
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 #13**

**January 27, 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. Comprehensive Plan Goals (45 minutes) – Matt Hastie
Review and approve draft goals to include in the Comprehensive Plan.
- III. Community Values for Comprehensive Plan (45 minutes) – Rich Faith
Review and approve values pertaining to land use planning for inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan.
- IV. Revised Stormwater Drainage Policy (15 minutes) – Kevin Cook
Review and approve revised stormwater drainage policy.
- V. Transportation Health Policies (10 minutes) – Jessica Berry
Review and approve revised health policies as discussed at last CAC meeting.
- VI. Housing Policies (10 minutes) – Matt Hastie
Review and approve revised housing policies as discussed at last CAC meeting.
- VII. Parking Lot Items (15 minutes) – Kevin Cook
Review and approve policy language for parking lot items 23 and 28 as discussed at last CAC meeting.
- VIII. Public Comment (5 minutes) – Eryn Kehe
- IX. Wrap up and Adjourn

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.

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 Rural Area Plan)*

1. Implement a transportation system that is safe and efficient in meeting the needs of area residents and those traveling through the area.
 2. Implement a balanced transportation system that supports all modes of travel.
 3. Develop a transportation system that supports the rural character of unincorporated Multnomah County.
 4. Develop a transportation system the supports a healthy economy.
 5. Provide transportation improvements in a timely manner according to funding capability.
- (Modified goals from the SIMC Transportation System Plan)*

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.

Memorandum

Comprehensive Plan Update

January 20, 2016

To: Community Advisory Committee
From: Kevin Cook, Multnomah County Planner
Re: Proposed Revision to Approved Stormwater Policy

OVERVIEW

Staff recently reviewed the stormwater policy that was previously approved by the CAC and found that it conflicts with current adopted code. In short, adopted code is more stringent with respect to how stormwater needs to be handled on private property than how it needs to be handled when draining off public roads.

Existing code requires stormwater run-off resulting from new development on private property be handled entirely on-site with off-site run-off not to exceed pre-development levels¹. Stormwater generated from public roads, on the other hand, can discharge to waterways but only under the strict rules outlined in the County's NPDES permit issued by DEQ. These rules are not tied to "pre-development levels".

In order to reconcile the approved policy with existing codes and rules, staff proposes a revised version, which we believe is actually stronger than the original and does not conflict with current rules.

Because rules for stormwater from private development differ from rules for stormwater from public transportation facilities, staff is removing references to the transportation facilities in this policy. The CAC has previously approved a TSP policy (shown at the end of this memo) regarding stormwater resulting from transportation facilities, negating the need to weave transportation facilities into this policy.

Summary of staff's proposed changes:

- Deleting reference to transportation improvements in the first paragraph.
- The existing reference to natural systems vs. engineered systems is confusing since any storm water system is engineered including 'natural' swales. We changed the wording to clarify the intent is to favor the natural hydrology.
- Deleting the first strategy since there is no option for discharging to a public system and because stormwater is required to be managed on-site.

¹ Stormwater run-off cannot exceed pre-development run-off as measured at the property line. Stormwater detention systems are required to, at minimum, accommodate stormwater resulting from a 10-year / 24-hour storm event (a once in a decade storm event).

- Deleting the second strategy to eliminate the off-site option and folding the requirement to manage stormwater on-site into new strategy 'b'.
- In strategy 'b' Deleting 'should' in favor of 'shall' and deleting 'wherever feasible' to strengthen the strategy in order to maintain the integrity of existing rules.
- Deleting 'where feasible' in strategy 'c' to make it mandatory.
- Reworded strategy 'd' to the employ the vernacular of those who live and breathe stormwater for a living.

CURRENT DRAFT POLICY (APPROVED BY THE CAC ON 12/02/2015)

STORM WATER DRAINAGE POLICY

Stormwater drainage for new development and redevelopment, including transportation improvements, shall emphasize water quality and use of natural systems over engineered systems to reduce and filter stormwater runoff in accordance with the following:

- a. If stormwater will be discharged to a public system, there shall have be adequate capacity in the storm water system to handle the run-off from the development; or
- b. The stormwater runoff shall be handled on the site or adequate off-site provisions shall be made to accommodate the run-off; and
- c. The runoff from the site shall not adversely affect the water quality in adjacent streams, ponds, or lakes, or alter the drainage on adjoining lands, or cause damage to adjacent property or wildlife habitat.
- d. Stormwater infiltration and discharge standards should be designed to protect watershed health by requiring onsite infiltration wherever feasible in order to mimic pre-development hydraulic conditions so that post-development runoff rates and volumes do not exceed pre-development conditions.
- e. Apply Low Impact Development Approaches (LIDA) where feasible in order to conserve existing resources, minimize disturbance, minimize soil compaction, minimize imperviousness, and direct runoff from impervious areas onto pervious areas.
- f. Protect and maintain natural stream channels wherever possible, with an emphasis on non-structural controls when modifications are necessary.
- g. Develop and adopt drainage system design guidelines and standards to accommodate fish and wildlife passage where appropriate.

