

---

1600 SE 190th Avenue, Portland Oregon 97233-5910 • PH. (503) 988-3043 • Fax (503) 988-3389

**Multnomah County Comprehensive Plan Update  
Community Advisory Committee Meeting #12**

**January 6, 2016 6:00 – 8:30 p.m.  
Room 126, Multnomah Building  
501 SE Hawthorne Blvd. Portland, Oregon**

**Agenda**

- I. Welcome/Introductions/Announcements (5 minutes) – Eryn Kehe
- II. Remaining Transportation Policies (20 minutes) – Jessica Berry and Joanna Valencia  
  
*Review and approve policies recommended by the Transportation and Public Facilities subcommittee.*
- III. Miscellaneous Policies – (50 minutes) – Staff  
  
*Review and approve miscellaneous policies that have not been considered by any subcommittee.*
- IV. Comprehensive Plan Goals – (30 minutes) – Matt Hastie  
  
*Review and approve draft goals to include in the comprehensive plan.*
- V. Community Values for Comprehensive Plan (30 minutes) – Rich Faith and Matt Hastie  
  
*Review and approve values pertaining to land use for inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan.*
- VI. Parking Lot Items (10 minutes) – Rich Faith and Kevin Cook  
  
*Review list of parking lot items and finalize remaining uncompleted items.*
- VII. Public Comment (5 minutes) – Eryn Kehe
- VIII. Wrap up and Adjourn

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
ROOM 126 MULTNOMAH BUILDING  
501 SE HAWTHORNE BLVD. PORTLAND, OR  
December 2, 2015 6:00 PM

## **MEETING SUMMARY**

### **I. Welcome/Introductions/Announcements**

In attendance:

#### CAC

Aaron Blake  
Andrew Holtz  
George Sowder  
Jerry Grossnickle  
Karen Nashiwa  
Marcy Cottrell Houle  
Martha Berndt  
Paula Sauvageau  
Will Rasmussen  
John Ingle  
Tim Larson

#### Project Team

Rich Faith  
Joanna Valencia  
Kevin Cook  
Rithy Khut  
Matt Hastie  
Eryn Deeming Kehe  
Jessica Berry

Absent: Catherine Dishion, Kathy Taggart, Linden Burk, Sara Grigsby, Stephanie Nystrom, Chris Foster

Others in attendance: Andrew Brown, Carol Chesarek, Michael Cerbone, Kate McQuillan

Eryn Kehe started the meeting off by giving an overview of the agenda and what topics would be covered and other policies that would be discussed relating to transportation and a few others that come from the Air, Land, Water, Wildlife & Hazards subcommittee. Eryn commented that the bad weather and ice in the eastern County had an influence as to why there were so many absent due to the hazardous road conditions. There were no other announcements for the good of the order so Eryn turned it over to Rich Faith.

### **II. Status Report on Draft Comprehensive Plan and Process for CAC Review**

Rich Faith announced that the project team wants to spend a little time informing the CAC how they would like to use the committee in reviewing the draft of the Comprehensive and Transportation Plan. Rich said that Matt Hastie and the consultant team have already started to draft portions of the Comprehensive Plan as well as the Transportation consultant doing the same with the TSP. Rich said that we wanted to roll out the plan for the CAC and how that is happening and the role they would be playing in

that. Rich let the CAC know that the project team anticipates needing additional meetings in order to complete the work that they are already engaged in, in reviewing policies and strategies, and also for the CAC to review the plan documents. Already confirmed on everyone's calendar is the January 6<sup>th</sup> date for the next CAC meeting. He proposed a January 27<sup>th</sup> meeting (the normal fourth Wednesday of the month meeting) and a February 24<sup>th</sup> meeting. The project team definitely anticipates needing those two additional meetings in 2016 to complete the work.

Matt Hastie then reported on the feedback that the project team has received thus far from the CAC on what portions of the current Rural Area Plans to retain in the Comprehensive Plan. CAC members were asked to let the project team know what they think is important narrative in the Rural Area Plans so that Matt and the team can better determine what should be incorporated into the Comp Plan. He also discussed how he sees the CAC role in review of the documents.

Matt stated that he has gotten feedback so far from the West Hills contingent -- a substantial set of information that came in just that day. He and the team have just had a chance to skim it. They will continue to talk about how best to incorporate that information into the Comp Plan narrative. He explained that they have already started to draft Comp Plan chapters which include a combination of narrative and illustrative maps or other graphics and also the policy language that everyone has been working on so far. He explained that part of the reason to ask for some guidance or suggestions from the CAC on the narrative was to have a sense of what is important to them and what to include in the Comp Plan.

For Sauvie Island, the project team has the recently adopted SIMC plan. What they expect is that the updated Comp Plan will include information from that and will also refer to that adopted document for additional information so that we are either including or referencing that Plan. He still needs suggestions from East County regarding rural area plan narrative and will follow-up with that.

The expectation is that by approximately early to mid February we will have a finished draft of the Comp Plan to send out to the CAC to review for the February 24<sup>th</sup> meeting. At that time a decision will be made if another meeting should be added. A member asked if there is another subcommittee meeting for the transportation group and Matt confirmed that there is -- the date for that meeting is December 14<sup>th</sup>.

Eryn Kehe quickly mentioned that she had forgotten to announce that an agenda item has been added to tonight's meeting between items III and IV. Flood Hazard and Wildfire Hazard policies still need to be approved and about ten minutes will be set aside for that discussion. These are the hazard related policies that weren't discussed at the previous CAC meeting.

### **III. Policy on Fill Sites**

Kevin Cook gave a detailed overview of the issue of fill sites which has come up in different subcommittee meetings and eventually was taken up by the Air, Land, Water, Wildlife & Hazards subcommittee. To summarize the issue, it is primarily about agricultural zones receiving large amounts of fill under the “guise” that it is an agricultural practice of adding topsoil. This is a problem all over the County and many sites have exceeded what can reasonably be considered a normal agricultural practice of topsoil fill. The reason that it is a concern is the grading and erosion control section and hillside development section of the code exempt these normal agricultural practices from needing a permit.

This policy is meant to provide a certain threshold for agricultural topsoil. Proposed fill under that threshold should have a cursory type 1 review to verify if that is really what is going on and to provide some parameters. The policy is aimed at preventing sites from exceeding the 5,000 cubic yard limit by claiming they are just doing a normal agricultural practice. In some zones, larger volumes of fill are allowed by conditional use permit but that is subject to further provisions beyond what is normally called a typical grading permit. In addition, there are a few other exemptions that occasionally suffer from abuse or confusion – for example, fill as part of forest practices and residential gardening. This policy will help by directing code amendments in the future that address the issue.

Rich pointed out that there are some changes in the policy language that came from the subcommittee to make it read more like a policy. The changes come at the request of the County attorney who reviewed the language. All of the changes are shown by strikeouts and underlines on pages 11 and 12 in the packet.

A CAC member representing the West Hills and also serving on the ALWW subcommittee commented that the West Hills group has had some second thoughts on the policy since the subcommittee meeting. They don't think it makes sense to allow up to 5,000 cubic yards of fill on a five-acre rural residential lot. They would like the policy to limit fill amount if the lot has a SEC-h overlay – maybe limited to 1,000 cubic yards.

Kevin responded by explaining that fill activity is not totally exempt from review. Permits pertaining to grading and erosion control and hillside development are still required. The SEC overlay zones requirement to do the SEC review is still in place.

Another member asked if someone could bring in fill to create level land where there currently isn't level for an agricultural practice and purpose. Kevin explained that that would be allowed as an agricultural practice but would be reviewed under applicable grading and erosion control standards and hillside development standards.

Public Comment – A person commented that there are a lot of complaints in their neighborhood regarding fill that is coming from North Bethany that is creating a lot of traffic on the road. This person shares the concern regarding the size of the site and what that means and how it doesn't make sense to allow fill on small lots. The person

also wondered if the conditional use permit could look at the traffic impact on the roads. Kevin Cook confirmed that the conditional use permit does look at the traffic impact.

