



Department of Community Services
Land Use and Transportation Planning Program
www.multco.us/landuse

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

**STAFF REPORT TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FOR THE
PUBLIC HEARING ON JANUARY 5, 2015
SAUVIE ISLAND – MULTNOMAH CHANNEL RURAL AREA PLAN**

CASE FILE: PC-2013-2931

PART I. INTRODUCTION

In 1997, the original Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel (SIMC) Rural Area Plan (RAP) was adopted for the rural, unincorporated area of Sauvie Island and Multnomah Channel. Over the past 17 years, many new issues have emerged and some issues present in 1997 were not resolved. Sauvie Island in particular has seen considerable growth in the number of visitors from the Portland metropolitan region. In response to the growing number of issues raised by citizens and stakeholders in the planning area, staff began a scoping effort in early 2013 in order to identify land use and transportation issues that need to be addressed. The 2014 Rural Area Plan and Transportation Plan updates began in the fall of 2013 with the formation of a Community Advisory Committee (CAC) comprised of eighteen community members.

The CAC formed five subcommittees focused on the following topic areas:

- Public and Semi-Public Facilities
- Natural and Cultural Resources
- Agriculture and Agri-Tourism
- Transportation
- Marinas and Floating Homes

The subcommittees were comprised of representatives from the CAC as well as members of the Technical Advisory Committee. Each subcommittee met at least twice (the Marinas and Floating Homes Subcommittee met four times), reviewed draft background reports (included as appendices to the 2014 SIMC Plan), and made specific recommendations to the full CAC. The CAC made recommendations for policies and policy direction. The policies in the draft plan are the culmination of CAC's recommendations, and county planning staff and county legal review.

The plan polices provide direction for future Planning Commission work program tasks, identify opportunities for improvements to county processes and operations and coordination with other agencies. The background reports provide the technical background needed in order to frame the parameters of specific work program tasks.

The Planning Commission hearing is structured to focus on specific topic areas over the course of three different dates. The hearing will conclude with a fourth hearing reserved for deliberation and a recommendation from the Planning Commission to the County Board of Commissioners. The hearing agenda is as follows:

January 5, 2015, 6:30 PM to 9:00 PM at the Sauvie Island Academy gymnasium: Hearing opens: Topics include natural & cultural resources, and public & semi-public facilities.

February 2, 2015, 6:30 PM to 9:00 PM at the Sauvie Island Academy gymnasium: Hearing continues: Topics include agriculture & agri-tourism, and transportation.

March 2, 2015, 6:30 PM to 9:00 PM at the Sauvie Island Academy gymnasium: Hearing continues: Topics include marinas & floating homes.

March 16, 2015, 6:30 PM to 9:00 PM at the Sauvie Island Academy gymnasium: Hearing continues: Planning Commission Deliberation.

The Planning Commission may recommend one of the following options to the Board of County Commissioners who will take final action on the recommended plan updates:

1. Adopt the proposed plan as proposed
2. Adopt the proposed plan with modifications
3. Do not adopt the proposed plan

PART II. PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

Though the Community Advisory Committee was generally representative of the community, additional creative outreach strategies were included in the program to gain input on policies from the broader community. A very useful outreach method was conducting focus groups with community members from around the SIMC area. Focus groups were targeted to young families that reside but don't work in the SIMC area, as well as people who reside but do not work in the plan area.

Sauvie Island Academy

In the update to the SIMC plan, County staff worked with a field study class of 6th-8th graders at the Sauvie Island Academy to educate them on the history of Oregon Land Use (relating to Sauvie Island and Multnomah Channel). The students toured the island, including stops at Colombia Farms, Bella Organic Farms, the Sauvie Island Fire Station, and the County Park & Ride lot. The students focused on the following question; *“how can we make Sauvie Island and The Multnomah Channel an equitable, accessible place for everyone to live, work, and play?”* The students developed surveys that were distributed to people who live, work and play within the plan area. The analysis was included into a short video shown to the public and Planning Commission.

Online surveys

Two online surveys were created to capture community perceptions and feedback including a “defining rural character” visual preference survey to capture what places, words, and photos depicted rural character for the SIMC area. The data were analyzed to determine the differences between people who live in the plan area and those who were determined to be “visitors”. In addition, online policy polls were created near the end of the process for the community to give feedback to staff on policy intent.