STORMWATER DRAINAGE POLICY (*Changed text is shown as strikeouts and underlines.*)

Stormwater drainage for new development and redevelopment, ~~including transportation improvements,~~ shall ~~emphasize~~ prioritize water quality and ~~use of natural systems over engineered systems~~ stream hydrology in order to reduce and filter manage stormwater runoff in accordance with the following:

a. ~~—— If stormwater will be discharged to a public system, there shall have be adequate capacity in the storm water system to handle the run-off from the development; or~~

b. ~~—— The stormwater run-off shall be handled on the site or adequate off site provisions shall be made to accommodate the run-off; and~~

ca. The runoff from the site shall not adversely affect the water quality in adjacent streams, ponds, or lakes, or alter the drainage on adjoining lands, or cause damage to adjacent property or wildlife habitat.

db. Stormwater infiltration and discharge standards ~~should~~ shall be designed to protect watershed health by requiring onsite infiltration ~~wherever feasible~~ in order to mimic pre-development hydraulic conditions so that post-development runoff rates and volumes do not exceed pre-development conditions.

ec. Apply Low Impact Development Approaches (LIDA) ~~where feasible~~ in order to conserve existing resources, minimize disturbance, minimize soil compaction, minimize imperviousness, and direct runoff from impervious areas onto pervious areas.

fd. Protect and maintain natural stream ~~channels wherever possible,~~ hydrology (or flow), with an emphasis on ~~non-structural controls when modifications are necessary~~ reducing hydromodification impacts such as stream incision and widening.

ge. Develop and adopt drainage system design guidelines and standards to accommodate fish and wildlife passage where appropriate.

STORM WATER DRAINAGE POLICY

Avoid and minimize impacts to the natural environment, fish, and wildlife habitat when applying roadway design standards.

Strategies:

- a. Implement standards and best practices for all transportation projects with regard to water quality treatment - the reduction, detention and infiltration of stormwater runoff from existing and new impervious surfaces - to improve water quality as well as fish and wildlife habitats, consistent with requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System - Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Phase I Permit and the Water Pollution Control Facility - Underground Injection Control Permit, issued by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality under the Federal Clean Water Act and Safe Drinking Water Act.
- b. Implement standards and best practices for all transportation projects with regard to protection of existing, and restoration of riparian buffers where waters of the state border current and future rights of way.
- c. Implement a program for the assessment and prioritization of fish passage barriers at stream crossings following the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) Fish Passage Rules.
- d. Secure funding for the restoration of existing fish passage barriers at stream crossings to meet ODFW Fish Passage Rules.
- e. Identify and protect critical fish and wildlife migration corridors to prevent the further fragmentation of existing habitats by future project alignments.

Memorandum

Comprehensive Plan Update

January 20, 2016

To: Community Advisory Committee
From: Jessica Berry, Transportation Planner
Re: Health Policy Changes from January 6, 2016 CAC meeting

I. OVERVIEW

This memo presents changes to the Health Policy that the Community Advisory Committee recommended at the January 6, 2016 meeting.

Text changes are **highlighted** with former text being deleted as ~~strikeouts~~ and new text being added as underlined.

A. HEALTH

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.”¹ 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 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,

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

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.

While these policies are important in achieving County and community goals for health and equity, they must be balanced with a variety of other policies in the TSP and with the rural character and conditions in the non-urban portions of the County.

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, low-income 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 and other peak use generators.
 9. Coordinating with other agencies such as ODOT when appropriate.

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 and employment centers.

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 appropriate connections to surrounding lots and streets.

D. Reducing exposure to air, light, and noise 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 and light pollutants.
 5. Implementing anti-idling campaigns around schools, road construction zones, and other places where drivers tend to idle.
 6. Using paving materials that are designed to minimize the production of road noise.

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 E. 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.

