through environmentally pristine areas and I just don't see the environmental benefits of building a new road where no road exists. So I would ask that if Policy 5.15 is part of what you're approving, or even an existing policy, the second piece be struck from consideration.

Barber responded thanking Mr. Nicholson for his observation. Policy 5.15 is a policy that is in the Sauvie Island / Multnomah Channel Rural Area Plan, which is not up for consideration tonight. The public hearing on that plan was in June. But that said, I think you're already doing the mental analysis of what we would talk about once we start looking at this; environmental issues, costs, constraints and those types of things. Typically these policies are drafted at the conceptual level. Let's try to do this or that so we can alleviate these concerns, but as you get into those concepts, sometimes they don't pan out and we have to readjust the thinking. At this point, my suggestion would be not to be too concerned about the specifics of how that may or may not happen, it's just to get on the radar that there could be opportunities to consolidate some of the access to ultimately address the concern that you raised about the rail crossing safety. Adam gave an example of when the Planning Commission took a tour of a couple of marinas and they were stopped behind a train and couldn't get out, so it really made an impression. It's certainly an issue and that's why it has risen to the level of one of the policies to see what we can do to help.

Mr. Nicholson said as long as that would be an opportunity, as we've had before, for plenty of stakeholder input, that would be great. And I want to thank you for the way that you have

provided plenty of input along the way for the Rural Plan as well as the Transportation Plan to be reviewed.

Foster said thank you for bringing that to our attention because when we had these discussions, that didn't enter my mind that it would possibly extend to Bridgeview. I was thinking it was going to make another connection for your moorage, and crossing the wetland to get to Bridgeview never entered my mind. When I voted for that, I wasn't thinking of that.

Carol Chesarek, 13300 NW Germantown Rd, said I testified at your March hearing on the Sauvie Island plan but didn't have time to follow-up in writing until now, so I apologize for that. She said that she supports the proposed changes from Mark Greenfield and hopes they will be easy for you to adopt. She read through her "Suggested Changes to the Draft SIMC Transportation System Plan" that was submitted in writing, and which is part of the record.

Barber said tonight is very critical, timing wise, for this project, because we are moving to the Board of County Commissioners. We need to package up the materials for the Board this week, and I want to make sure that I understand the Climate Action Plan reference. It sounds like you're encouraging some sort of a reference within the TSP so that when we are working through the TSP policies in the future, we don't lose sight of the Climate Action Plan and balance what we are trying to achieve in the TSP.

Chesarek said that is exactly the point. One of the things I realized as we were thinking about the Comprehensive Plan and looking at the Transportation Plan policies there, I remembered the Climate Action Plan. The initial direction seemed to be to put the mention of the Climate Action Plan in a separate chapter. My concern was if you do that, you kind of lose track of them. It's so closely tied to transportation policy that I thought some direct reference would be helpful as a reminder for somebody who's going through this.

Valencia said my thought is to add a strategy nine as an implementation strategy; a general Climate Action Plan Implementation Strategy to make sure that we take a look at the Climate Action Plan as we're looking at this.

Dick Springer, 2701 NW Vaughn St, Ste 450, Portland, thanked staff and acknowledged their work on this plan and effort. I've been to most of the meetings over the last couple of years. I had a chance last Saturday to attend a Town Hall meeting on Sauvie Island at the community church hosted by State Senator Betsy Johnson and State Representative Brad Witt and I'm sorry to say they had some discouraging news about the future of state transportation funding because the legislature gridlocked at the close of the session. Senator Johnson estimated that we're probably not going to see anything happen on that front for the next year and a half until after the November 2016 elections. So that's discouraging in terms of the funds we thought might be available to help fund some of these improvements for local government. The West Multnomah Soil and Water District has worked for the past three decades to improve habitat and connectivity between the Columbia River and Sturgeon Lake to protect a lot of ESA species. A big part of that is replacing failed culverts on Reeder Road.

Staff Note: At this point, something happened to the PA system and it became very difficult to hear the speakers.

