

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
ROOM 126 MULTNOMAH BUILDING
501 SE HAWTHORNE BLVD. PORTLAND, OR
January 6, 2016 6:00 PM

MEETING SUMMARY

I. Welcome/Introductions/Announcements

In attendance:

CAC

Aaron Blake
Andrew Holtz
Catherine Dishion
Chris Foster
George Sowder
Jerry Grossnickle
Tim Larson
Stephanie Nystrom
Marcy Cottrell Houle
Martha Berndt
Paula Sauvageau
John Ingle
Sara Grigsby

Project Team

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

Absent: Karen Nashiwa, Kathy Taggart, Linden Burk, Will Rasmussen,

Others in attendance: Carol Chesarek, Michael Cerbone

Eryn Kehe opened the meeting by recognizing that the CAC has come a long way and then asked everyone in attendance to introduce themselves. She gave a brief overview of the agenda. Rich Faith announced that County planning staff have drafted agri-tourism code amendments for in East County and he would like to set up a working group of CAC members to review those amendments as called for in the Agri-tourism policy and strategy that the CAC has already approved. The strategy specifically says to involve interested members of the CAC and the community when drafting agri-tourism provisions. Rich asked who would be interested in participating in the working group – he mentioned that he will not rule out anyone from the West County but said that there should be an emphasis on East County representatives. He speculated there would be couple of meetings and stated that he would like make use of the CAC while it is still in session. The following CAC members offered: to serve on the working group: Sara Grigsby, Catherine Dishion, Stephanie Nystrom, however, the general consensus was that all of the East County CAC reps would probably want to participate and they all should be contacted to find out if they are interested.

Rich said that he would get back to the working group and let them know time and place for potential meetings. Eryn then said that if anyone had an inclination to join once they thought it over, they would be able to do so. Rich chimed in that he would like to keep the group consistent so once the working group starts, he would like to carry it through with those members.

Eryn moved forward by asking if there were any other announcements or if anyone brought any meeting notes/changes to the current agenda. There was a question regarding the finalized dates for the end of the month meetings – Rich continued that in the packet, the remaining meetings for 2016 were listed on page 11.

II. Remaining Transportation Policies

A. Health

Jessica Berry presented the remaining transportation policies being recommended by the subcommittee – starting on page 12 in the packet. She gave a brief overview and mentioned that Steve White of Oregon Public Health Institute, one of the subconsultants working on the comprehensive plan update, wrote the memo that these policies came from. Starting with the health related policies, Jessica briefed the CAC on what the focus of each one is and what was discussed at the Transportation subcommittee meeting.

A member of the transportation subcommittee commented on an email conversation she had with some County staff about reducing light pollution that was not addressed in the health policy. At the subcommittee meeting she had suggested that light pollution be rolled in with the air and noise pollution strategies and they all be made into one. There was general agreement among the subcommittee on this suggestion. Rich said that per the email communication, there needed to be more detail and clearer communication regarding what it is the CAC wants directly addressed. Staff offered the question of “under what situations would the county need a specific strategy relating to light pollution through transportation?” The response was that screening light from vehicle headlights by planting roadside vegetation could be part of road projects in certain circumstances.

Eryn then raised the question whether there should be an additional strategy regarding light pollution under transportation even though it is currently reflected in the Dark Skies policy in the Natural Resources section of the Comprehensive plan. Does this need to be included in this section as well? It was mentioned that the screening of headlights is definitely a different scenario than the Dark Skies ordinance and that it should be addressed along with air and noise pollution associated with vehicles.

Jessica Berry suggested combining Strategy D (air pollutants) and E (noise pollution) and including light so that air, noise and light pollution would be addressed as a single strategy. All agreed this was a good solution.

Another CAC member shared his thoughts about the West Hills not having much connectivity and that they do not want much connectivity with the road system and would like to modify strategy C4. Eryn then asked what the West Hills would feel about this connectivity strategy if it didn't relate to cars but instead pertained to pedestrians or bicyclists. The member responded that the same concerns would exist if they were new connections and not existing. The West Hills does not want a policy that could be

construed in support of having to create more roads because that is not what they want there. Rich Faith stated that the policy was speaking about connectivity between different uses – connectivity within adjacent commercial uses or commercial to schools or parks. It wasn't meant to portray that we want more roads to provide connections to different areas.

