

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
ROOM 126 MULTNOMAH BUILDING  
501 SE HAWTHORNE BLVD. PORTLAND, OR  
FEBRUARY 24, 2016 6:00 PM

## **MEETING SUMMARY**

### **I. Welcome & Announcements**

In attendance:

#### CAC

Aaron Blake  
Andrew Holtz  
Catherine Dishion  
Stephanie Nystrom  
George Sowder  
Jerry Grossnickle  
Karen Nashiwa  
Kathy Taggart  
Linden Burk  
Marcy Cottrell Houle  
Martha Berndt  
Paula Sauvageau  
Tim Larson  
Will Rasmussen  
John Ingle

#### Project Team

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

Absent: Sara Grigsby, Chris Foster

Others in attendance: Michael Cerbone, Carol Chesarek, Brendon Haggerty, Stephanie Millar

Eryn Kehe and Rich Faith announced that staff has been working to solidify the community meeting dates and let the CAC know that they are tentatively looking at April 5<sup>th</sup> and April 7<sup>th</sup>. Eryn explained that there would be two different meetings held, one in the west portion of Multnomah County and second meeting in the east portion of the County. Rich also mentioned that depending on where the CAC ends tonight in regards to the Comp Plan and TSP review and the approvals of the drafts, staff is prepared to schedule another meeting to complete that task. There will be more discussion about this at the end of tonight's meeting.

### **II. Public Comment**

There was none.

### **III. Policy Revision Based on Technical Review Comments**

Rich reported that we received technical review comments regarding the draft Comprehensive Plan and Transportation Plan from six different agencies. The proposed revision to Policy 9.7 comes from a request by the Port of Portland. This policy originated from the Transportation subcommittee because it talks about river transportation and the importance of that to the local and regional economy; transportation was the original focus of this policy, but it has since been placed in Chapter 9 on Rural Economy. The main change that the Port of Portland requested is that the policy be broadened so that it is not just talking about river transportation but also the importance of the rail and road systems to our economy in terms of moving freight for the good of commerce. The Port of Portland also asked that we expand the policy by pointing out what the river navigation system consists of – the things that go into that to be spelled out.

Many of the CAC members felt as though the revised policy language elevated the importance of sediment control and river dredging that could be detrimental. Depositing dredgings in the stretch of river adjacent to Sauvie Island has been a sensitive issue that residents there have had to battle in the past. The policy doesn't need to call out sediment removal, grading and placement as maintenance items of the river navigation system.

**Action Taken** – The CAC unanimously approved the revised policy 9.7 with this change: Replace the words “moving, placing and grading river sediment” at the end of the policy with “maintaining channel depth”.

### **IV. Draft Multnomah County Comprehensive Plan**

Matt Hastie gave an overview on how staff organized the Comprehensive Plan and how they wanted it to generally mirror the statewide planning goals with a few exceptions where they consolidated goals (for example Chapter 5 addresses Goals 5 and 6). Staff drew on a lot of other documents and pieces of information, such as the existing County Framework Plan and the Rural Area Plans, the policy papers that staff drafted over the course of these CAC meetings and that supported the policy recommendations that everyone made, the Climate Action Plan, Hazard Mitigation Plan as well as communications with technical advisors both within and outside the county to make sure that what was reflected in the Comprehensive Plan is in accordance with these other agencies.

Matt also noted that the Table of Contents has a placeholder for Chapter 12, the Transportation section, which will not be physically a part of the Comprehensive Plan as it will essentially be the Transportation System Plan as a separate document. Matt's final note was that the citizen involvement goals and policies in Chapter 1 are county wide and that some of the maps still need to be updated. It was also noted that one hard copy of the Comprehensive Plan was provided for each side of the room for reference.

Staff addressed the CAC in regards to “wordsmithing” and that they would take into account all those proposed word changes in the narrative (however, not the policies as the policies have already been approved by the entire CAC and cannot be revisited unless unanimously agreed to). Staff also let the CAC know that they would take into

account extensive comments that came in today from the West Hills contingent and any other editorial notes/suggestions being submitted via email. When asked more specifically about how the West Hills comments will be addressed, Rich said that staff will provide written responses to each of their comments with an explanation for why they agree or not with what was requested. Eryn also mentioned that if there is a member of the CAC that is unhappy with a policy, this would be the time and place to mention it as these policies would not be open for review or revisited unless the entire CAC agreed to do that.