Lisa Scaglione 17133 NW Lucy Reeder Road, said when this process first began, I wrote a letter, an email, to the transportation department expressing some of my concerns. I remember there were public meetings that were scheduled and then changed and I lost track of when they were. This is the first time something has come through my mailbox that I've noticed and had a chance to respond to and now it looks like we're at the end of this process. I apologize for that because I would have liked to have been involved in the process.

Lisa commented further that it sounds as if some residents had given some feedback and she didn't find that, glancing at this, it reflects her concerns and the concerns of her neighbors. I feel that the Island gets treated as if it's primarily a recreational place, it gets looked at from the point of view of what can we do to improve people's recreational experience and their safety on the Island. Although there is some talk about what Islanders need and infrastructure on the Island, there doesn't seem to be any practical action on these things, and I'm wondering about the cost analysis of this. Glancing at these signs, the share the road signs; I'm an avid bicyclist, I drive an automobile and I own horses so I drive an agricultural vehicle to haul my horses. So I have every kind of experience on the Island on the roads. In the twelve years that I've lived there, I have only in one instance when I encountered somebody rude to me as a bicyclist when they drove past me too fast. Generally, most people that visit the Island seem to be aware that there's pedestrians, bicyclists, you slow down, you give berth. There's an agricultural vehicle, you do the same. I do not encounter problems with automobiles as a bicyclist. I can't tell you the number of times I have been put in danger as someone in an automobile by a bicyclist. The roads, as you know, are quite narrow and particularly when you're in a wide vehicle or you're hauling animals, you do not wish to cross the yellow line completely into the oncoming lane of traffic. I can't make evasive maneuvers with an animal, I can't turn quickly, speed up; I have to do everything very slowly when I have a horse in the trailer. This goes for anyone with livestock. I find that the bicyclists are completely unaware of this. They will not only ride double and triple as if they are in formation, they take up more room than the agricultural vehicles. When I come upon a wide agricultural vehicle, one of us yields, we have no problem with that. When I come upon a bicyclist, I've encountered varying levels of courtesy. Sometimes I've been forced to sit there and drive 15 miles an hour following the bicyclists or risk a head on collision by moving into the oncoming lane when I can't see the traffic. This has happened more times than I can recall. I brought this up in the past that there seems to be a refusal to educate bicyclists about the nature of the Island.

Lisa noted that this is an agricultural district, we have large, wide vehicles. They may actually have to pull over at times, just like I do in an automobile when I come across a wide vehicle; I pull over completely off the road sometimes, or the oncoming person does. These are things that a bicyclist might have to do too. It's not a matter of political correctness, it's a matter of safety. The agricultural vehicle cannot make it unless you yield for them. It's a matter of politeness, and we do that on the Island. But people who come to the Island for recreational purposes aren't aware of these things and there doesn't seem to be any educational campaign or any willingness to tell people what the needs of the Islanders are, of the traffic patterns and how to be safe. And I'm stunned by the numbers. You put out a counter in October on a Saturday and that reflects the traffic pattern. You realize we have ten other months other than August and October. There aren't many bicyclists during those times of year that we need massive amounts spent on bike lanes.

Let me address the issue of lowering the speed limit. I live in a rural area, six miles from the bridge, which means anytime I go someplace, I drive twelve miles just to get off the Island, so if you lower the speed limit from 45 to say 35, you're significantly impacting my life, adding time for me just to get off the Island to do normal things. I live in an area with mainly low traffic,

outside of August and October, with mainly straight roads that are mainly flat with no stop signs or no lights on my route, and yet there's a proposal to lower the speed limit to a speed that would be more appropriate for the city and I just don't understand that. That doesn't meet my need as a resident, and I don't understand why recreational use takes precedence over my need. Particularly, and I hate to have to mention this, but my taxes are very high. My taxes are twice as high as people in Columbia County and I don't get the same services, I don't get some agricultural services that they get. We tax ourselves to pay for our volunteer fire department, we tax ourselves to uphold the dike. I don't know why I'm paying these taxes when I don't get the services.

Going back to the bike lanes, if you were to expand, I would lose property. I would lose my fence and all of my mature trees would have to come down, which would affect the environment and would certainly affect me. And this isn't just me, probably 50% of the people on the Island have some kind of landscaping or fencing that would have to be removed. And I'm wondering why, in order to create a recreational use for someone outside of my community, with my tax dollars, you are willing to consider this. And then there's the issue of the cost. There are all these grand proposals for recreational use, but where is this money supposed to come from and what do I get for my taxpayer dollars?