**Action Taken** – The committee unanimously approved the Policy on Fill Sites as proposed without any changes.

#### **IV. Flood Hazard and Wildfire Hazard Policies**

Matt Hastie provided an overview of these policies found on page 14 in the packet -- policies pertaining to flooding and wildfire hazards recommended by the Air, Water, Wildlife & Hazards subcommittee. The change from current policies is primarily updating and expanding the current policy language in the framework plan on these types of hazards. For floodplain, it's doing a lot of what the County already does in terms of limiting what occurs in the floodways and floodplains.

The newest part and change of the policy has to do with the updating mapping of floodways and floodplains based on channel migration data. This was an issue that was not reflected in the existing plan but one that has been raised with new mapping data.

Wildfire Hazards – This policy will add additional and more up-to-date information on areas that are more prone to wildfires with safety and mitigation standards. It calls for using updated information and strategies that the County has identified in its natural hazard mitigation plan along with its wildfire risk management plan.

Strategy D is also a newer piece that has been added. Currently the County has code requirements for minimizing wildfire risks that are only applied in the commercial forestry use zones (CFU zones). The recommendation of this strategy is to update the code to address multiple hazards. Also looking at potential wildfire hazards in other zones and applying wildfire protection regulations like those in the CFU zone.

- A committee member opposed the proposed wildfire strategy b and provided a written comment explaining why. He is worried that the strategy will result in the destructive of wildlife habitat – especially in places that are heavily wooded, such as the West Hills. He composed a proposal as to why he feels this is the wrong way to go unless the strategy is modified with the suggested verbiage.
- Matt Hastie explained that this concern was discussed at the subcommittee meetings and that is in fact why the language was modified by the subcommittee to strengthen the strategy from how it was originally written. In Strategy b, added was “while protecting wildlife habitat” – this came out of the subcommittees discussion which also had someone from the County’s emergency management planning team who is familiar with current standards related to preventing wildfires. Matt went into detail about how the standards are not in conflict in protecting wildlife habitat and natural resources and reassured the CAC that those things have in fact been considered.
- Another CAC member asked about the existing codes for wildfire protection and Kevin Cook explained what those are.

- There were a few other comments from some members of the CAC and the public regarding the strategy and the concern about the existing regulations for the 30ft primary fire safety zone vs. the 100ft secondary fire safety zone and what that means when applied in certain zoning districts and how the code may be counterproductive to wildfire hazards.
- Eryn took a “temperature check” to see if the CAC agreed with the current wildfire hazard policy as written. The results were:
  - 4 green -- 4 yellow -- 2 red
- A member suggested that the CAC accept the revised language being offered for strategy b but not include strategy b2 about “consulting with the City of Portland”. His recommendation would be to revise strategy b as proposed but to reject the Strategy b2 language. Other members of the CAC commented on this with varying opinions.

**Action Taken** -- Specific to the wildfire hazards policy as revised in the written comments that were submitted, the CAC took the following action:

By a vote of 8 (green) to 2 (yellow), strategy b was approved and will read:

**Strategy b:** To reduce wildfire risk and associate impacts while protecting wildlife habitat, expand requirements to areas identified as a prone to wildfires but not currently subject to regulations after revising standards to better ensure wildlife habitat compatibility. Weigh and balance wildlife habitat needs with effective wildfire risk reduction.

Proposed strategy b2 was not approved. The remainder of the wildfire policy was approved without change.

**Action Taken** – The committee approved the floodplain protection and channel migration policies without change.

## **V. Existing Policies Relating to Environmental Quality -- Air, Land, Water, Wildlife and Hazards**

Rich Faith gave an overview of the existing policies related to Environmental Quality (pages 21 – 61 in the packet). He pointed out a couple of entirely new policies on page 27 in the packet under Fish and Wildlife Habitat. These new policies were approved by the subcommittee based on a letter they received from a member of the public, Carol Chesarek. That letter has been included in the packet (pages 15-17) for this meeting. Rich stated that there will be another filtering done of these policies to determine which ones may be in conflict with some of the new policies that have been approved or are duplicated. The following are the some of the major questions and comments regarding these policies:

- A member who is a resident of Sauvie Island had a comment and question regarding the air, noise and light pollution issues caused by activity on Port of Portland property across the Willamette River from Sauvie Island within the City

of Portland. She asked how they might reduce these impacts. Rich responded this is a difficult question as Sauvie Island lies directly across river from an industrial zoned within another jurisdiction – the City of Portland. The County's comprehensive plan does not apply to those properties.

- Another member followed up with two questions: The first question is about page 51 Policy 46 from the East of Sandy RAP -- He is concerned that because it is struck out this means the policy is going away? His second question is regarding heavy truck traffic in areas such as Corbett. Truck traffic associated with EFU and CFU zone uses travel through denser areas and the trucks are older and cause a lot of noise. Logging trucks that use air brakes are particularly a problem. Can there be a policy written in regards to how this impacts residents in these areas? Matt Hastie stated that there has been discussion in the Transportation and Public Facilities subcommittee about a number of policies related to freight, freight traffic and freight movement in the context of noise – it should be discussed more so in that subcommittee.
- Concerning noise issues, a member proposed keeping the existing policy language about Multnomah County requesting the Port of Portland to conduct a review of noise impacts (Strategy under Policy 46 from East of Sandy RAP). Matt Hastie voiced his uncertainty of putting this in the Comp Plan and didn't know if this is the most appropriate place to have it? After further discussion, the suggestion was made to retain the strategy with changes so that it applies to both noise and light impacts from all Port properties, not just PDX. The CAC agreed with that change.

**Action Taken** - Retain and revise the strategy under Policy 46 from the East of Sandy RAP to read: "Request that the Port of Portland conduct a semi-annual review of impacts from Port owned properties having noise and light effects on rural areas of the County."

- A member commented on policy 24 from the West of Sandy RAP (page 53) and wanted to know why the strategy "Require industrial uses to meet the same siting standards as residential development in order to protect scenic views" was being deleted and didn't believe that it should be. Rich commented that the problem that he saw was that it would be difficult to have the same standards for an industrial development as a residential development. There were other comments from CAC members about requirements and standards. It was suggested that industrial uses can be addressed with a change in the second strategy "allow placement of residences so that a view from the property is possible as long as the proposed development is visually subordinate from key viewing areas." Replace the word "residence" with "buildings" or "development", something that is more generic. Everyone agreed that was a good addition and decided that they would change "residences" to "structures" in that strategy statement.

**Action Taken** – Revise the second strategy under Policy 24 from the West of Sandy RAP to read as follows: “Allow placement of structures so that a view from the property is possible as long as the proposed development is visually subordinate from key viewing areas.”

Public Comment – A person voiced agreement with the CAC members who requested the language addition for policy 46 strategy.

**Action Taken** – The CAC unanimously approved the Existing Policies Relating to Environmental Quality with the two changes mentioned above.

## **VI. Existing Public Facilities Policies**

Rich provided the following background information:

1. The staff notes were added to point out that our County attorney reviewed these policies prior to their review by the subcommittee, and he emphasized that a lot of the narrative needed work as things appeared to be unorganized and scattered. Staff acknowledges that and instructed the subcommittee not to focus on the introduction language because that is very likely going to be changed.
2. The policy that drew the most attention from the subcommittee pertains to storm water drainage on page 72. Rich said that there was a lot of talk and debate regarding this at the subcommittee level.
3. There is one new proposed strategy on page 85 that wasn't reviewed and discussed by the subcommittee because it was brought up by a staff after the subcommittee completed its review. It expresses the general desire from the subcommittee to see utility poles and lines undergrounded if possible. Rich commented that he misspoke when he told the subcommittee that the Zoning Code already requires utility infrastructure to be placed underground. The only time that it is required currently is when it is infrastructure serving a subdivision; it is not required for development that is not part of a subdivision. Because of this miscommunication, staff now proposes the new policy regarding this.
  - A committee member voiced support for this new strategy but thought there should be exceptions to utility undergrounding for unique terrains and that the strategy should say something about that. Rich proposed adding the following language at the end of this strategy: “... with exceptions for unusual circumstances”.