***Revisions and additions to housing policies as discussed at the January 6, 2016
CAC Meeting***

BACKGROUND: *This paper presents changes to the Housing Policies that the Community Advisory Committee recommended at the January 6, 2016 meeting.*

Explanation of Different Types of Text in this Document

Standard text – means previously approved text from the January 6, 2016 CAC Meeting

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

Underlined – means new text that is being added.

HOUSING CHOICE POLICIES *(from Comprehensive Plan Policy 21)*

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. Maintain a non-exclusionary housing policy.
- E. Reevaluate regulations and, where possible, streamline or eliminate requirements to reduce development costs.
- F. Support efforts to conserve existing housing stock, particularly housing that is affordable to community members with low and moderate incomes.
- G. Accommodate innovative housing ~~construction techniques~~ development opportunities, which decrease development costs to improve housing affordability.
- H. Cooperate with the private sector to expand the supply of housing that is affordable to low and moderate income residents.
- I. Encourage innovative housing construction techniques, which increase energy efficiency and reduce carbon emissions.
- J. Allow for mobile homes on individual lots where single-family dwellings are allowed, consistent with state law, and provide site development standards for such dwellings.

[Note. Housing policy J was not among those reviewed and discussed at the January 6 CAC meeting. It was inadvertently left off.]

STRATEGIES

- A. Work with the regional government to determine expected housing demand in the unincorporated County based upon demographic and housing trends, transportation improvements and economic development in the region.
- B. 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~~ Oregon Specialty Codes
 - 3. An expeditious design review, building permit and land division process

Memorandum

Comprehensive Plan Update

January 20, 2016

To: Community Advisory Committee
From: Kevin Cook, Multnomah County Planner
Re: Follow-up on 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:

BACKGROUND:

At the January 6, 2016 meeting, staff and the CAC discussed concerns around the list of conditional uses, community services uses, and review uses in the RR and MUA-20 zones (see Attachment 1).

While the code consolidation and reorganization project includes potentially deleting uses that no longer comport with State Law, the scope of the project does not include a review of the appropriateness of the uses. Staff indicated that such an effort would need to be a distinct planning effort including public outreach and participation. CAC members indicated they would like policy to clearly indicate that a review of listed uses will eventually occur, likely as a modification or addition to previously approved policies regarding RR and MUA-20 uses. Following is staff's proposed addition to a previously approved policy that will apply to both the RR zone MUA-20 zone:

PROPOSED POLICY TEXT (NEW TEXT IS DOUBLE UNDERLINED):

Policy (Already approved for Rural Residential zoned lands.)

New non-agricultural businesses should be limited in scale and type to serve the needs of the local rural area.

Strategy

Review the appropriateness of review uses, conditional uses and community service uses in the RR zone through a public process that involves community stakeholders prior to amending the Zoning Code.

Policy (Already approved for Multiple Use Agricultural zoned lands.)

New non-agricultural businesses should be limited in scale and type to serve the needs of the local rural area.

Strategy

Review the appropriateness of review uses, conditional uses and community service uses in the MUA- 20 zone through a public process that involves community stakeholders prior to amending the Zoning Code.

28. CONDITIONAL USE APPROVALS AND THE CLIMATE ACTION PLAN:

Item 28 was a specific request raised in an email from the West Hills contingent on November 9, 2015 relating to existing public facilities policies being reviewed by the Transportation and Public Facilities subcommittee:

“New general policy (not just for public facilities): Conditional use evaluations shall include conformance with the goals of the County’s Climate Action Plan.”

While staff is committed to including policies in the Comp Plan that support relevant action items in the Climate Action Plan, we do have some concerns with policies that could be rendered “void for vagueness.”

A community member has suggested a modified version of a recently adopted Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel TSP policy. The CAC ran out of time at the end of the last meeting to discuss the proposal but agreed that the suggested language should be a starting place for consideration when the discussion resumes.

For the purposes of resuming the discussion staff has provided both the original TSP policy text as well as the proposed version:

Strategy IX of Goal 3 Objective B – 2015 SIMC TSP (see Attachment 2 for Objective B in its entirety):

Consider climate change and the Climate Action Plan when planning transportation investments and service delivery strategies.

Modified Strategy (as proposed by community member):

Consider climate change and the Climate Action Plan when ~~planning transportation investments~~ applying comprehensive plan policies and strategies, developing code and service delivery strategies.

Staff sees the above proposal as problematic; specifically, the words ‘when applying comprehensive plan policies and strategies’ – this is because we are still running into the vagueness issue.