The policy polls were in conjunction with a community conversation board placed in the park and ride lot at the base of the Sauvie Island Bridge.

Planning Commission Briefings and Community Open Houses

The project team provided periodic updates to the Planning Commission on the planning effort. This approach informed the Planning Commission of the latest discussion topics and overall progress of the committees well in advance of the public hearing process. Two Planning Commission members also participated in the CAC and subcommittee meetings. The project team hosted three open houses prior to the scheduled Planning Commission briefings. The Open Houses coincided with Planning Commission meetings in January, March and June of 2014.

Mailing and email updates

The project team developed a mailing list utilizing the extensive scoping work done prior to the CAC kickoff as well as interest expressed at community events. The mailing list continued to grow during the project and was used to apprise interested community members and stakeholders about project progress and upcoming project events. The mailings and email updates provided community members an opportunity to provide written feedback about issues at any time during the project.

Other Community Outreach

The project team hosted a number of other opportunities for community members to receive project updates and provide input including, regular mailings, email updates, and press releases. County staff also attended the SICA Community Fair in April 2014 to provide information and answer questions from community members.

Sections III through VIII below highlight the primary topic areas in the SIMC plan. The sections align with the order that topics will be discussed over the course of the three Planning Commission meetings covering the hearing. Section VIII addresses a general policy on equity that was raised throughout the process.

Meeting #1:

PART III. PUBLIC & SEMI-PUBLIC FACILITIES

According to the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area (SIWA) Management Plan:

“Sauvie Island has become one of the most visited locations in Oregon, even surpassing Crater Lake National Park almost two fold (counts in 2008 - 415,686 visitors at Crater Lake and nearly 800,000 at SIWA). Public use on the wildlife area was 989,361 visitor days in 2009. Due to its close proximity to the Portland Metropolitan Area SIWA staff expects public use to continue to climb. In particular, the beaches of SIWA receive 55% of the total annual public use. Unfortunately, high levels of public use can impact fish and wildlife species through disturbance at critical times in their life cycle or physical alteration of their habitats. Public use can also occasionally exceed the physical capacity of facilities needed to accommodate these uses.”

Public and semi-public facilities serve both visitors and residents of the SIMC plan area. Public facilities include state, regional and local parks, wildlife refuges, schools, utilities and similar publicly-owned facilities. Semi-public facilities are those which serve or pass through the island but are not publicly-owned, such as railroads, the drainage company, natural gas pipeline, farm-worker housing and the grange. The major issue identified by the Public and Semi-Public Facilities subcommittee was traffic and other impacts from increased use of public facilities.

Public and Semi-Public Facilities Policies:

Policy 4.1 Cooperate with state and local agencies to address drainage, flood control, and roadway functions of existing levees while restoring natural systems where appropriate.

Provide notice to the Drainage Company of any proposed code amendment or development on lands on and/or adjacent to Drainage Company infrastructure.

Staff Comments: There was strong support at the subcommittee and CAC for continued interagency cooperation on important issues within the plan area such as flood control, transportation, and environmental protection and enhancement.

Policy 4.2 Continue to coordinate with Metro to ensure compliance with Rural Reserve designations, implementation of Metro's Greenspaces Master Plan and planning for Howell Park. In particular, work with Metro to:

(a) Ensure activities will complement natural and environmental resources of local and regional significance; and

(b) Ensure that Howell Territorial Park uses and improvements maintain harmony with the rural character of the plan area as well as natural and cultural resources.

Staff Comments: This policy recognizes the special rural and historical setting at Howell Territorial Park, which should be considered when uses and/or improvements are proposed.

Policy 4.3 Support only those recreational activities within the rural plan area that are complimentary to and do not negatively impact natural and environmental resources on Sauvie Island and along the Multnomah Channel and its tributaries that are identified in Goal 5 and in the Metro Greenspaces Master Plan and lands approved in Metro's Acquisition Refinement Plan.

Staff Comments: This policy recognizes that the plan area is a popular recreational area and activities that do not negatively impact the natural environment are valued.

PART IV. NATURAL & CULTURAL RESOURCES

The subcommittee and the CAC fully support strong environmental protections as well as opportunities for habitat enhancements. Additionally, the plan area was an important, relatively densely populated, center of trade for Native Americans and many artifacts are found in the area. RAP Appendix 5 identifies and discusses natural and cultural resources within the SIMC planning area.

