



HOOD RIVER | PORTLAND | WASHOUGAL

GORGEFRIENDS.ORG

## EXHIBIT H1 PC-2021-14505

August 13, 2021

Adam Barber  
Multnomah County  
Department of Business and Community Services  
Land Use and Transportation Program  
1600 SE 190th Avenue  
Portland, Oregon  
*Via email to: gorge2020@multco.us*

Dear Mr. Barber,

Friends of the Columbia Gorge (“Friends”) has reviewed and submits these preliminary comments on the Proposed Amendments to Zoning Code and Rural Area Plan: Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. As the project unfolds, Friends anticipates providing further comments.

Friends is a non-profit organization with approximately 5,500 members dedicated to protecting and enhancing the resources of the Columbia River Gorge. Friends’ mission is to vigorously protect the scenic, natural, cultural, and recreational resources of the Columbia River Gorge. We fulfill this mission by ensuring strict implementation of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act and other laws protecting the region of the Columbia River Gorge; promoting responsible stewardship of Gorge land, air, and waters; encouraging public ownership of sensitive areas; educating the public about the unique natural values of the Columbia River Gorge and the importance of preserving those values; and working with groups and individuals to accomplish mutual preservation goals.

Friends notes the following issues that should be addressed:

- MCC § 38.0015
  - Definition of “Grade, finished” is different from the Management Plan’s definition of “Grade (ground level).” It omits the reference to the International Building Code. This reference should be added for clarification.
  - The definition of “Physical setting” is not correctly placed in alphabetical order.
- MCC § 38.0080
  - There are two new guidelines for signs in the Management Plan that apparently did not make it into the proposed MCC changes. The new language around

recreation signs in GMA Guidelines F and G are not included and should be added.

- MCC § 38.0110
  - The GMA language uses tribal and Indian interchangeably. To prevent confusion, tribal should be used throughout.
  - For SMAs, there should be a clear statement that no approval can be issued until the Forest Service verifies that it will not affect treaty rights.
- MCC § 38.0207(D)(6)
  - To prevent confusion, please add “If any provision of the Management Plan is more restrictive than this code, Multnomah County shall apply the more restrictive provision of the Management Plan, otherwise the provisions of Chapter 38 apply.”
- MCC § 38.0530
  - A new row labeled “Minimal Impact Project” was added to the table and identified as not a land use decision. “Minimal Impact Project” is not defined in Chapter 38 and any application for development as defined in MCC § 38.0015 and the Management Plan must go through county review.
- MCC § 38.2025(A)(14) has been removed from the Management Plan and must be removed from the MCC.
- MCC § 38.2625(A)(1) apparently has an extraneous “and” at the end that should be removed.
- MCC § 38.7040(D) the word “seen” should be changed to “visible” for consistency and accuracy.
- MCC § 38.7045(H)(3)(c) the bolded words should be inserted “The proposed use is limited to the transfer, lease, or sale **of non-federal lands that contain** cultural resources. . .”
- MCC § 38.7085(B)(2).1 should reflect the wording of the Management Plan: “Campgrounds for twenty (20) units or less, tent sites only.”
- MCC § 38.7100(A)(2)(a) the reference to § 38.7045(A)(1), (2), & (3) should be changed to MCC § 38.7045(A)(1)–(4) so that the proper criteria are used for historic surveys.

In addition, Friends requests the following changes:

- The definition of “Accessory building or accessory structure” should not include the reference to breezeways. This is a frequently abused provision of the Management Plan where an applicant will apply for two structures that are connected by a breezeway rather than for a single structure. This often results in development that is not compatible with nearby development.
- MCC § 38.7794 should be updated so that lots that are subject to the consolidation provisions are automatically consolidated.

- MCC § 39.1510 should be updated to clarify that a violation of Chapter 38, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, or the Management Plan for the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area is a violation of the MCC.
- MCC § 38.0530(B)(2) sets a comment period and an appeal period of 14 days. This is very short turnaround. The quality of comments will improve if this is changed. Friends requests that the comment period and the appeal period both be raised to 28 days.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "S. McCoy", written in a cursive style.

Steven D. McCoy  
Staff Attorney