Staff supports the following language as a new strategy:

Consider applicable goals of the Climate Action Plan when developing Zoning Code amendments.

Attachments:

1. List of Review, Conditional, and Community Service uses in the RR and MUA-20 zones.
2. Objective B, Goal 3 of the 2015 SIMC TSP – (from pages 38-39).

Attachment 1:

List of Review, Conditional, and Community Service uses in the Rural Residential (RR) and Multiple Use Agriculture – 20 (MUA-20) zones.

I. Review Uses in RR:

MCC 33.2225

REVIEW USES

The following uses may be permitted when found by the approval authority to satisfy the applicable standards of this Chapter:

(A) Replacement or restoration of an existing lawfully established habitable dwelling more than 100 feet from the existing dwelling.

(1) In the case of a replacement dwelling, the existing dwelling is removed, demolished or converted to an allowable nonresidential use within three months of the completion or occupancy of the replacement dwelling.

(2) Restoration or replacement due to fire, other casualty or natural disaster shall commence within one year from the occurrence of the fire, casualty or natural disaster.

(B) The following dwellings:

(1) A Large Acreage Dwelling pursuant to all applicable approval criteria, including but not limited to MCC 33.2235;

(2) A Template Dwelling pursuant to all applicable approval criteria, including but not limited to MCC 33.2240(A);

(3) A Heritage Tract Dwelling pursuant to all applicable approval criteria, including but not limited to MCC 33.2240(B).

(C) A temporary dwelling for health hardship pursuant to all applicable approval criteria, including but not limited to MCC 33.0515 and 33.2256.

(D) An asphalt and concrete batch plant accessory to a specific highway project pursuant to MCC 33.2245.

(E) A mobile home during the construction or reconstruction of a residence allowed under MCC 33.2220 (D) or 33.2225 (A) or (B), provided that the mobile home is removed, demolished or converted to an allowable nonresidential use within three months of the completion of the dwelling pursuant to all applicable approval criteria, including but not limited to MCC 33.2245, 33.2256 and 33.2261.

(F) Off-street parking and loading as required by MCC 33.4100 through 33.4220.

(G) Lot Line Adjustment pursuant to all applicable approval criteria, including but not limited to the provisions of MCC 33.2270.

(H) Placement of Structures necessary for continued public safety, or the protection of essential public services or protection of private or public existing structures, utility facilities, roadways, driveways, accessory uses and exterior improvements damaged during an emergency/disaster event. This includes replacement of temporary structures erected during such events with permanent structures performing an identical or related function.

Land use proposals for such structures shall be submitted within 12 months following an emergency/disaster event. Applicants are responsible for all other applicable local, state and federal permitting requirements.

(I) Wireless communications facilities that employ concealment technology or co-location as described in MCC 33.6177(B) pursuant to the applicable approval criteria of MCC 33.6175 through 33.6188.

(J) Lots of Exception pursuant to all applicable approval criteria, including but not limited to MCC 33.2265, 33.2273 and 33.7700 et seq.

(K) Consolidation of Parcels and Lots pursuant to MCC 33.7794.

(L) Structures or uses customarily accessory or incidental to any use permitted or approved in this district, which do not meet the “accessory structures” standard in MCC 33.2220 Allowed Uses.

(M) A Type B home occupation when approved pursuant to MCC 33.0550.

II. Review Uses in MUA-20:

MCC 33.2825

REVIEW USES

(A) Residential use, consisting of a single family dwelling constructed off-site, including a mobile or modular home placed on a Lot of Record, subject to the following conditions:

(1) Construction shall comply with the standards of the Building Code or as prescribed in ORS 446.002 through 446.200, relating to mobile homes.

(2) The dwelling shall be attached to a foundation for which a building permit has been obtained.

(3) The dwelling shall have a minimum floor area of 600 square feet.

(B) Temporary uses when approved pursuant to MCC 33.0510 and 33.0515.

(C) Wholesale or retail sales of farm or forest products raised or grown on the premises or in the immediate vicinity, subject to the following condition:

The location and design of any building, stand or sign in conjunction with wholesale or retail sales shall be subject to approval of the Planning Director on a finding that the location and design are compatible with the character of the area; provided that the decision of the Planning Director may be appealed to the approval authority, pursuant to MCC 33.0785 and 33.0790.

(D) Off-street parking and loading.

(E) Property Line Adjustment pursuant to the provisions of MCC 33.2860.