Natural and Cultural Resources Policies:

Policy 3.1 Collaborate and partner with private, public and non-profit organizations and tribes to address natural resource issues including but not limited to hydrology, climate change, changes in regional geography, wildlife and habitat conservation, restoration enhancement, educational programs and inventory of natural systems.

Staff Comments: Policy 3.1 recognizes collaboration and volunteerism in protecting and enhancing habitats.

Policy 3.2 Consider extending the Wildlife Habitat tax deferral to MUA-20 lands, and community-based restoration projects) that complement Multnomah County's Goal 5 (Natural and Cultural Resources) and Goal 15 (Willamette River Greenway) regulatory programs.

Staff Comments: Policy 3.2 directs the staff to extend the Wildlife tax deferral to MUA-20 zoned land, through code amendments and coordination with the County Department of Assessment, Recording, and Taxation.

Policy 3.3 Coordinate with federal and state agencies, including National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries Division (NOAA Fisheries) in considering development of design standards that protect salmon habitat and fish passage within, and along the Multnomah Channel and tributaries and ensure compliance with the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

Staff Comments: Policy 3.3 ensures that NOAA Fisheries will be consulted during the development of standards for protection of fish and riparian habitats in the Multnomah Channel and its tributaries.

Policy 3.4 Update the surface water resources inventory, and associated riparian areas, and apply appropriate protections in compliance with Goal 5 requirements (based on an evaluation of economic, social, environmental and energy (ESEE) consequences).

Staff Comments: This policy indicates that surface water resources inventories should be updated and new zoning overlay protections should be applied as appropriate.

Policy 3.5 Consider exemptions and process efficiencies to provide and encourage fish and wildlife habitat restoration and enhancement projects on public and private lands conducted by natural resource public agencies such as Metro, Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation Districts and Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Staff Comments: This policy recognizes habitat restoration and enhancement projects that are conducted by the County's partner agency. The policy directs the County to explore code exemptions and process efficiencies that would identify any unnecessary regulatory barriers to restoration and enhancement efforts by partner agencies and make changes to the code and/or processes accordingly while upholding the County's state and federal regulatory mandates.

Policy 3.6 Multnomah County should work collaboratively with the Sauvie Island Drainage Improvement Company, state and federal agencies, and non-profit organizations to maintain the drainage and flood-control functions provided by the Company while restoring natural systems where appropriate.

Staff Comments: Policy 3.6 provides for coordination with public agencies, non-profits, and property owners with respect to drainage and flood-control functions provided by the Sauvie Island Drainage Company, which has jurisdiction over maintenance of the flood control infrastructure on Sauvie Island.

Policy 3.7 Consider a "dark sky" ordinance for the planning area and work with the City of Portland, Port of Portland, and other adjacent jurisdictions and agencies towards reducing light pollution from sources beyond the plan area.

Staff Comments: The subcommittee and the CAC fully support the development of a dark skies ordinance. While such an ordinance is currently being developed, the policy is a statement of support for such measures.

Policy 3.8 Support protection of cultural areas and archaeological resources and consider a process that includes notification protocols and standards to evaluate comments received from tribes and the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office.

Policy 3.9 Support the inventory, recovery and protection of archaeological and cultural resources, and coordination with affected agencies during the land use process.

Policy 3.10 Consider standards to address comments received from SHPO and Native American Groups and support efforts to report the discovery of cultural resources to SHPO and the Native American groups.

Policy 3.11 Encourage proposed development on areas of cultural significance to evaluate alternative sites or designs that reduce or eliminate impacts to the resource.

Policy 3.12 Recognize the heritage value of natural resources for Native American groups and encourage protection and restoration of historic wetlands, riparian areas, water bodies, and oak uplands.

Encourage and support efforts for natural resource restoration and historic activities such as plant harvesting for heritage value.

Staff Comments: Policies 3.8 through 3.12 recognize and seek to protect the plan area's original inhabitants. These policies direct the County to develop standards and procedures to notify tribes and SHPO of development applications within the plan area and to develop standards to evaluate comments received regarding potential development impacts to cultural and historical resources.

New standards should minimize impacts by development to cultural and historical resources and include provisions for consideration of alternative sites. The CAC suggests that the procedures and code standards currently employed in the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area would be a good starting place for evaluating standards and procedures that could be implemented in the SIMC plan area.