**Action Taken** -- The committee approved the new strategy on page 85 of the meeting packet, with the addition of the above language, to read as follows: STRATEGY: Amend the Zoning Code to require new or replacement development to underground personal power lines serving the development with exceptions for unusual circumstances.

- Questions were raised about how the County would implement the policy on alternative uses of public school buildings (p. 75-77 of the meeting packet). Does the County have the means to compel school districts to actually take action on

abandoned or underutilized school buildings? Rich responded that the only time the County could step in is if we had a dangerous building ordinance and the vacated building has deteriorated to the point that it becomes derelict or dangerous; then the County can step in and require that it be corrected. Typically this is done through the building code. There was more talk about specific provisions in the code which allow additional uses for old school buildings.

- Regarding the utility undergrounding strategy, a member confirmed that PGE requires power line to be placed underground. Another member asked what the trigger point is for requiring undergrounding. How would this strategy affect existing property and how much redevelopment would trigger the requirement to underground power lines. In reply, the operative words in the strategy statement are “new” and “replacement” development. Undergrounding is not triggered by additions or expansions of existing structures.
- Following up on this topic, a committee member would like to have a stronger policy that places some pressure on utility companies to underground power lines to help prevent the power outages. None was proposed.

Public Comment – Someone suggested a revision to Policy 17 from the West Hills RAP on page 82 of the meeting packet to replace the word “mitigate” with “avoid and minimize”. There was no opposition to this text change, which was consistent with similar wording changes made to other policies.

**Action Taken** – Revise the policy to say “... avoid and minimize significant adverse impacts...” instead of “...mitigate significant adverse impacts...”

**Action Taken** – The CAC unanimously approved the existing policies and strategies related to public facilities with the two changes as noted above.

## **VII. Existing Transportation Policies**

Jessica Berry gave a brief overview of the memorandum on the proposed policies. She walked the CAC through the methods and approach they take to ensure projects get built and designed consistently. She also gave information on how these policies are evaluated and developed.

- A committee member requested that policy 7 be even more refined primarily because of the traffic on Sauvie’s Island and is interested in adding something with more enforcement. She asked what is meant by “available techniques” for speed limit enforcement and what can be done to support more enforcement of safe travel speeds on Sauvie Island. Jessica responded that speed bumps are an example of a measure that could be taken but the idea is to take a look at what the safety issue is and what the area is like to determine what can be done. Joanna Valencia commented that depending on the circumstances, there could be many other measures taken so the policy is written to be open in order not to limit what measures are used.

- A person asked about a process in which citizens can rent a flashing speed sign to put in a dangerous area to bring attention to speeding violations. She wondered if this was something that can be done or maybe looked into for the speeding violations on Sauvie Island. Can a private citizen “borrow” a speed sign to put out where there is a speeding problem? Joanna replied that this has been done in the past and that this is something that needs to be looked at and explored once again. She explained that there are state rules that are very specific about where these signs can actually go up.
- Another member commenting on the speed enforcement policy preferred to keep it open because things change and new tools become available. He suggested that maybe the state will give the County the authority to put out unmanned speed radars as an enforcement tool.
- A committee member was confused about language in Policy 5 that talks about discouraging through traffic on roads with a functional classification of rural local road. He felt the policy needed to be clear that it also includes arterial roads such as Cornell and Germantown Road. It shouldn’t be limited to just “local” roads. Otherwise, he felt as though the policy wouldn’t do any good in addressing the problem of unwanted through traffic in the West Hills. He also opposed the second bullet under strategies and wanted “local” removed. Joanna suggested broadening the policy by adding taking out reference to the functional classification and replacing it with more general “trafficways within unincorporated Multnomah County” and on the second bullet, taking out “local” and just say “rural roads”.
- A member pointed out that the last bullet under policy 8 says “climate” when it should say “climate change”.

Public Comment – A person had a question about policy 2F on page 87 of the meeting packet. Who deems the “where appropriate” in the communities? Is it possible to communicate in the policy that the local community has a voice in the decision for bike tourism? Joanna stated that appropriateness is determined as part of the public outreach process to the communities in conjunction with securing grants for bike tourism projects.

A CAC member shared a concern that the committee didn’t talk about language being stricken in the Willamette River Greenway policy on pages 58 and 59 in the packet. Matt commented that this had already been reviewed as part of a bigger piece of an earlier agenda item in this evening’s meeting and these policies have already been approved by the group. The member wanted to make sure that the policy remains strong and that striking out the particular language doesn’t diminish the importance of the policy. Kevin Cook confirmed that it wouldn’t as there are other policies in place that speak to this.

Another member asked about the Port of Portland cutting down cottonwood trees across from Sauvie Island and wondered if they have to abide by the greenway policy. It was explained that it solely depends on the jurisdiction that the area falls under.

**Action Taken** – The CAC unanimously approved the transportation policies with the following two changes as discussed above.

Revise Policy 5 to read: “Discourage through traffic on trafficways within unincorporated Multnomah County.”

Delete the word “local” from the second strategy of Policy 5.

#### **VIII. Public Comment**

There was no additional public comment.

#### **IX. Meeting Wrap Up**

- Recap of any follow-up items
  - For the next meeting there are some stray policies that haven’t been discussed yet, so those will be on the agenda. Also, the overall goals have yet to be reviewed so that will be a topic. There is more coming from the Transportation subcommittee and remaining parking lot items to discuss.
- Confirm Next Meeting Date and Time
  - The next meeting will be on January 6<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 pm.

#### **X. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 8:02 pm.

## **Community Advisory Committee Meeting Schedule for Calendar Year 2016**

### **Full CAC Meetings**

<b><u>Date</u></b>	<b><u>Topics</u></b>
Jan 6	Transportation; Air, Land, Water and Wildlife
Jan 27	Transportation; Comp Plan Goals
Feb 24	Comprehensive Plan Draft/TSP Draft

**All CAC meetings will be held from 6:00-8:30 PM in room 126 at the Multnomah Building.**

# Memorandum

## Comprehensive Plan Update

December 28, 2015

**To:** Community Advisory Committee  
**From:** Steve White, Oregon Public Health Institute  
Jessica Berry, Transportation Planner  
Joanna Valencia, Planning and Development Manager  
**Re:** Policy Recommendations—Health and Equity, and Utilities

### I. OVERVIEW

This memo presents transportation-related health and equity policies and strategies as recommended by the Transportation and Public Facilities subcommittee. Also, included in this memo is a utility policy and strategy that the subcommittee also approved at its final meeting. These policies and strategies are intended to be included in the Transportation System Plan (TSP). The health and equity policies, along with the issue summary in the next section, are taken from a memorandum written by Steve White, Oregon Public Health Institute, a subconsultant on the County Comprehensive Plan update project.

### II. HEALTH AND EQUITY ISSUE SUMMARY

Existing transportation systems in the US have been shaped by multiple policy inputs and decisions provided by planners, funding agencies and others at local, state, and national levels that have focused largely on building a system designed to move people and goods efficiently. An increasingly large body of research now shows that transportation decisions also directly and indirectly impact human health in multiple ways by influencing a wide range of “health determinants”. Health determinants—also referred to as “social determinants of health” or “risk factors”—are features of the built, social, and natural environment that are known to impact an individual’s risk of experiencing negative health outcomes (injury or illness). According to the American Public Health Association, “fifty percent of the leading causes of death and illness in the United States—traffic injuries, heart disease, cancer, diabetes, and respiratory illness—are preventable” because “these diseases have several risk factors that can be mitigated by transportation policies.”<sup>1</sup> The Baseline Report that was prepared for the Comprehensive Plan update contains existing conditions information about planning related health determinants and outcomes in different parts of Multnomah County.

Much of this research has also highlighted the fact that the benefits and burdens of transportation decisions has fallen unequally on different sub-groups within a community. In

---

<sup>1</sup> American Public Health Association. (2009). *At the Intersection Of Public Health And Transportation*. Washington, DC: American Public Health Association.

particular, the negative health impacts stemming from transportation systems have disproportionately fallen on low income and minority groups, as well as others who lack access to cars or the resources to choose where they live. As a result, many transportation decisions to date have often inadvertently supported or exacerbated health inequities. Health inequities are unfair and avoidable differences between socio-economic groups in the presence of disease, injury, or other health outcomes. For the public health sector, addressing equity means prioritizing the elimination of health inequities by addressing the root causes of inequity and related health outcomes. From a transportation planning perspective, this means ensuring that the benefits and burdens of the transportation system are equitably distributed, and prioritizing investments that address historical inequities and ensure that the transportation system provides all members of a community with the ability to safely and conveniently move about to meet their daily wants and needs.