(F) Placement of structures necessary for continued public safety, or the protection of essential public services or protection of private or public existing structures, utility facilities, roadways, driveways, accessory uses and exterior improvements damaged during an emergency/disaster event. This includes replacement of temporary structures erected during such events with permanent structures performing an identical or related function. Land use proposals for such structures shall be submitted within 12 months following an emergency/disaster event. Applicants are responsible for all other applicable local, state and federal permitting requirements.

- (G) Lots of Exception pursuant to the provisions of MCC 33.2860.
- (H) Wireless communication facilities that employ concealment technology or co-location as described in MCC 33.6177(B) pursuant to the applicable approval criteria of MCC 33.6175 through 33.6188.
- (I) Consolidation of Parcels and Lots pursuant to MCC 33.7794 and Replatting of Partition and Subdivision Plats pursuant to MCC 33.7797.
- (J) Structures or uses customarily accessory or incidental to any use permitted or approved in this district, which do not meet the “accessory structures” standard in MCC 33.2820 Allowed Uses.
- (K) A Type B home occupation when approved by MCC 33.0550.

III. Conditional Uses in RR:

MCC 33.3130

CONDITIONAL USES

The following uses may be permitted when found by the Hearings Officer to satisfy the applicable Ordinance standards:

- (A) Community Service Uses under the provisions of MCC 33.6000 through 33.6230;
- (B) The following Conditional Uses under the provisions of MCC 33.6300 through 33.6660:
 - (1) Operations conducted for the mining and processing of geothermal resources as defined by ORS 522.005 or exploration, mining and processing of aggregate and other mineral or subsurface resources;
 - (2) Commercial processing of agricultural products, primarily raised or grown in the region;
 - (3) Raising of any type of fowl, or processing the by-products thereof, for sale at wholesale or retail;
 - (4) Feed lots;
 - (5) Raising of four or more swine more than four months of age;
 - (6) Raising of fur-bearing animals for sale at wholesale or retail;
 - (7) Commercial dog kennels;
 - (8) Planned Development for single family residences as provided in MCC 33.4300 through 33.4360 and the applicable current “planned unit development” standards within the Oregon Administrative Rules Chapter 660, Division 004;
 - (9) Cottage industries, under the provisions of MCC 33.6300 through 33.6350.
 - (10) Limited rural service commercial uses, such as local stores, shops, offices, repair services and similar uses.
- (C) Type C home occupation as provided for in MCC 33.6655 through 33.6665.
- (D) Large Fills as provided for in MCC 33.6700 through 33.6720.

IV. Conditional Uses in MUA-20:

MCC 33.2830

CONDITIONAL USES

The following uses may be permitted when found by the approval authority to satisfy the applicable ordinance standards:

(A) Community Service Uses pursuant to the provisions of MCC 33.6000 through 33.6230;

(B) The following Conditional Uses pursuant to the provisions of MCC 33.6300 through 33.6660:

(1) Operations conducted for the mining and processing of geothermal resources as defined by ORS 522.005; or exploration, mining and processing of aggregate and other mineral or subsurface resources;

(2) Commercial processing of agricultural products primarily raised or grown in the region;

(3) Raising any type of fowl or processing the by-products thereof for sale at wholesale or retail;

(4) Feed lots;

(5) Raising of four or more swine over four months of age;

(6) Raising of fur bearing animals for sale at wholesale or retail;

(7) Commercial dog kennels; and

(8) Commercial processing of forest products primarily grown in the region.

(C) The following Conditional Uses may be permitted on lands not predominantly of Agricultural Capability Class I, II, or III soils:

(1) Planned Development for single family residences, as provided in MCC 33.4300 through 33.4360 and the applicable current "planned unit development" standards within the Oregon Administrative Rules Chapter 660, Division 004;

(2) Pursuant to the provisions of MCC 33.6300 through 33.6350:

(a) Cottage industries,

(b) Limited rural service commercial uses such as local stores, shops, offices, repair services and similar uses, and

(c) Tourist commercial uses such as restaurants, gas stations, motels, guest ranches and similar uses.

(D) Type C home occupation as provided for in MCC 33.6655 through 33.6665.

(E) Large Fills as provided for in MCC 33.6700 through 33.6720.

V. Community Service Uses in both RR and MUA-20:

MCC 33.6015

USES

(A) Except as otherwise limited in the EFU, CFU-1, CFU-2, and CFU-5 districts, the following Community Service Uses and those of a similar nature, may be permitted in any district when approved at a public hearing by the approval authority.