This was discussed further by the committee. There was concern that the strategy advocates a street grid when discussing connectivity and how they believe it is the wrong language being used. Eryn asked what the policy should say and someone suggested leaving the portion that mentions connections to surrounding lots and streets. Someone else stated that the language used here seems to relate more to an urban context and not a rural one. People could use it for the wrong purposes and argue it is for land use expansion.

There was more discussion around the idea of this particular strategy being under the Transportation Equity policy and that it wants to provide people access to the resources around them in an equitable way so that everyone has the same access.

Another CAC member voiced concern about this strategy not fitting the rural situation where she lives. There was a suggestion to eliminate all of strategy C because it feels more like it belongs in an urban plan than in a rural one. Matt Hastie reminded the CAC members that this is a forward looking plan and that these policies are being written because this is what we are aspiring towards.

A committee member stated the importance of keeping the language as he agreed with Matt's statement and would like this for his area in the future. Matt commented further that it's important to look at the full document and not each section individually as this is a part of a bunch of different policies and the importance of making sure all the policies are balanced.

One of the members expressed the importance of having language in the Health policy about working with other agencies. Jessica responded that there are other policies where that is mentioned, but that she would make a note to add that part of strategy A.

Another committee member suggested adding more narrative to the last paragraph of the introduction to set the context of rural character. Adding this language would make it clear that the Health policy doesn't supersede any of the rural land use policies that also apply. Other members supported this change.

Eryn then asked the CAC and staff if moving forward with an approval of this section is what is preferable or if this needed to be continued to a future meeting.

Public Comment – A member of the public spoke about the frustrating nature of these policies as she feels like they've been adequately covered in other areas. Staff keeps saying it wants to avoid and eliminate redundancy, yet there is so much of it in this Health policy. Regarding the language in strategy C4 she suggested removing the words "surrounding lots and streets" as a way of softening the connectivity aspect.

Action Taken – The CAC unanimously approved the Health Policy but directed the following changes and asked that they be able to see the changes before they are final.

- Include additional language about rural context to the last paragraph of the issue summary text.
- Include “low-income” among the groups mentioned in strategy A5.
- Add “and peak use generators” at the end of strategy A8.
- Include a strategy A9 about coordinating with ODOT and other agencies.
- Add “and centers of employment” at the end of health policy B.
- Delete the word “to surrounding loots and streets” at the end of strategy C4 and insert the word “appropriate” in front of the word “connections”.
- Combine C and D and add Light Pollution -- nothing will be removed, only added and edited, the extra language at the end of the summary that will help soften the introduction for rural settings.

B. Equity

A member asked why the rural areas don’t have public transportation and wondered why it isn’t in the Equity portion of the policy as there should be at least some type of public transportation in the rural areas. Staff responded that a policy in the TSP talks about promoting and investigating public transportation in rural areas. Matt stated that this was discussed in the prior meeting and that there are references in other areas of the TSP pertaining to this.

Another member asked what the Equity and Empowerment Lens is and where it can be found on the County website. Staff reminded the committee that the County’s Equity and Diversity officer spoke to them about this at an early committee meeting. Staff will send out the link to the County website where the Lens is explained.

Public Comment – None

Action Taken – The CAC unanimously approved the policy without change but with the understanding that the language about rural context being added to the opening issue summary would pertain to this policy as well.

C. Utilities

This policy should have been among those already reviewed and approved by the CAC, but it was inadvertently left out. This policy pertains to utilities in the public right-of-way and complements a similar one approved under Public Facilities. There was some discussion around where the utilities are placed and the requirements of the utility service providers. There were several ideas for amending the policy but upon further discussion none of the changes proved acceptable.

Public Comment – There was no public comment.

Action Taken – The CAC approved the Utilities policy with no changes.