The following are the major topics that were discussed for each chapter.

**Definitions:** A CAC member pointed out that the term “important natural landscape features” comes from the reserves rule, so the definition of that term in the definitions section should say that the term is used in reference to rural reserves.

Another member had questions about the definition of “context sensitive design” and didn’t think it quite captured the essence of what the term involves. The definition should speak to things like rural character, quality of life and wildlife habitat protection. Rich mentioned that the definition really doesn’t belong in the Comprehensive Plan because the term is only found in the Transportation System Plan. He proposed moving it to the TSP and discussing the definition when we take up the TSP on the agenda.

**Chapter 1 Introduction:** A CAC member disagreed with the last two sentences at the end of the first paragraph on page 3 which say: “The city would be stifling without the ability to venture to nearby, big open areas. And the rural pockets would not be as vibrant without the urban attractions of the city next door.” A major objection to this statement was that seemed to imply that the rural areas exist only to provide a place for urban dwellers to visit as tourists; but they are much more than that. There was a spirited discussion of this topic and after much debate the CAC agreed to revise the two sentences to read as follows:

*“The city benefits from the nearby farms and forests that provide locally grown food, as well as recreational opportunities, clean air and water, and wildlife.”*

**Chapter 2 Land Use:** No changes.

**Chapter 3 Farm Land:** No changes.

**Chapter 4 Forest Land:** A CAC member asked that the language on pages 3 and 6 pertaining to the State Forest Practices Act be checked with the Oregon Department of Forestry for verification. The concern was about the statement that zoning restrictions cannot conflict with forest practices rules unless the county adopts its own forest practices ordinance in place of the State’s. Staff replied that the information came directly from ODW but agreed that they can verify it’s accuracy with ODW officials.

A CAC member stated that policy 4.13 on page 9 that mentions disaggregation seems to be specific to the East of Sandy rural area, and suggested that it be placed there. Another member asked if there should be a disaggregation policy listed under East of Sandy to further clarify and support policy 4.13. Staff stated that policy could be shown as a policy specific to the East of Sandy area and will revisit that.

**Chapter 5 Natural Resources:** A CAC member requested that on page 10, under Scenic Views, that text be added to mention that protection of views from the west side also warrant protection for the West Hills. Staff did not believe a text change was necessary since the policy clearly advocates for that protection.

A CAC member asked to revise Strategy 5.4-1 on page 16 to include periodic reviews of wildlife habitat regulations along with streams. The committee would not agree to reconsider this strategy for revisions, so no change was made.

**Chapter 6 Historic and Cultural Resources:** Regarding comments about changes to the text on page 4 that were received from the State Historic Preservation Office, a CAC member asked whether staff thought it was a good idea to wait until the pending court cases are decided before finalizing this text. Staff responded that the county was not going to hold up the adoption of this plan simply to await the outcome of these court cases. There is currently language in the document which states that things may change based on the outcome of the cases. If the court cases come to a completion prior to the Comprehensive Plan being finalized, staff assured the CAC that they would go back and rewrite the language reflecting that.

**Chapter 7 Natural Hazards:** A CAC member asked whether there should be a policy about the hazards of radon gas. Another member said radon gas is addressed through construction methods regulated by the building code. It is already dealt with in that code.

**Chapter 8 Parks and Recreation:** A CAC member pointed out that policy 8.9 is also applicable to the West Hills area and should not be limited to Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel (SIMC). After some debate about whether to reopen this policy for discussion and possible revision, the CAC agreed to open it for reconsideration. The CAC decided that policy 8.9 can remain as is for the SIMC area because this language comes directly from the SIMC rural area plan; however, a similar policy specific to the West Hills planning area should be added. After considerable discussion and compromises on how that policy should be worded, the CAC unanimously agreed that the policy for the West Hills planning area read as follows:

*“Support only those recreational activities within the West Hills area that are complementary to, and do not cause undue negative impacts on, natural and environmental resources that are identified in Goal 5 and in the Metro Greenspaces Master Plan and lands approved in Metro’s Acquisition Refinement Plan.”*

**Chapter 9 Rural Economy:** No changes other than that to policy 9.7 already approved under agenda item III earlier in the meeting.