Allowed Community Service Uses in the EFU, CFU-1, CFU-2, and CFU-5 districts are limited to those uses listed in each respective district.

- (1) Boat moorage, marina or boathouse moorage.
- (2) Camp or campground.
- (3) Cemetery, crematory, mausoleum, mortuary or funeral home.
- (4) Church.
- (5) Group care facility.
- (6) Government building or use.
- (7) Hospital, sanitarium, rest or retirement home.
- (8) Kindergarten or day nursery.
- (9) Library.
- (10) Park, playground, sports area, golf course or recreational use of a similar nature.
- (11) Philanthropic or eleemosynary institution.
- (12) Power substation or other public utility building or use.
- (13) Private club, fraternal organization, lodge.
- (14) Racetrack.
- (15) Radio and television transmission towers.
 - (a) VHF and UHF television towers, FM radio towers, two-way radio, common carrier personal wireless communications towers for cellular, personal communications service (PCS), specialized mobile radio (SMR) transmitters, and fixed point microwave towers are permitted in any district.
 - (b) Low-power television towers, satellite ground stations, AM radio towers, and building-mounted towers are permitted in any district except urban residential districts, provided only self-supporting structures are permitted in the Exclusive Farm Use district.
 - (c) Ham radio, amateur sole source emitters, Citizen Band transmitters, and structures to support them are permitted in any district as an accessory use and do not require a Community Service use designation if used for non-commercial purposes only. Any such tower shall comply with the regulations of the district in which it is located. Non-amateur sole source emitters shall also comply with the registration requirements of MCC 33.6125 (B).
 - (d) Receive-only facilities in conjunction with a permitted use are exempt from the provisions of this section, but shall comply with all other requirements of MCC 33.6015 (A) (15), 33.6100 through 33.6125, and 33.6135.
- (16) Refuse dump or sanitary landfill.
- (17) Resort, dude ranch, hunting or fishing lodge.
- (18) Recycling collection center.
- (19) Riding academy or the boarding of horses for profit.
- (20) School, private, parochial or public; educational institution.
- (21) Transit station.
- (22) Waste collection, transfer, processing, or recovery facility.

- (23) Museum.
- (24) Ambulance Service Substation.
- (25) Regional Sanitary Landfills.
- (26) Mining and processing of geothermal resources.
- (27) Wireless communications facilities
- (28) Limited alternative uses of surplus public school space pursuant to the provisions in MCC 33.6050.
- (29) Accessory uses to the above.
 - (B) Approval of a Community Service Use shall be deemed to authorize associated public utilities, including energy and communication facilities.

Attachment 2:

Objective B, Goal 3 of the 2015 SIMC TSP – (from TSP pages 38-39)

Goal 3: Develop a transportation system that supports the rural character of West Multnomah County...

Objective B: Provide a transportation system that minimizes impacts to wildlife and agricultural resources.

Policy: Apply roadway design safety standards appropriately by balancing the needs of the travelling public and minimizing negative impacts to the environment.

Implementation strategies:

- I.** Develop and implement a design exception process that considers the relative and incremental benefits of implementation, costs and impacts to the environment.
- II.** Assess implications of fish passage requirements on county facilities and develop a program for retrofitting drainage facilities.
- III.** Adopt and apply drainage system design guidelines and standards to accommodate fish passage.
- IV.** Adopt and apply rural roadway shoulder standards that preserve the rural character of the area.
- V.** Adopt and apply rural roadway standards that maintain and improve safe wildlife movement and ensure wildlife connectivity in the SIMC planning area.
- VI.** Assess Natural Resource strategies and explore design elements to minimize impacts to fish and wildlife habitat.
 - 1.** Where possible, avoid harm to wildlife, including wildlife movement, from new, existing, or improved transportation facilities, and where not possible, minimize harm to wildlife. Mitigate any unavoidable harm to wildlife.
 - 2.** Potential mitigation measures include, but are not limited to: wildlife crossings; improved culverts with shelves or dry paths built into the sides; mechanisms to funnel wildlife into the culverts; signage; habitat modification; asking drivers to turn on running lights; public awareness programs; and other wildlife mitigation measures that have been demonstrated to be effective.
- VII.** Explore incorporation of wildlife criteria for the Capital Improvement Plan and Program (CIPP).
- VIII.** Work with agencies to address impacts of boat traffic on the environment (e.g. shoreline).
- IX.** Consider climate change and the Climate Action Plan when planning transportation investments and service delivery strategies.