At this point, Chair Ingle said to Lisa that we had to move on with the hearing, but that she brought up some very relevant points. He noted that there will be County Commissioner hearings as well and that will be another opportunity to bring her message to the County Commissioners. I think some of the points that you brought up, though, are covered in the plan. Maybe not to the level of specificity that you're looking for, but the document is really intended as a broad brush approach. Nothing is set in stone because funding is a big issue and the implementing strategies are wide ranging enough that it covers a full gamut of no dollars to lots of dollars. I think there was a public outreach component in the plan too.

Scaglione said my I ask, I've only had a chance to glance at it, has there ever been a proposal for parking permits? We have millions of visitors and they don't pay anything to come to the Island. Ingle said the plan has that kind of concept in it. Valencia said because there have been increasing demands over the years since the 1998 plan, we have been having some of those conversations. Some of the conversations and concepts that were raised are parking management and user fees. Scaglione said I'm not actually talking about parking management, I haven't seen problems with parking, I'm talking about people who use the Island for recreational purposes giving something to the Island through user fees. Valencia said that's a conversation we will continue to have as part of some of the TSP projects that have been identified to explore. There will be more opportunities for you to get involved and for the public to get involved to address these concerns.

Scaglione asked if there is there someplace to figure out what this process is. I had a hard time making my way through the website. Valencia said if you want to give us your contact information, we can add you to the Sauvie Island / Multnomah Channel email list.

Paul Thacker, 17133 NW Lucy Reeder Road, Portland said my wife, Lisa, touched on some issues, and I have to say that I think she's being generous because I get the mail, and we received a notice for tonight's meeting and a notice for an upcoming meeting. The presenter said there have been all these public things and I guess one of the main vehicles of communicating with people has been through the Sauvie Island Association email list. We are not members of that list, and yet that's her main vehicle to communicate. I think that's not right. Just for the record, I'd like everyone in the room who actually lives on the Island, who is a resident of the Island to raise their

hand. So there's five, six of us to represent the entire Island of residents tonight and I think that's very inadequate. I can't even see how you can proceed in the 11th hour with your planning. The gentleman here said we need to hurry up, we're in the final stages and we need to get this wrapped up, we're going to vote on it. For the public record, five people to represent the residents doesn't seem very adequate.

Foster said I personally have attended meetings for over two years on Sauvie Island and listened to hundreds of residents; this has been at least a two year process with probably fifty community meetings. Thacker said it's very interesting that I'm an interested party who lives on the Island, as my wife did speak, we spend \$6,500 a year on property taxes, and I don't remember 50 some odd community meetings.

Ingle said staff can probably summarize. Thacker said it's not a matter of summarize, there's a communication break down here. How can it be that I missed fifty pieces of mail over a two year period? Ingle asked, did you attend any of the Sauvie Island Rural Area Plan meetings? Thacker said I was just told by this gentleman that Betsy Johnson, the state representative at the meeting at the church shared some information. It might have been a great meeting to attend and how it plays in tonight's decision is beyond me because I was not made aware of it, which made it impossible for me to attend. In any case, I don't want to make a mountain out of a molehill, but with literally only a handful of residents tonight and as my wife said, this seems like a plan for recreational purpose for people that don't live on the Island rather than people who do live on the Island. In any case, I appreciate you listening to my comments.

Ingle said that concludes our public testimony and asked if the Commissioners had any more questions.

Foster asked staff about the road possibly extending to Bridgeview Moorage, was that ever the intention? I think I remember Anne Squier proposing language that would connect Larson Road and I saw that as giving the folks along Marina Way and one moorage to the north of the bridge a second option. Valencia said the general intent was the concern with increased freight traffic and taking a look at alternative options for connection roads. As part of the concept planning effort, that's something we will take a look at and find that it may not be feasible.

Ingle closed the public testimony portion of the meeting to begin deliberations. Silodor moved to adopt the Sauvie Island / Multnomah Channel Rural Area Transportation System Plan. DeBoni seconded. Ingle asked if anyone had any comments or additional questions of staff.