Policy 3.13 Continue to explore and encourage opportunities to conduct selected dredging to increase depth, flows, flushing, and circulation action in Sturgeon Lake in coordination with partner agencies and organizations.

Staff Comments: Multnomah County is a partner in the ongoing efforts to improve Sturgeon Lake and is committed to continuing efforts to improve and restore the lake.

Policy 3.14 The Multnomah County Health Department Vector Control staff is encouraged to coordinate with Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, using that agency's map of sensitive areas and their Vector Control Guidance for Sensitive Areas to identify important habitat for sensitive species like red-legged frogs and painted turtles where an altered protocol should be used.

The county's vector control staff are encouraged to act as a resource in efforts to educate and collaborate with landowners about natural means of mosquito control.

Staff Comments: This policy encourages the continuation of collaboration between County Vector Control and landowners in the effort to natural control of mosquitoes.

Policy 3.15 Recommend that any fill generated as a result of dredging activities be located on Sauvie Island only under the following conditions:

- (a) To assist in flood control
- (b) Not on designated wetlands
- (c) Not on high value farmland unless placement of such fill improves a farm's soils or productivity
- (d) In areas where it will not negatively impact wildlife habitat.

Staff Comments: This policy restricts the placement of dredging material on Sauvie Island in order to protect productive agricultural soils.

Policy 3.16 Review internal protocols related to road and right-of-way maintenance, including roadside hedgerow trimming and weed eradication. Work with the West Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District, ODFW and the Sauvie Island Habitat Partnership to protect wildlife, manage invasive plant species, to ensure that habitat and water resource restoration projects are coordinated with county road maintenance and drainage control programs.

Ensure that non-profit organizations and property owners are aware of county programs that may limit wildlife habitat restoration projects, and that road county staff are aware of existing and completed habitat restoration projects when they conduct their operations. To implement this policy, the County Road Maintenance program will review the following recommendations:

- (a) Except in emergency situations, County road mowing should be done between August 15 and March 15 to minimize impact to nesting birds, and workers should avoid mowing at identified turtle, frog and salamander crossings during nesting season (May and September).
- (b) Culverts under county roads should be surveyed, then repaired and replaced as needed to limit barriers to fish and wildlife passage.
- (c) County staff should work with ODFW and the Sauvie Island Habitat Partnership to identify and mitigate in areas where concentrations of small wildlife cross county roads.
- (d) Mowing equipment should be regularly cleaned so that seeds of invasive plants are not spread into areas where they have not yet been introduced.
- (e) County staff should confer with the West Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District on best management practices before removing invasive weeds along road right-of-way.
- (f) County staff should be trained to recognize invasive and desirable native plant species; Multnomah County should prioritize plant species for control.
- (g) County staff should inform property owners of the existing Owner Vegetation Maintenance Agreement, which allows abutting property owners to maintain right-of-way vegetation.

Staff Comments: This policy encourages cooperation between the County Road Maintenance division, property owners, and agencies in the ongoing efforts to avoid the importation of invasive plants and to manage invasive plants within the County right of way.

Meeting #2:

PART V. AGRICULTURE & AGRI-TOURISM

A number of issues relating to uses on farmland were identified in the 2013 Scoping Report and through extensive community outreach. These issues are summarized below:

1. Concern regarding the types and degree of promotional activities at farm stands and related offsite impacts.
2. Desire to examine the pros and cons of agri-tourism and to form a consensus around the issue of what should or shouldn't be allowed on Sauvie Island farms with respect to farm stands and events.
3. Concern for maintaining the rural character and agricultural nature of Sauvie Island.
4. Concern regarding increasing number and size of events and large gatherings.
5. Concern that farm stands could become the dominate use of farmland rather than agriculture.

Policy 1.1 Maximize retention of Sauvie Island's agricultural land base for productive farm use.

Staff Comments: This policy reflects the SIMC community's strong desire to preserve and protect Sauvie Island's exceptional, productive farmland. The community value is that preservation of high value farmland should be considered when contemplating all other uses on farmland. The CAC fully supports this policy.

Policy 1.2 Consider standards for limiting the area, location, design, and function of farm stand promotional activities to the extent allowed by law to retain a maximum supply of land in production for farm crops or livestock, to ensure public health and safety, and to minimize impacts on adjacent farming operations, residents, roads, traffic circulation, wildlife and other natural resources.