As a result of the increasing awareness of the connections between transportation systems, health, and equity, more and more planners and policy-makers recognize that transportation plans provide an opportunity not just to improve mobility, but also to address historical inequities and improve the health and well-being of all the members of the communities they are designed to serve. An increasing number of state, regional, and local transportation plans are acknowledging these connections by including goals and metrics that mention both health and equity. Locally, this trend is evident in the inclusion of health and equity policies and goals in Metro's Regional Transportation Plan and in Clackamas County's recently updated TSP. In Multnomah County, the cities of Portland and Gresham are working on including similar policies and goals into their Comprehensive Plan and TSP updates.

### III. HEALTH AND EQUITY POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

#### A. HEALTH

**Policy: Ensure that the transportation system is designed to minimize negative health impacts and promote healthy behaviors and environments by:**

**A. Improving safety for all modes**

- Strategies include:
  1. Lowering traffic speeds through speed limits, enforcement, and roadway design.
  2. Minimizing modal conflict by planning and building bicycle and pedestrian networks that encourage travel on low-traffic streets or off-street trails.
  3. Identifying and addressing real and perceived high crash corridors or hot spots with high crash rates.
  4. Incorporating safety-related features and best practices when designing new facilities or renovating existing facilities.
  5. Ensuring that vulnerable groups such as youth, elderly, and disabled are engaged in planning and design efforts.
  6. Supporting Safe Routes to School and other education and encouragement programs that teach people how to safely use the transportation system
  7. Developing a transportation safety action plan.
  8. Coordinating with land use planning for safe traffic control and parking at events.

**B. Increasing opportunities for physical activity by promoting active transportation modes (walking, bicycling, transit, and equestrian) and multimodal access to parks, trails, open space, and other recreational facilities.**

- Strategies include:
  1. Building out multimodal transportation networks.
  2. Ensuring safe, convenient, multimodal access to parks, trails, open space and other recreational facilities.
  3. Supporting Safe Routes to School and other education and encouragement programs that teach and encourage people to safely use active transportation modes.
  4. Partnering with the Multnomah County Health Department on health promotion and chronic disease prevention programs and initiatives that focus on increasing physical activity.

**C. Ensuring multimodal access to health supportive resources such as healthy food retail, employment, affordable housing, and parks and recreation facilities**

- Strategies include:
  1. Coordinating land use planning to ensure that such resources are easily accessible by multiple modes.
  2. Working with transit providers to ensure that service plans are coordinated with development.
  3. Working with transit providers to ensure that bicycle and pedestrian improvements support transit use.
  4. Ensuring site design guidelines and requirements provide and promote multimodal site access and circulation, and connections to surrounding lots and streets.

**D. Reducing exposure to air pollutants**

- Strategies include:
  1. Encouraging programs that reduce dependence on single occupant vehicle miles travelled and increasing use of electric and low emission vehicles.
  2. Encouraging bicyclists and pedestrians to use parallel low traffic streets where possible instead of high traffic roadways.
  3. Coordinating transportation and land use planning to avoid locating sensitive land uses near high traffic roadways. Sensitive land uses include schools, parks and playfields, community and senior centers, affordable housing, and other places where vulnerable groups such as youth, seniors, and people with low incomes spend significant amounts of time.
  4. Establishing vegetative buffers (trees and shrubs) along roadways to filter and reduce the air pollutants.
  5. Implementing anti-idling campaigns around schools, road construction zones, and other places where drivers tend to idle.

**E. Reducing exposure to noise pollution**

- Strategies include:
  1. Encouraging bicyclists and pedestrians to use parallel low traffic streets where possible instead of high traffic roadways.
  2. Coordinating transportation and land use planning to avoid locating sensitive land uses near high traffic roadways. Sensitive land uses include schools, parks and playfields, community and senior centers, affordable housing, and other places

where vulnerable groups such as youth, seniors, and people with low incomes spend significant amounts of time.

3. Using paving materials that are designed to minimize the production of road noise.

**F. Working with Multnomah County Health Department staff to ensure that the TSP and related planning documents incorporate the findings and recommendations from the most recent versions of their Community Health Assessment and Community Health Improvement Plan.**

- Strategies include:
  1. Having relevant health department staff serve on planning related technical and advisory committees.
  2. Having relevant planning staff participate in the development of the community health assessments and community health improvement plans.

## B. EQUITY

**Policy: Ensure that transportation system plans and investments not only equitably distribute the benefits and burdens of the system improvements, but also prioritize and support programs and projects that eliminate transportation-related disparities faced by groups that have historically had significant unmet transportation needs or who have experienced disproportionate negative impacts from the existing transportation system.**

- Strategies include:
  1. Incorporation of project prioritization criteria that address equity in the County Capital improvement Plan and Program to address investments in road, bicycle, and pedestrian programs and infrastructure in order to improve mobility and access for people who don't have access to a personal vehicle.
  2. Investments in areas with relatively high concentrations of people that have historically received relatively little benefit from transportation system investments should be considered. These people include:
    - *People who cannot drive.* People in this category include many older adults, children, and persons with disabilities.
    - *People experiencing poverty, including those who do not have access to a car,* are struggling with the high costs of car ownership, maintenance, and operation, or are struggling with the cost of transit. People in this category include many people with low incomes, people of color, older adults, persons with disabilities, people who are geographically isolated, and people who experience language barriers.
    - *People with limited mobility.* People in this category include many older adults and persons with disabilities.
    - *Isolated individuals living far from community centers and lacking direct routes for accessing goods and services.*
    - *Communities experiencing racism and discrimination.*

3. Coordinating transportation planning with land use and development to avoid locating sensitive land uses near high traffic roadways. Sensitive land uses include schools, parks and playfields, community and senior centers, affordable housing, and other places where vulnerable groups such as youth, seniors, and people with low incomes spend significant amounts of time.
4. Coordinating transportation planning with land use and development to ensure that new development is well connected with existing development and provides convenient multi-modal access to health supportive resources such as schools, healthy food retail, employment, affordable housing, parks and recreation facilities, and medical and social services.
5. Ensure that public participation includes outreach to equity focused or population specific organizations or culturally specific organizations and explore partnerships with these groups to develop the capacity to effectively participate in planning processes.
6. Working with the Multnomah County Office of Diversity and Equity to use their Equity and Empowerment Lens tool to ensure that county planning staff and project stakeholders are prepared to engage in internal and external conversations about equity and use this input to inform plans, policies and projects.
7. Conducting equity analyses that identify existing disparities as a part of county planning processes.
8. Gathering available data and public input useful for understanding equity issues, impacts and opportunities.

#### IV. ADDITIONAL POLICY RELATED TO UTILITIES IN THE RIGHT OF WAY

##### A. UTILITIES

**Policy: Coordinate with public service providers and private utility suppliers to maximize the efficient delivery of both public and private utilities and facilities in County Right of way.**

- Strategies include:
  1. Work with utility companies that own transmission and distribution lines to strive to bury the power lines to provide more secure power service during emergency situations and improve scenic qualities.
  2. Coordinate utility and road work whenever possible.

### ***Miscellaneous Policies from the County Comprehensive Plan and New Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel Plan***

**BACKGROUND:** *There are a number of policies and strategies that have not been reviewed by either a subcommittee or the CAC that staff believes ought to be included in the new County Comprehensive Plan. Some of these policies come from the current Comprehensive Plan but pertain to a subject that was not assigned to any of the subcommittees (eg. Housing). Some of the policies come from the new Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel (SIMC) Plan but could be applied countywide with little or no modification. A few are simply additional policies or strategies that staff believes complement or complete one that the CAC has already approved.*

*This paper presents an assortment of proposed policies and strategies from various sources for the CAC's consideration and approval.*

#### **Explanation of Different Types of Text in this Document**

Standard text – means existing text from the current County Comprehensive Plan or SIMC Plan.