Kabeiseman said I want to echo some of what Commissioner Foster said. We have been at Sauvie Island for a long time; this Commission held at least six hearings, the Citizen's Advisory Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee had a significant amount of public participation, and I think everything the Commission has done has been pretty well guided by residents out there. I don't know if there was a communication breakdown with some folks, but certainly, as far as I could tell from the people I know who live on the Island, the communication tended to be fairly good. So I'm not concerned about the fact that there's only a handful of people here tonight. I think a lot of people from the Island have been involved in producing this plan, and the fact that they're not here, I interpret that to mean they support the outcome of it.

The second thing I want to address is the recreational aspect. Again, given my understanding of the support from the Islanders, we can't pretend that there's not a recreational impact coming to the

Island. What I read the plan to do is not encourage more, but to make sure it's accommodated in a way that allows the Islanders to have the best outcome they can, given the demands that are going to be placed on this Island, given the relative proximity of this beautiful place so close to a major metropolitan area. I just don't think it's feasible to put up a wall and only let Islanders in and out; that's not something we can do. But we're looking at ways in which we can address that and lessen the impacts. I think that's what the plan allows us to do, so I'm in favor of the plan that we have.

DeBoni said I live on the Island and this is very important to me as well. Originally, the County had planned on having one hearing out on the Island and everything else in this venue and I had long conversations with the Planning Director, and as a result of reconsideration, we had seven public hearings at the Academy on the Island and every one of those meetings were heavily attended, in many cases it was standing room only. Most of the issues that were discussed tonight were heavily discussed at those meetings. I think a lot of the concerns are embodied within the general policies that we ended up with in this document. One of the issues that I particularly raised myself was making sure that we demonstrate the difference between recreational bike activity and transportation for commute, which are very different. I'm very concerned about some of the same issues that were raised tonight; I think that this plan has been through the mill, has been well discussed; I think it's a good first step in the process. I think the real work is to come ahead to find out how many of these policies may be implemented, how they may be implemented, and which ones are reasonable and which ones are realistic. But, I think we're ready to move this plan along to the Board of County Commissioners for adoption with the Rural Plan. Then, at that time, I think everyone has to roll up their sleeves and make it work.

Silodor said I, too, appreciate not only the staff, but everyone here and everyone who has been at meetings. Before I was a Commissioner, because I'm very new to the Commission, I sat on the other side of that table and addressed the staff and certainly had interesting exchanges. And it really is true that those meetings were packed, they were always packed. I understand the communication issue in that I do believe there is some difficulty in how to communicate with all the residents. The Sauvie Island Community Association is self contained, so it doesn't necessarily reach everyone on the Island as one would hope. But I will say that the meetings were productive, sometimes a little tense, and I think each point was thoroughly debated. And when I came onto this side of the table as a Commissioner, I was really pleased to see that people were really listening to everyone who had been sitting in that room time and time again and that I believe this was guided by the will and the desires of the majority of people from the Island who were at those meetings. So I myself am very pleased and looking forward to the rest of the work.

Foster said I have one last comment I want to make, the Commissioners mentioned the seven meetings that this body has heard, but there was also the Community Advisory Committee, attended often by up to 100 citizens; that went on for two years. And below that was another layer of committees, the Technical Advisory Committee and committees assigned to specific topics, so. I know there were at least 50 meetings. If you counted every body at the door to all those meetings, it would probably be in the thousands. The plan document shows what was done in terms of community outreach and I believe a good effort was made to contact as many folks as possible.

Ingle said we have a motion, but I will ask for an amendment because there were some things that we talked about that were not incorporated in the motion. Kabeiseman said the changes you're talking about; the revised version to implementing Strategy VI(2) about "shelves or dry paths built into the sides". Ingle said right, and I think we talked about another... Valencia said

Implementation Strategy 9 about the Climate Action Plan, and on page 10, I have the correction on clarifying the bike counts. Ingle said okay, staff has noted the changes. I just wanted to make certain for the record. Silodor said yes, that's what my motion was for, thank you.

Motion passed unanimously to move forward the recommendation to the Board the approval of the SIMC TSP.