III. Miscellaneous Policies

Rich Faith introduced this agenda item by stating that there were a number of miscellaneous Comprehensive Plan policies that neither a subcommittee or the full CAC have reviewed because they didn’t fit under any of the topics assigned to the various subcommittees. They were being presented now so the CAC could have a chance to

weigh-in on them. He explained the three different tiers of policies pertaining to Rural Economy, Housing Choice, and Equity. Matt added that most of the changes to the policy language are because the old language is really urban centered. They have been revised to make them applicable to the rural areas of the county.

A member commented on the Housing Choice, strategy C2, "Legislative amendments to the Uniform Building Code". The uniform building code doesn't exist anymore as it is now the Oregon Specialty Codes based on the International Building Codes.

Another CAC member asked if there were any policies or strategies regarding signage – how tall, the lighting of them, etc. Kevin Cook responded that the sign code is very comprehensive and that many of those regulations already exist. The Dark Skies ordinance that has been drafted and will be considered for adoption will address some of these types of concerns as well.

A CAC member from the West Hills referred to the written comments that were provided to everyone at the start of tonight's meeting. Regarding Policy 1 under Rural Economy on page 18 of the packet, they wondered why there was a policy to open up the other policies. Matt and Rich agreed that it wasn't necessary, so it can be deleted.

Page 19, Policy 7 under Rural Economy: Does the County actually "stimulate" economic activities? The West Hills members are OK with leaving in "encourage" but would like to delete the word "stimulate". There was lots of discussion about this suggestion. How "stimulate" means that the County will be purposeful in economic development – will take steps to "stimulate" the economy. The West Hills members are requesting that Policy 7 be rewritten as follows:

"Encourage agricultural and timber processing industries which will improve the economic viability of farm and forest production within the County. The location of these processing facilities must be carefully balanced with the production of agriculture and timber production outside urban growth boundaries."

There was much debate about this particular policy and the word choices that were made -- particularly to stimulate or not to stimulate the economy. Some were in favor of leaving the word in, while others were not. Ultimately, the committee agreed to accept the language to Policy 7 requested by the West Hills representatives.

Another member had questions about signs and wanted to know if there should be a policy to address his concerns. There was some discussion around that. Staff assured the CAC that the Dark Skies Policy would include address many of those concerns.

Other major discussion points on the Rural Economy policies were as follows:

- Policy 4 under Rural Economy should be moved up as the first policy.
- Policy 2 as written is confusing and seems to be saying two different things. Several members felt the need to rewrite it and to break it into two policies. After lengthy discussion Matt said he would rework it and bring it back for the committee's review at the next meeting.
- Policy 5(2) should be moved up as the first listed item under this policy.
- There were additional concerns with Policy 7 even as modified because it appears to be eliminating natural resources. Some did not support this policy as they felt it was promoting timber cutting on small lots in rural areas that are not

intended for timber harvesting. The member wanted to be clear that they were interested in a healthy balance of natural resources and that logging isn't done everywhere.

- Staff reminded the CAC members that these policies are a part of a bigger picture plan and that when looked at like that, it makes more sense.

Discussion moved on to the Housing Choices policies, with the following major points.

- Policy H should be revised to say: "Accommodate innovative housing opportunities which decrease development costs to improve housing affordability." Others agreed with this change.
- The title of these policies seems to be a misnomer. Rather than call these Housing Choice Policies, simply call them Housing Policies.
- Other concerns were raised about policy H needing to say something about increasing energy efficiency or reducing carbon emissions. Everyone agreed that adding "increase energy efficiency or reduce carbon emissions" was a good idea. It was then decided that a new policy should be written to address this. Eryn proposed that the CAC let staff work on that and bring it back next meeting for review and approval.

A CAC member brought attention to the Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel Rural Area Plan Policies and shared concern regarding duplication. Staff clarified that the policies are written for different locations in the TSP and the Comprehensive Plan.

Before the vote was taken on the Miscellaneous Policies, a CAC member asked about the two things that were going to be brought back for review and whether the vote pertained to those. Staff responded that the vote did not pertain to those items -- Policy 2 under Rural Economy and Policy H under Housing will be rewritten in the way the CAC has suggested and will be brought back for their review.