~~Strikeouts~~ – means existing text that is being deleted.

Underlined – means new text that is being added.

**Bold Underlined** – means a new policy or strategy that staff is proposing for the first time

## RURAL ECONOMY POLICIES (From Current Comprehensive Plan Policy 5: Economic Development)

~~Policy: Maintain the Economic Development Advisory Commission and implement a County Economic Development Program consistent with federal, state and local land use policies and programs and responsive to private sector development needs.~~

Policy 1: Implement policies and strategies related to commercial, office and industrial land use in rural centers included in Chapter 2 of this Plan.

Policy 2: Encourage the retention and creation of employment opportunities and economic development projects designed to meet the needs of business, industry, and the community for a skilled labor force and family wage jobs.

Policy 3: Direct economic development public expenditures and capital improvements projects into ~~comprehensive framework and community plan~~ designated commercial and industrial areas rural centers, which support the timely, orderly and efficient growth and development of these centers.

~~Policy: Determine economic program and project priorities through the use of an evaluation system with criteria and standards consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and overall Economic Development Plan.~~

### **Policy 4: Prioritize and encourage economic development investments and projects that are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.**

~~Policy: Monitor implementation measures for consistency with economic development goals, plans, and policies.~~

Policy 5: Support economic development investments and land use actions which will:

1. Maximize the use of developable sites zoned for commercially and industrially ~~zoned~~ uses sites;
2. ~~Assure the timely and efficient provision of public services and facilities by public agencies in a coordinated manner or result in a substantial number of the following public benefits:~~
  - a. ~~Expansion of existing commercial and industrial firms;~~
  - b. ~~New commercial and industrial ventures which create permanent job opportunities and increase community employee-per-acre densities;~~
  - c. ~~Small firm and incubator industry growth;~~
  - d. ~~Off-site private capital investment;~~
  - e. ~~Opportunities for local purchasing of goods and services by industry, business, residents, and visitors;~~
  - f. ~~Private and/or public capital improvement investments;~~
  - g. ~~Entry level jobs targeted to the economically disadvantaged and unemployed.~~
2. **Promote agriculture and timber production as economic drivers; and**
3. **Recognize the importance of home occupations as a valid employment option for County residents.**

Policy 6: ~~Help initiate and~~ Actively support community-based economic revitalization and development efforts which create employment opportunities, generate business investment capital, and improve the attractiveness and marketability of commercial and industrial ~~areas~~ sites.

Policy 7: Encourage and stimulate ~~natural resource~~ agricultural and timber processing industries, ~~marketing and pre-processing structures, and information distribution~~ which will improve the economic viability of ~~natural resource farm and forest~~ production within the County. The location of these enterprises must be carefully balanced with the protection of ~~other natural~~ these resource lands when they occur outside the urban growth boundaries.

### HOUSING CHOICE POLICIES *(From Current Comprehensive Plan Policy 21: Housing Choice)*

~~The County's policy is to support and assist in the provision of an adequate number of housing units at price ranges and rent levels affordable to the region's households, and to allow for variety in housing location, type and density, the County will:~~

#### **POLICIES**

- A. Encourage the provision of housing affordable to residents of all incomes and household types.
- B. Support the provision of housing for the elderly, including low-maintenance, small units within existing communities.
- C. Support the provision of housing in sizes and styles, which suit the needs of smaller households, including single adults and couples without children.
- ~~D. Encourage more efficient utilization of housing in communities to eliminate over housing of the elderly and under housing of large families.~~
- E. Maintain a non-exclusionary housing policy.
- F. Reevaluate its regulations and, where possible, streamline or eliminate requirements to reduce development costs.
- ~~G. Take a direct role in conserving the existing housing stock.~~
- G. Support efforts to conserve existing housing stock, particularly housing that is affordable to community members with low and moderate incomes.**
- H. Accommodate innovative housing construction techniques which decrease development costs.
- I. Cooperate with the private sector to expand the supply of housing which is affordable to low and moderate income residents.

## STRATEGIES

- ~~A. Maintain an inventory of buildable lands and monitor the effects of the urban service boundary on land costs.~~
- B. Work with the regional government to determine expected housing demand in the unincorporated County based upon demographic and housing trends, transportation improvements and industrial economic development in the region.
- C. Work with trade associations, community groups and other interested groups to reduce the cost of housing through the formulation of:
  - 1. Alternative road and improvement standards;
  - 2. Legislative amendments to the Uniform Building Code;
  - 3. An expeditious design review, building permit and land division process;
  - ~~4. An expeditious building permit process;~~
  - ~~5. An expeditious zoning and land division process;~~
  - ~~6. Smaller minimum lot sizes.~~
- ~~D. Reduce minimum size of units to 500 square feet for high density elderly apartments in the light rail transit corridor.~~
- ~~E. Reduce parking requirements for high density apartments for elderly persons in the light rail corridor, consistent with adopted community plans and light rail corridor plans.~~
- ~~F. Reevaluate the planned development requirements to reflect prevailing public attitudes regarding common space.~~
- ~~G. Consider amendments to the Zoning Ordinance in order to allow accessory apartments in single family zones.~~
- ~~H. Continue the housing rehabilitation program for owner-occupied residences and consider extending the program to investor-owned rental property.~~

## SAUVIE ISLAND/MULTNOMAH CHANNEL RURAL AREA PLAN POLICIES PROPOSED FOR COUNTY-WIDE APPLICATION

### EQUITY POLICIES

**Goal:** To support access to all people and to ensure that planning policies and programs are inclusive.

**Policy 1.1.** Acknowledged the needs of low-income and minority populations in future investments and programs, including an equity analysis consistent with required federal, state and local requirements.

**Policy 1.2. Consider and seek to achieve social and racial equity in evaluating and making planning decisions.**

**Strategy 1.2.1** Incorporate an equity analysis when developing implementation standards and processes that accounts for health, safety and disparate impacts on low income, communities of color, and immigrant and refugee communities.

**Policy 1.3. Provide meaningful citizen engagement opportunities for communities of color in planning, decision-making and evaluation.**

**Strategy 1.2.1** Review and work towards removal of barriers to equity through targeted outreach that results in meaningful participation and feedback.

**Policy 1.4.** Use the county Equity and Empowerment Lens when developing policy, implementing codes, and capital projects.

**FARM LAND POLICIES**

**Policy 3.1** Ensure that transportation policies and policies related to the regulation of activities and events in agricultural zones minimize the difficulties conflicting uses impose on farming practices.

**Policy 3.2** Develop and adopt a unified permitting process for review of mass gatherings and other gatherings. Establish more restrictive permitting thresholds for the number of visitors and the frequency or duration of events than the maximums authorized by state law.

**Strategy 3.2-1** Provide appropriate public notice of applications for gatherings and coordinate these activities with affected local public agencies.

**Strategy 3.2-2** Require through conditions that noise levels associated with gatherings comply with state and local noise ordinances to maintain the rural character.

**Policy 3.3** Limit the area, location, design, and function of farm stand promotional activities and gatherings to the extent allowed by law to retain a maximum supply of land in production for farm crops or livestock, to ensure public health and safety, minimize impacts on nearby farming operations, residents, roads, traffic circulation, wildlife, and other natural resources, and maintain the rural character.

**Strategy 3.3-1** Require applicants for development of nonfarm uses on land zoned Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) to demonstrate need for the amount of acreage they propose to remove from the agricultural land base for nonfarm uses, including promotional events.

**Strategy 3.3-2** The County shall develop reporting requirements in sufficient detail to assess compliance with the 25% total limit on annual farm stand income from fee-based promotional events and from the sale of retail incidental items, including food or beverage items prepared or

sold for on-site consumption. The County may audit farm stands to ensure compliance with this requirement. Implementation of this strategy should balance a reasonable expectation of financial privacy and burden with the need to request information necessary to reasonably demonstrate compliance with the 25% total limit standard.