VI. Briefing: Extending the Wildlife Habitat Tax Deferral Program to the MUA-20 Zoned Lands (PC-2015-4106)

Adam Barber noted that he prepared a more formal report than is typical for a briefing. The main message I want to report is that we have started working on the Sauvie Island / Multnomah Channel Rural Area Plan Policy 3.2, which deals with voluntary conservation efforts. Even though the Board has not yet acted on this plan, there seemed to be universal support around this concept. He read Policy 3.2, then presented the staff report, which is in the record. Barber asked if the Commissioners had any suggestions about additional stakeholders besides the ones identified in the staff report.

DeBoni said he just went through a development of the Habitat Restoration Management Plan last June, and just submitted the annual report that is required to Fish & Wildlife service. I just got a response back that the position that was funded for Elizabeth Ruther, who was the biologist for Fish & Wildlife and was handling these, has been reassigned because apparently they eliminated her position from the local Sauvie Island office. The office in Oregon City is now handling it. I have the name of the new representative who handles all the local Management Plan analysis at home, I can email that to you. Barber said I appreciate that, thank you.

Foster asked if Ducks Unlimited had been involved in a number of projects. DeBoni said Ducks Unlimited actually funded the work. Foster said I think there are other folks that get involved in these restoration projects. Barber said this is not intended to be an exhaustive list, at this point it is to get us started, and we would certainly work with the Soil & Water Conservation District. Kessinger said it seems like another stakeholder would be some community organizations out on the Island.

Ingle asked how the program is monitored and enforced. I think I heard that there is an annual plan that needs to be submitted to ODFW. DeBoni said the management plan has a multiyear reporting requirement and we were told if we fail to submit the report and have it accepted, ODFW would notify the assessor's office about non-compliance. Barber referred the Commissioners to Exhibit 1, a manual for Counties & Cities from ODFW about the Wildlife Habitat Conservation & Management Program, which outlines some of the mechanics of the program. My assessment is it doesn't look that complicated, it's more a matter of getting the resources to get it together. Sauvie Island seems like an easy pitch, that it is a significant wildlife habitat. I think that statute was amended to encourage jurisdictions to take these kinds of approaches.

Ingle asked if there would be a public hearing. Barber said I think we'll want to be enrolled in the program before we change the code, and I'm not sure that will need to come to the Planning Commission. I believe that will be a Board action.

VII. Briefing: Sauvie Island / Multnomah Channel Rural Area Plan Code Drafting Priorities (PC-2013-2931)

Barber gave an overview of the SIMC policies that will result in code changes, and introduced the drafting priorities document that is before the Planning Commission. He noted that policies outlined in this document are broken into Priority 1, 2 and 3, and he wanted to know whether they were in agreement with the items under each priority list, or if some should be rearranged. Also of note, the order of the individual policies under each priority category have no relevancy. The items at the top of a priority list will not necessarily be tackled before the ones toward the bottom. However, Priority 1 will likely be tackled before Priority 2, which will likely come before Priority 3. Priority 1 contains the projects that we believe are most specific to the Sauvie Island / Multnomah Channel area. There are policies that talk about moorage issues, large fills on farmland, coordination for rail crossing issues, etc. We want to be conscious of the Comprehensive Plan project that is happening now and don't want to get ahead of that project. We're trying to focus on the types of projects that are going to be the most helpful and most specific to the Sauvie Island / Multnomah Channel community first. The Priority 2 projects are ones where the scope is a little more difficult, with more agencies involved, and Priority 3 may be a little slower to get off the ground. So, we're trying to get some momentum with the Priority 1 projects. I don't have any idea how long it will take to get through the priority lists, it may be three years before we get through all of these. We're starting to think about asking for additional long range resources in the future so we can get through this work more quickly. We also have the Comprehensive Plan project which will have some similar code change direction in the future and want to make sure we can be as responsive as possible to the community.

Barber said some of the longer term Commissioners are familiar with the annual work program that we generally introduce toward the end of each calendar year. We usually have a lot more on the work program than we can normally accomplish in a year. We are still planning to do that, likely in December or January, and you will see some of these projects on that work program. I think that the bulk of the program next year will be Sauvie Island related, but there will be other work as well. However, this is not a work program conversation, this is about asking if we generally got the priority categories right. Is there anything in the Priority 3 category that you would recommend we bump up to Priority 1? If so, what should we bump out of Priority 1?