**Chapter 10 Housing:** No changes.

**Chapter 11 Public Facilities:** A CAC member wondered whether there should be a policy about the County coordinating with emergency responders in the case of natural disasters. Matt Hastie replied that the County’s Hazard Mitigation Plan includes information about emergency response so it is addressed in detail in that plan.

A CAC member posed a question about the comments submitted by Bill Burns of DOGAMI about not concentrating stormwater on slopes susceptible to landslides. In light

of that, should there be some exception language added to policy 11.14(2) so that stormwater infiltration is not required in landslide hazard areas? Staff and the CAC agreed that this was a policy that should be opened for reconsideration. After some discussion about possible wording to address this, the CAC directed staff to work on the specific language for the policy revision. The CAC unanimously approved modification to policy 11.14 that is consistent with the concern raised in Bill Burn's comments.

**Chapter 12:** This is the Transportation System Plan which is how it will be referenced in the Comp Plan chapter.

**Action Taken** – The CAC voted 13 green and 1 yellow to approve the Draft Comprehensive Plan and to forward it to the Planning Commission for public hearing.

## **V. Draft Multnomah County Transportation System Plan**

Susie Wright provided an overview of the Transportation System Plan (TSP) and communicated with the CAC what the focus of the updated plan was, including the additions to it and how the TSP is really a toolkit for moving forward when planning for all the modes of transportation.

A CAC member brought up the definition of “context sensitive design” he raised earlier and asked if it was possible to focus on capturing the definition more clearly as far as community values go and other elements surrounding the term from the discussions the transportation subcommittee had. Joanna Valencia agreed that we can incorporate language that better reflects the conversation about context sensitive design during the subcommittee and CAC meetings. The CAC member also mentioned that these topics were called out in an email he sent to staff earlier in the day. There was also an opinion expressed about language on page 12 about “widening roads”. Road widening inevitably leads to higher traffic speeds, which is another problem that should be considered.

Another CAC member asked why some of the roads projects in East County were considered low and medium priority (Corbett Hill Road, Lusted Road and Hurlburt Road) even though they have the highest numbers of crashes as shown in the table on page 31. Susie responded that general crash data reflects many different factors. It is not necessarily an indication of unsafe road conditions or greatest need for improvements.

The parking enforcement segment was also brought up by a CAC member who asked how this would be enforced in places such as the Columbia River Gorge especially at locations like Multnomah Falls and other popular attractions where parking along the roadway is a big safety issue. Joanna responded that there is an agency called the Oregon Solutions Team that is studying the parking problem at Multnomah Falls and along the Historic Columbia River Highway and is looking at long-term and short-term solutions to the problem. She added that ODOT has recently installed several messaging signs to assist with these issues and that there needs to be a further implementation plan to address this matter.

A CAC member would like to see the page on Advisory Bike Lane (p. BFG -2) removed from the toolkit of potential solutions. No vote was taken. Staff will consider this request and decide whether to remove it or to revise it.

A CAC member asked how projects get added to Table 9 on page 101 or how those already in the table get amended. He suggested that language be added to page 98 under Improvement Projects, and possibly at the end of Table 9, to explain how projects get reviewed and updated. Staff agreed that could be done.

Another CAC member suggested that project S19, Transportation Demand Management Study, in table 9 be broken into separate studies for East County and West County since there are big differences between the two for this type of study.

**Action Taken** – The CAC unanimously voted to approve the Draft Transportation System Plan and to forward it to the Planning Commission for public hearing.

## **VI. Wrap up and Next Steps**

Rich Faith said that even though the committee completed everything on tonight's agenda and there is really nothing further that they need to do, staff would like to have a final, celebratory meeting on either March 2 or March 16 if everyone is agreeable to that. There was unanimous support for the idea but not everyone would be able to make either date. When the two dates were voted upon, five members voted no to March 2, while only one voted no to March 16, so the final meeting will be held on March 16. Rich said he would send out official notices for that meeting once he confirms what room it will be held in.

Eryn provided more information about the scheduled Community Meetings in April and what staff was thinking with respect to the format of those meetings and how they would be presented. She asked the CAC to consider volunteering to assist staff in the various presentations about the Comprehensive Plan and Transportation System Plan. There are sign-up sheets posted on the wall and she encouraged committee members to put their name down under the topic category and meeting location (Eastside or Westside) they are interested in attending. Eryn said that the dates and locations still have to be confirmed but that staff would notify the CAC members when that occurs.

## **VII. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 8:38PM