### **NATURAL RESOURCES POLICIES**

**Policy 3.5** Where possible, streamline and simplify the Multnomah County Code to provide and encourage fish and wildlife habitat restoration and enhancement projects on public and private lands conducted by natural resource public agencies such as Metro, Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation Districts and Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife.

**Policy 3.14** Direct the Multnomah County Vector Control staff to coordinate with Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, using that agency's map of sensitive areas and their Vector Control Guidance for Sensitive Areas to identify important habitat for sensitive species like red-legged frogs and native turtles where an altered protocol should be used. The county's vector control staff is encouraged to act as a resource in efforts to educate and collaborate with landowners about natural means of mosquito control.

## Draft Comprehensive Plan Goals

Staff is proposing the following draft goals be included in the updated County Comprehensive Plan. There is a goal for each chapter of the Plan, with possible additional goals to be included in the Transportation System Plan (TSP). A number of these proposed Comprehensive Plan goals have been taken from the Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel (SIMC) Rural Area Plan and have been modified to apply to all rural areas of the County.

It is important to keep in mind that goals are broad, aspirational statements about the community's long-term desires, values and preferred directions for its physical development. Policies and strategies, on the other hand, are commitments to general and specific courses of action designed to guide decisions to achieve the goal. For that reason, goals carry less weight than policies and strategies and, thus, demand less careful scrutiny in how they are worded.

### RECOMMENDED GOAL STATEMENTS

**Citizen Involvement:** To promote equitable participation by all members of the community in the development and implementation of the Comprehensive Plan by ensuring access to information and transparency of decision-making, and providing multiple and meaningful opportunities to become involved.

**Land Use:** To implement a land use planning process and policy framework as a basis for all decision and actions related to use of land that is consistent with state law and community goals and priorities; addresses or mitigates potential conflicts between different land uses; and is implemented in a fair, equitable and reasonable manner.

**Farm Land:** To conserve agricultural land in exclusive farm use and mixed use agricultural zones and maximize its retention for productive farm use. (*Modified from SIMC*)

**Forest Land:** To conserve forest lands in forest zones for timber production, while practicing sound management of natural resources and hazards, providing for recreational activities, and minimizing conflicts between forest production and non-forest production uses and activities.

**Natural Resources:** To protect and restore natural resources and conserve scenic areas and open spaces and maintain their contribution to the rural character of the County. (*Adapted from combined goal for Natural, Cultural and Historic Resources in SIMC Plan*)

**Cultural and Historic Resources:** To protect cultural resources and conserve and restore historic resources. (*Adapted from combined goal for Natural, Cultural and Historic Resources in SIMC Plan*)

**Natural Hazards:** To reduce impacts to people, property, structures, and natural resources from natural hazards such as erosion, flooding, landslides, earthquakes and wildfires.

**Rural Economy:** To support the rural economy of the County, including farm and forest production, as well as commercial, industrial, office and retail activities; to do so consistent with available infrastructure and resources, in compatibility with other land uses, and in compliance with state and local goals and laws.

**Housing:** To support housing opportunities for rural County residents, including lawfully authorized marinas and moorages and floating residential units, while meeting health and safety concerns, minimizing environmental impacts and complying with state land use requirements. *(Adapted from Marinas and Floating Homes goal in SIMC Plan)*

**Public Facilities:** To coordinate and collaborate with service providers and affected agencies to ensure an appropriate level of public services to rural areas of the County, consistent with their rural character.

**Transportation:** To provide a safe and efficient transportation network for all modes of travel that serves the rural areas of the County and reduces congestion on rural County roadways. *(Modified overall goal from SIMC; Kittelson has drafted possible additional goals for the TSP)*

Staff is proposing the following value statements and introductory text for inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan as a substitute for individual rural area vision statements or a single countywide vision statement. The Board of County Commissioners originally adopted these values in 1999 and officially reaffirmed them in 2007. We have revised and expanded upon them in an attempt to better represent the community values that have been expressed during the course of the comprehensive plan update.

Each of the currently adopted Rural Area Plans contains a Vision Statement or something comparable that conveys what each community cherishes and desires to retain or to achieve in the future. Staff believes that the following land use planning values, already adopted by the County, capture in a more general way the ideals expounded in the individual rural area plans. These values appropriately serve as the planning principles upon which the Comprehensive Plan is based.

Copies of the Rural Area Plan vision statements are attached for the sake of comparison.

### **Land Use Planning Values in Multnomah County**

The State of Oregon places great importance on land use planning and has a long tradition of recognizing the benefits of a strong statewide planning framework. Multnomah County has also embraced land use planning as a necessary means to preserve its rural lands predominantly for agricultural and forestry uses, to protect natural resources from environmental degradation, and to foster a high quality of life for rural residents.

In 1999, the Board of Multnomah County Commissioners formally established their commitment to sound land use planning and its many related fields by adopting value statements. These values were reaffirmed by Board action once again in 2007.

The values previously adopted by the County appropriately lay the foundation to this Comprehensive Plan document. To that purpose, the following value statements have been taken from those adopted in 1999, reaffirmed in 2007, and updated as part of the Comprehensive Plan to reflect those things the County cherishes and desires for all who live and work here.

**We value** the preservation and protection of:

- Wildlife and its habitat
- Streams and other natural resources
- Scenic Views
- The Columbia River Gorge
- Forest Lands, and
- Farm and Nursery Production

**We value and promote** inclusion, diversity and equity in and throughout our communities.

**We value** sustainability and resiliency to climate change, with an eye to the future, and believe that maintaining the quality of life in the rural areas of Multnomah County provides a social benefit that serves those on both sides of the urban growth boundary.

**We value and promote** the health and safety of our communities.

**We recognize** that we are part of a larger ecosystem and want to make decisions accordingly, working with other jurisdictions and stakeholders with common purpose.

**We value** rural communities and rural character and support an economically viable rural lifestyle.

**We support** the Statewide Planning Goals adopted by the Land Conservation and Development Commission in 1975 and strive to further those goals with locally adopted plans and policies.

**We support** the "recreational values" and "cultural and historic values" imbedded in the goals.

**We value** the ability to travel by a variety of modes and a transportation system that provides choices for rural residents, while minimizing adverse impacts on residents and natural resources.

**We value** clear, courteous, respectful and responsive communication and collaboration with the many communities and its members, and with jurisdictions involved.

**We seek** fairness, equity and balance in finding creative solutions that build community as well as benefit the public.

**We value** swift, accessible and understandable processes that are administered in a consistent and predictable manner in compliance with applicable local and state laws.

**We value** history and a sense of place.

**EAST OF SANDY RIVER RURAL AREA PLAN**  
**Citizens' Advisory Committee**  
**PREAMBLE/VISION STATEMENT**  
**for**

**Rural Multnomah County, East of the Sandy River**

We the citizens of rural Multnomah County, east of the Sandy River, set forth this vision for our unique community over the next forty years. It is our intent that the rural area plan, developed in cooperation with Multnomah County, shall serve as a framework to realize this vision. We expect our county government, through use of all planning tools and policies available, to serve as our advocate regarding all concepts and policies herein.

**For our environment, we envision:**

- The people of our community living in close proximity to nature, conserving and caring for our precious natural resources.
- Healthy and unpolluted air, soils and streams.
- Diverse and robust native plants and wildlife.
- A night sky free from increased light pollution and a community free from increased noise pollution

**For our community, we envision:**

- Maintaining and enhancing our quality of life through neighborly communication, education, cooperation, and community facilities.
- Expanding our commitment to land stewardship through the use of sustainable forestry and farming practices
- Working with all available resources to promote and encourage forest and farm economic development projects and to create conservation land trusts.
- Working with all available resources to purchase land for public benefit
- Setting an example of how our diverse community, young and old, can work together in creating viable and productive forests and farms on both small and large acreages.
- Creating education and work programs which provide forest and farm experiences for people from other communities as well as our own.

**For our future, we envision:**

- The residential density east of the Sandy River stabilized at levels allowed by current zoning.
- The Urban Growth Boundary maintained west of the Sandy River.

This vision statement is created to ensure that with vigilance and foresight, the unique rural character of our area shall be maintained and enjoyed by present and future generations.