Kabeiseman said the one I was most concerned with is in Priority 2, the update to the Willamette River Greenway (WRG). I think that's only a Sauvie Island one and to me, there's some real priority in terms of dealing with the salmon/riparian protections, and I'd love to see that bumped up. I know it could be a much more complicated one, but I still think that it makes sense as a Priority 1. If I had to pick one to bump out, there are several of the moorage ones that I think could wait, that are not time sensitive. And I think Dark Sky is more of a County wide issue than just Sauvie Island.

Barber said the thinking on the Willamette River Greenway, even though it is specific to the Sauvie Island / Multnomah Channel plan area, it is a large project. My concern was spending time there would defer from some of the health and safety issues we heard about from the community. I feel like we should start with health and safety issues; that should be our top priority. For instance, there are people in the Channel that jump into the water and get electrocuted because of improper wiring. Although we do have some in Priority 1 that are not necessarily health and safety related.

Foster said I had a similar thought, the WRG issues are going to be tied into the moorage reconfiguration discussion and I'm not sure how you do one without the other. Or you make accommodations for it down the road. Barber said I should mention that my experience has been that even with the best plan, once we get into them and scope them, certain ones will come

together, while others will break apart. So you're right, we may get into the moorage building codes and wonder why we're not talking about the WRG while we have all the right people at the table.

Ingle said we heard countless hours of conversation on the Island about farm stand, ag-tourism policies and things related. It seemed that our focus a lot of times was Ag related, and yet it sits idly at Priority 3. And you look at Priority 1 and the only thing that's even closely Ag related, although there is some overlap, is the large fill restrictions on high value farmlands and wetlands. My initial reaction was, I wonder if we're doing ourselves a little bit of a disservice to the community when the Ag issues seemed to be the center pivot, yet it is Priority 3. Barber said the thinking on why that is Priority 3 is farm stands are not unique to Sauvie Island, so what might we learn from with the Comprehensive Plan conversations...should we wait a bit on this. And also recognizing that there was some placeholder code-like policy language added to the draft plan recognizing that we may not get to farm stands right away. Ingle said it's a huge issue so it's probably appropriately placed as Priority 3, I just thought that Priority 1 was void of much Ag related things.

Denney said I thought the biggest issue was mass gatherings, which is a Priority 2. Barber said we broke out mass gatherings into Phase I, Phase II and Phase III. Phase I is under Priority 2 and Phase II-III under Priority 3, with some policy numbers that talk about what those phases mean. I agree that the mass gatherings and the farm stand conversations would work well together.

Kessinger asked about SB 960, but because of the technical difficulties we were experiencing from the recording device, it was very difficult to hear what his comments were. Barber said 960 was agri-tainment and we don't need to do anything there because the policy says "do not adopt". I'm sure we'll talk about 960 as context when we get into these conversations because it's all so similar. It's just called different things in statute.

Kessinger said I pulled up the work program for 2015 and there's a lot we're not doing. One thing that's happening this year is we're putting more energy into what we're doing here, and now comes up the Comp Plan, which will probably be even bigger. So it feels to me like we're dumping a lot more projects onto our plate while we remove our ability to do anything. Barber said this is what keeps me up at night. Right now, I have no long range planners available for the routine stuff. Kessinger said we're supporting you, of course, on this, I'm just saying you really need to elevate this issue to whoever you elevate it to; the Board of Commissioners; I don't know what your course of relief is. Barber said I appreciate that. I agree. Ingle said a voluntary citizen planning commission. Barber said on that note, let's talk about that because I could use some help, and I would love to have your help. Maybe it's informal, we break out into groups, we write code together; I don't know, but it doesn't have to always be like this for every meeting. Maybe we do work sessions differently in the future. And I think we could get some work done. I just need to make sure we do it in a way that's researched properly. I'm really open to some new ideas. We have a structure that we have to follow for public hearings, but outside of that, we have flexibility.