Public Comment – A community member proposed that for Rural Economy Policy 2 if staff were to take the language "for a skilled labor force and family wage jobs" and inserted that after "employment opportunities" it would clarify this policy better. After more discussion about how the policy could be rewritten everyone finally agreed to the following language:

"Encourage the creation and retention of employment opportunities and economic development projects that require a skilled labor force and generate family wage jobs, and that meet the needs of business, industry, and the community."

A comment was made about Policy 7 and use of the word "stimulate" which suggests an investment of money. The County shouldn't be investing money where it actually has nothing to do with. Another point was that energy efficiency is good for low income housing as it lowers the cost associated with that.

Action Taken – The CAC unanimously approved the miscellaneous policies on the subjects of Rural Economy, Housing and Equity with the agreed upon changes as noted above, particularly substituting the language in Rural Economy Policy 7 proposed by the West Hills representatives (removing the word "stimulate"). Rural Economy Policy 2 no longer needs to come back since revisions to that policy have already been agreed to. Revisions to the Housing policies as discussed will be brought back next meeting for final review.

IV. Comprehensive Plan Goals

Given the limited time remaining, it was decided to skip this agenda item and to bring it back at the next CAC meeting.

V. Community Values for Comprehensive Plan

It was decided to also skip this agenda item.

VI. Parking Lot Items

Rich introduced this agenda by referring to the table of Parking Lot Items in the meeting packet. With respect to item #3, he informed the committee that the Urban/Rural Reserves appeal is still pending. According to the County Attorney, Multnomah County, Metro and Clackamas County are still in the process of determining the proper response to the Court of Appeals.

Parking lot items #14 and #22 are very similar. Matt explained that the Comprehensive Plan narrative will talk about rural values. That was going to be one of tonight's agenda items but we weren't able to get to it. There will be more discussion about that at the next meeting. For #22 Matt mentioned that a glossary of terms would be included in the Comp Plan and the staff is working on that. Currently, there are 60-80 definitions. A CAC member suggested adding a list of acronyms and Matt agreed that would be a good to have as well.

Kevin Cook spoke about item #23 and #28 and referred to his memorandum on page 35 in the packet. One of the CAC members had a problem with how item 23 is written since he is the person who raised this issue. It does not accurately describe the concern that he raised. The issue isn't whether the review uses and conditional uses listed in the MUA-20 and RR zones align with state rules and statutes; the question is whether the uses listed in the zoning code as community service uses should be allowed in these zones because they go well beyond serving the needs of the rural area. Some of the listed uses, such as cemeteries, race tracks, and landfills, are regional uses and don't just serve the surrounding rural area. We should evaluate the list of conditional uses to determine whether they are appropriate for these rural zones.

Kevin then suggested that staff bring back a proposed strategy statement to the CAC at its next meeting that makes these points stronger. The strategy would direct amendments to the Zoning Code to accomplish what has been expressed here. He pointed out that the attorney would have a look at the strategy before the next meeting.

With respect to parking lot item #28, a West Hills representative referred to their written comments that were submitted on this topic. They are not satisfied with how the Climate Action Plan is being handled within the Comprehensive Plan. They still believe there should be a policy that speaks to the overall goals and objectives of that plan in land use decisions. The West Hills folks have suggested some language that modifies a policy from the Sauvie Island TSP that they believe is a good approach at addressing this. Staff agreed to take a look at the language that was submitted and to use that as place to start in drafting something to bring back for further discussion next time.

VII. Public Comment

A CAC member announced that the City of Portland is revisiting its tree protection code and is having a public hearing and that if anyone wanted to get involved, they can go online or email him. A member of the public requested that the list of conditional uses and community services be provided to the CAC. Rich confirmed that would be sent out via email or staff can provide a link to the webpage of the Zoning Code that shows the list of community service uses and other allowed conditional uses in the MUA-20 and RR zones.

VIII. Meeting Wrap Up and Adjournment

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, January 27th.
The meeting adjourned at 8:39 p.m.