# Community Vision

The policies in this document should be read in harmony with the following vision statement. This statement was developed with the Community Advisory Committee & broader public to be a compass that directs the policy framework.

The vision for the Sauvie Island & the Multnomah Channel planning area is to retain its cherished rural character and agricultural productivity, to enhance resource protections, and to reduce and manage cumulative impacts of recreation, visitation, and commercial activities in order to preserve the distinctive character of the island and channel for future generations.

Those who live on, work on, and visit Sauvie Island, value the Island's productive farm land, which provides fresh food for both locals and the region. Many who live here have a deep sense of place and are passionate about protecting and preserving a beloved way of life characterized by the predominance of nature, wildlife and water.

The Multnomah Channel is historically significant concerning the early settlement of the area. The marina community is dedicated to preserving and enhancing the channel environment and wildlife habitat on which they live. They desire to see continuation of floating home moorages as a part of the mix of uses on the channel.

The community strives to coordinate with state and local agencies to implement projects that protect and enhance the natural and cultural features of the area. Community health and safety continue to be a high priority for many residents, particularly the public road system and along the rail line adjacent to the Channel. By providing safe, accessible roads and facilities, the variety of multi-modal users may be accommodated.

Sauvie Island and the Multnomah Channel, as one rural area, both deeply value their commitment to the land and water that surrounds them. The community recognizes and respects the rich cultural history of both the native inhabitants and settlers who followed. It is this history, along with current commitments and values, which has helped create such a strong sense of place and devotion to preserving its uniqueness.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Policies for the various zones beginning with Exclusive Farm Use in Policies 11 – 15;
- Parks and open spaces in Policies 16 – 19;
- Flood hazard areas in Policy 20;
- The Orient and Pleasant Home rural communities in Policies 21 – 27;
- Transportation system in Policies 28 - 38.

### West of Sandy River Vision

The citizen task force created a vision to help guide the planning process, as follows:

As residents and landowners in the area between the cities of Gresham and Troutdale and the Sandy River, our vision is that we will continue to enjoy our rural lifestyle. We value all of the features that make this a rural place including the quiet open spaces, vistas of productive farm and forest lands and of Mt. Hood, country roads, healthy air, soils and streams, and a night sky where we can clearly see the stars.

We envision that the Orient and Pleasant Home rural centers will continue to prosper within defined areas in order to provide for the needs of residents and visitors. We want our roads to continue to serve as the transportation network for the area, while remaining usable for people enjoying the country and accessing the Sandy River, with opportunities for exercise by walking, running, bicycling and horseback riding.

In order to maintain this vision, we recognize that the planned density of residential development must not increase, that the agricultural economy of the area must remain strong, and that development of new non-agricultural businesses should serve the needs of the local area. This plan is intended to help us in our stewardship of the environment, our lifestyle, and our community over the next 20 years.

West of Sandy River  
Rural Plan Area

## **Proposed Community Visions by West Hills CAC Members**

### **West Hills Community Vision:**

*The vision for the West Hills planning area is to retain its cherished rural character, natural features, scenic views, forestry and agricultural productivity, to enhance resource protections, and to reduce and manage cumulative impacts of traffic, recreation, and development in order to preserve the distinctive character of the West Hills for future generations.*

### **Rural Character of the West Hills:**

What is the cherished rural and distinctive character of the West Hills that is to be preserved for future generations?

The West Hills are part of the Tualatin Mountains, bordered on the east by US Highway 30 and Multnomah Channel, to the north by Columbia County, to the west by Washington County and the Tualatin Valley, and to the south by the city of Portland and Forest Park. The hills are mostly forested with native trees and laced with numerous healthy headwater streams, with some agricultural land along the southwestern edges near Washington County. Views of our steep, densely forested hills from Portland, Sauvie Island, and the Tualatin Valley provide a strong sense of place in the western part of the Portland metropolitan region. The impression one gets when visiting these hills is of a sparsely occupied area with extensive wildlife habitat and open space, where people use the land to produce trees and food, and share the land with wildlife.

**The rural and distinctive character of the West Hills to be preserved, its “sense of place”, includes the following:**

- **Natural beauty:** The extensive forests, open space and greenery of the area, with occasional views of four Cascade peaks, the Coast Range, the Tualatin Valley, and the Columbia and Willamette Rivers, give the hills a rare and special beauty.
- **Sparse population and low-intensity uses:** The land is intended for growing trees and food, raising livestock and preserving wildlife and habitat.
- **Low environmental impacts:** Thriving diverse wildlife and plant life, quietude, good air quality, healthy headwater streams, good water quality and availability, and residents committed to protecting and enhancing the environment contribute significantly to the area's low impact on the environment. Our forests provide many valuable eco-system services, cleaning our air, filtering and buffering storm water, and absorbing carbon.
- **Diverse landscapes, life forms & uses:** Rich productive farm fields and forests, wildlife, plant life, all coexist with a small human population.
- **Family-owned farms:** Some farms have been in the same families for generations.
- **High-value forestry lands and natural features:** All of the West Hills was designated by the county as Rural Reserves for Natural Landscape Features because of the extensive high value wildlife habitat, headwater streams, and scenic views that provide sense of place for the region. This area provides critical habitat connections between Forest Park and the Coast Range, Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel, and the Tualatin Valley. Most of the West Hills was also highly suitable as Rural Reserves for Forestry.

- **Wildlife and habitat:** The West Hills are a long, narrow extension of the Coast Range ecoregion that reaches into the Willamette Valley ecoregion. The West Hills connect wildlife in Forest Park to the Coast Range, Tualatin Basin, Multnomah Channel, Sauvie Island, and the Columbia River and Willamette Rivers. This confluence of three different habitat types (valley, river/wetlands, and mountains) provides particularly rich but fragile (due to its long narrow shape and nearby urbanization) wildlife connections of statewide importance, identified by the State of Oregon's Department of Fish and Wildlife as a Conservation Opportunity Area. Large areas of contiguous forest canopy provide an increasingly rare and valuable habitat for neo-tropical migrant birds and other habitat specialists. Pockets of rare native oak woodland and savannah are also valued.
- **Public lands:** Metro owns over 1000 acres near the northern end of Forest Park to ensure wildlife connectivity. These Metro properties are part of a large and extensive network of protected natural areas in the West Hills that extend into the city of Portland's jurisdiction, including Forest Park Conservancy's Ancient Forest Preserve, over 5000 acres in Portland's Forest Park and the Audubon Society of Portland's 150-acre Nature Sanctuary, Washington Park, and the Hoyt Arboretum. The Bureau of Land Management owns land north of Cornelius Pass Road used for forestry and recreation. Nearby Burlington Bottoms is part of this network of public land, providing high value breeding ponds for amphibians that migrate to and from our upland forests.
- **Finite geographical features:** Our steep hills, many streams, landslide hazards, and the presence of Forest Park work together to limit our rural road system. Access is limited to a relatively small number of rural roads despite our proximity to developed urban areas in Portland and Washington County.
- **Rural landscape:** The area is peaceful, and natural sounds generally dominate the few man-made noises. There are few paved surfaces other than main roads, minimal signage, homes that fit into the landscape, an absence of commercial enterprises & buildings, and a notable absence of suburban-like developments and subdivisions once you leave Portland and urban areas in Washington County.
- **Community services:** Skyline Grange, Skyline Elementary School, Skyline Ridge Neighbors, and Forest Park Neighborhood Association provide community and communication for area residents. West Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District provides assistance to property owners interested in sustainable farming and forestry, fights invasive plants, and restores native habitat. There are no sewers and limited public water facilities in the area. Ground water via wells supply most water needs.
- **Sense of place:** The community and visitors are inspired by extensive closed-canopy forests that connect to Forest Park, views of mountains, rivers, and valleys, nature, wildlife, habitat and the serene and quiet quality of rural life. Residents are committed to retaining and improving the environmental quality of land, water and sky for future generations of humans and wildlife.
- **True rural community:** The West Hills are an outstanding example of a supportive rural community. Residents are all each other's neighbors, regardless of distance. While interests are diverse, they enjoy each other's company and help one another in times of need.