Foster suggested working sub-groups. Barber said any ideas like that are appreciated. If you are interested, we could use some help and it could be done in a way that's interesting for you and helpful to the County. DeBoni said doesn't the Open Meetings law cause some problems? Barber said we need to research what the constraints are. I was thinking open meetings with the public in the room, commissioners break out in small groups and we scope issues. Kessinger said there ought to be a way to satisfy that.

Silodor said because the workload is heavy, which I understand, what's in place doesn't all get done, or not in a timely fashion just because of resources. In thinking about that, maybe the Ag issues and mass gatherings should be bumped to Priority 1, since it's hard to tell when they're going to get addressed or worked on. Barber said we might elevate the need for the resources when we're making the budget request.

Ingle said, so effectively, how many planners do we have now? Barber said we have three current planners, with one senior planner over current planning. For long range we have Kevin Cook, but he's working on the Comp Plan project. We have Rich Faith, he's managing the Comp Plan project, we have Joanna, who's not available for this kind of work, she is focused on transportation. We have my senior planner position for long range, which I'm not able to do much now because I'm acting as the planning director. We have John Miller's position, which we'll be recruiting for, so I'll have one staff that can work maybe 80% of their time on code development. I would really like to have two staff, because I don't do much code writing myself because of other duties, so with only one staff there's only so much that we can get through.

Foster said going back to the conversation about the health and safety issues as being a priority. I think people forget that the number of residents on Multnomah Channel is probably equal to or greater than all of Sauvie Island. It's similar at least, there's a lot of people involved. So it's a big issue. Barber said I'm thinking probably the very first project that we should dig into is the building code issue for the floating structures. That's probably what should be the most important. There was agreement from the commissioners.

VIII. Director's Comments:

Barber said we talked about the Sauvie Island hearing coming up and there's a briefing on Tuesday, August 25 starting at 9:30am in this room. The purpose of the briefing is for staff to cover technical material with the Board. This will be open to the public, but there will not be an opportunity for public comment. But we did notice everyone in the plan area so they could attend. On Thursday, August 27, starting at 9:30 in the morning, we will have the hearing in this room. If you are interested in coming and testifying, that would really be encouraged and helpful. We hope that you come and can support the plan; especially if you can respond to any concerns that you heard as Planning Commissioners. That really helps the Commissioners understand that those issues have been vetted. I heard some of that tonight with some of the testimony, and it really helps staff, so thank you for that.

As far as the recruitment goes, this Friday we're going to advertise four different positions. One is for an additional current planner, because we've been understaffed for quite awhile. This is a planner that meets with people at the counter and processes applications. Next would be a full-time long range planner to replace John Miller's position. We currently have an intern that we were able to hire on as a temporary planner so he can continue working on the Comp Plan, but we don't know how long that funding is going to be available. We are also looking at a new position called a Compliance Planner. This will be a land use planner who works most closely with code compliance. It's intended to be a pro-active person out in the community to identify what the issues are and check in with how the community is feeling about our current compliance program. We currently have a voluntary compliance program, but there are other models out there and we want to talk to the community about their thoughts. Foster said, you're funded for that one, right? Barber said yes, we are funded for all four of these. The Board has recognized that we need some additional horsepower.

Barber said he's very sad to report that this will be Commissioner DeBoni's last meeting. It's really been great having you on the Commission and you will be missed. We will get the recruitment started as soon as possible. Chair Ingle's recruitment is still in process.

Barber noted that we plan to have our next meeting on a Wednesday, September 16th, (*see staff note below for update**) somewhere in East County. We are still looking for a venue and will let you know where it ends up. That meeting will focus on a Comprehensive Plan briefing.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for September 16, 2015. (*See staff note below for update**)

Recording Secretary,

Kathy Fisher

*Staff Note: Subsequent to the August 3 meeting, plans changed. Instead of holding a Planning Commission meeting on September 16, Commissioners were invited to attend two different public meetings held mid-September, one on the west side (9/9/15), the second on the east side of the county (9/16/15). These meetings were intended to provide an opportunity for staff to provide an update on the status of the Comprehensive Update project and for the public to provide comment on the draft policies to date. Public meeting law was followed and less than a quorum of Planning Commissioners attended both meetings.