**Parking Lot Items from CAC & Subcommittee meetings**  
**(through December 14, 2015 )**

#	MEETING	TOPIC	STATUS
1	2/25/15 CAC	State requirements for agri-tourism (bring CAC more details)	<b>Done.</b> Provided at March 4 F/F/RE subcommittee mtg and April 22 CAC meeting
2	2/25/15 CAC	Provide relevant information about state requirements before CAC makes a recommendation.	<b>Is being done.</b>
3	2/25/15 CAC	Pending decision re:rural/urban reserves connection to important wildlife corridor.	Need update from County Attorney's office when final decision is rendered.
4	2/25/15 CAC	Scenic and natural area view protection.	<b>Done.</b> Various policies have addressed this.
5	2/25/15 CAC	Douglas fir reforestation	<b>Done.</b> Addressed by ODF representative at May 27 CAC meeting.
6	2/25/15 CAC	TSP to apply climate change lens	<b>Ongoing.</b> Various policies address climate change.
7	2/25/15 CAC	Citizen review process like Portland's	<b>Done.</b> Policy on permit process did not specifically address this item but it is flexible enough to allow for such a review process when drafting zoning code amendments.
8	4/1/15 CAC	Where does waste disposal go in the plan?	<b>Done.</b> CAC approved policy under public facilities.
9	4/1/15 CAC	Will the committee discuss policy for nonconforming uses?	<b>Done.</b> Policies discussed and approved at 7/22/15 CAC mtg.
11	4/22/15 CAC	Definition of winery – do they need to produce prescribed amounts from grapes? Can it be wine made from berries or fruits?	<b>Done.</b> Answered at July 22 CAC meeting as part of winery policy discussion.
12	4/22/15 CAC	Must a winery be registered or officially recognized to qualify for promotional activities and events?	<b>Done.</b> Answered at July 22 CAC meeting as part of winery policy discussion.
13	5/13/15 Land Use	Should dwelling sizes be limited in the SEC Overlays?	<b>Done.</b> Policy to explore this for SEC-h was approved with wildlife habitat policies.
14	5/27/15 F/F/RE	Defining rural values. Different communities may want to define or describe rural values differently.	The comprehensive plan narrative can do that.

#	MEETING	TOPIC	STATUS
15	5/27/15 CAC	Siting residential uses in Rural Center zones for compatibility with commercial uses.	<b>Done.</b> Discussed at 6/17/15 Farm/Forest meeting and determined not to be an issue.
16	5/27/15 CAC	Code compliance policy that addresses reoccurring violations.	<b>Done.</b> New policy addresses this.
17	5/27/15 CAC	Will there be policies regarding winery agri-tourism events?	<b>Done.</b> Policies discussed and approved at 7/22/15 CAC mtg.
18	6/24/15 CAC	How will comp plan policies impact the CRGNSA? Is there any crossover applicable to the NSA?	Not yet addressed. Comp plan narrative will do that.
19	6/24/15 CAC	Can we prohibit public utility infrastructure in the rural county that is solely intend to serve urban developments.	<b>Done.</b> CAC discussed on 9/23/15. Policy approved by CAC on 10/28/15.
20	6/24/15 CAC	Is "limited forest product processing" as an allowed an issue in Mult Co? (ie. Is a bark removal facility a limited forest product processing use?	<b>Done.</b> Discussed at 9/2/15 CAC meeting. Deleted reference to all land uses from the introductory text to the Rural Residential land use category.
21	6/24/15 CAC	Would like a policy requiring the County to take a position on proposals by outside agencies or companies that could have adverse impacts on County residents. (Dumping dredge materials in Columbia River; coal trains; oil trains, etc.)	<b>Done.</b> Assistant County attorney, Jed Tomkins, saw problems with this type of policy and advised against it. CAC discussed on 9/23/15. No further action necessary.
22	7/22/15 CAC	Define specific terms in policies such as "important natural landscape features", "community identity" and "rural character".	The comprehensive plan narrative may be the best place to explain or define terms that have specific meaning. Alternatively, a glossary of terms could be part of the comprehensive plan.
23	9/02/15 CAC	Appropriateness of the conditional uses (all uses) now allowed in Rural Residential and MUA-20 zones	Staff looked at this and determined that it is really a zoning code housekeeping task and should be performed in conjunction with amending the zoning code to implement the comprehensive plan. It is outside of the comp plan update.
24	10/19/2015 Tran/PubFac	Should there be a policy in the comprehensive plan that addresses drones?	<b>Done.</b> Staff researched topic. Memo presented to subcommittee on 12/14/15 recommending against any policy. Subcommittee agreed with staff recommendation.

#	MEETING	TOPIC	STATUS
25	10/19/2015 Tran/PubFac	There should be a policy about the importance of marine transportation as an economic development driver.	<b>Done.</b> Memo presented to subcommittee on 12/14/15 with recommended policy in comp plan chapter 9 on economic development. Subcommittee approved the proposed policy.
26	10/28/2015 ALWW&H	Do we need to have policies on Energy Sources under Goal 5?	<b>Done.</b> Staff researched this and determined a policy is necessary. Existing policy and strategies on energy sources were revised to comply with Goal 5 and subcommittee wishes.
27	11/9/2015 Tran/PubFac	Does the County already have adopted drainage system design guidelines and standards for roadways that address avoiding degradation of fish and wildlife habitat from storm runoff? If not, add stormwater drainage policy in TSP to address this.	<b>Done.</b> Memo on this topic given to subcommittee on 12/14/2015 with recommended policy language for inclusion in the TSP.
28	11/9/2015 Tran/PubFac	There should be a general policy requiring a CUP approval criterion about conformance with the goals of the Climate Action Plan. Where would it go in the Plan?	Discussed at 12/14/15 subcommittee meeting. Staff recommended against such a policy. No decision reached. Subcommittee asked that it be taken to the CAC.

# Memorandum

## Comprehensive Plan Update

December 21, 2015

**To:** Community Advisory Committee  
**From:** Kevin Cook, Multnomah County Planner  
**Re:** Parking Lot Items 23 and 28

### OVERVIEW

23	Appropriateness of the conditional uses (all uses) now allowed in Rural Residential and MUA-20 zones.
28	There should be a general policy requiring a CUP approval criterion about conformance with the goals of the Climate Action Plan. Where would it go in the Plan?

#### 23. APPROPRIATENESS OF USES IN THE ZONING CODE:

This concern was raised in September during a CAC discussion of particular uses mentioned in the introductory narrative to the Rural Residential land use category. During the discussion it was suggested that various allowed, review, or conditional uses listed in the Zoning Code may no longer align with current state rules and statutes and that an audit of listed uses in the code should occur as part of the Comprehensive Plan update.

Staff has discussed the issue and decided that such an audit would be appropriate as part of the Zoning Code reorganization process, which is a separate process from the Comprehensive Plan update. As part of the Zoning Code update, staff will compare listed uses against state law in consultation with Dept. of Land Conservation and Development staff and will propose code amendments as appropriate, which will in turn be considered by the Planning Commission.

#### 28. CONDITIONAL USE APPROVALS AND THE CLIMATE ACTION PLAN:

A few members on the Transportation and Public Facilities subcommittee indicated interest in a policy that would direct Zoning Code amendments to require Conditional Uses to demonstrate conformance with the goals of the City/County Climate Action Plan (CAP). Staff raised concerns about the appropriateness of such a vague policy and reminded the subcommittee that applicable goals of the CAP are appropriately addressed under specific topic areas such as transportation, land use, and natural hazards.

The subcommittee did not reach consensus on the issue and opted to forward the question to the full CAC.

Staff's position is that such a policy is not appropriate for the following reasons:

1. As proposed, the policy would be too general and could be used to deny any CUP application.
2. Goals in the Climate Action Plan relevant to County land use are in fact addressed in existing and proposed Comp Plan policies dealing with natural hazards, transportation, land use and so on. The final Comp Plan document will include narrative discussing how the Comp Plan supports the CAP.
3. County Attorney's office indicates that such a policy applied to a land use application could be struck down as "void for vagueness," a constitutional due process violation.