Staff Comments: The CAC considered policies that would prescribe specific area limits to the amount of land dedicated to farm stands, events, and related support infrastructures, such as parking. Additionally, standards such as setbacks from neighboring properties for events and promotional activities and noise requirements were discussed. While many on the CAC supported design standards for farm-stands, other members expressed concern that too many standards could threaten the viability of utilizing promotional activities as a supplement to farming income. The concern is for the protection of the underlying resource (high value, productive Sauvie Island farm soils) and managing off site impacts as appropriate. Farm stands are a permitted use in the EFU zone, but are subject to County Review. Future updates to the Multnomah County Code should consider appropriate standards for addressing impacts generated by farm stands and promotional activities on EFU lands.

Policy 1.3 Consider a tiered review process for farm stand operations on EFU land distinguishing between operations that include promotional activities and those that do not.

Staff Comments: This policy recognizes that not all farm stands require a discretionary review. Farm stands that include a basic, small structure and do not include promotional events and activities are an example of farm stands that could be reviewed through clear and objective, non-discretionary standards. The processes and standards would be developed when staff brings to the matter to the Planning Commission for consideration.

Policy 1.4 Consider amending the Multiple Use Agriculture zoning code to include deed restrictions protecting surrounding agricultural practices as a requirement for approval of new and replacement dwellings and additions to existing dwellings.

Staff Comments: This policy is brought over and modified from the current 1997 RAP. The policy acknowledges the fundamental right to farm and helps insure future residents understand that agricultural practices are allowed outright. Code amendments requiring these deed restrictions should be developed. The CAC fully supports this policy.

Policy 1.5 Consider developing a unified, multi-agency permitting process for review of mass gatherings and other gatherings. Consider more restrictive permitting thresholds for number of visitors, frequency and duration than the maximums authorized by state law.

Staff Comments: State law allows for outdoor 'mass' (3000 or more people) and 'other' (less than 3000) gatherings on property once every 90 days for up to 120 consecutive hours. State law clarifies that outdoor gatherings falling within the definition are not land uses. Nevertheless, counties

regulate the health and safety impacts of gatherings and can provide different definitions than used in state law. The CAC favored a more formalized permitting process, such as county routing forms for various departments and agencies for outdoor gatherings. The CAC further supports adopting more conservative standards with respect to the number of attendees, the length and the frequency of events. The CAC fully supports this policy.

Policy 1.6 Do not adopt the agri-tourism provisions of ORS chapter 215 due to the island’s limited road infrastructure and already high levels of visitation.

Staff Comments: New provisions in ORS 215.283(4) create a category for “agri-tourism” opportunities on EFU lands beyond what is currently allowed in association with farm stands and outdoor gatherings. Counties may adopt these optional provisions which may permit up to 18 events per year per property. The provisions require that these events be “incidental and subordinate to existing farm use on the tract” and allow events outdoors and within structures. The CAC was presented with the option of either supporting adoption of agri-tourism for the plan area or not supporting adoption of agri-tourism provisions. The majority of the CAC did not support adopting agri-tourism out of concern that the island is already beyond traffic capacity at times and because impacts from existing high levels of visitation detract from the island’s rural character. Others on the CAC felt that the provisions should be adopted in order to capture the demand for events like weddings and farm to plate dinners and to provide another category of possibilities for farmers to supplement their income.

PART VI. TRANSPORTATION

Existing and new policies were revised and developed as part of this process. Existing transportation policies reviewed and revised comes from the existing Rural Area Plan (RAP) and policies in the Westside Rural Multnomah County Transportation System Plan (TSP). Policies from the Westside TSP are included in a separate attachment and will be incorporated as part of the TSP update that is anticipated to occur after completion of this project. Proposed RAP policies are also listed below and reflect either a revision of an existing policy or a new policy developed as part of this process. In total there are 11 proposed RAP policies. These policies address the following items raised both during the scoping and RAP update process:

- Need for strategies that reduce traffic conflicts between modes on Sauvie Island roads, particularly between bicycles and motorists, but also including farm equipment and pedestrians. There is a strong desire for better accommodations for bicycles and pedestrians. The lack of road shoulders and/or multi-use paths was a common theme.
- Need for safety improvements for roads, intersections, and rail crossings.
- Concern regarding the increasing numbers of visitors to Sauvie Island and related issues, such as increased traffic and increased demand on emergency service providers.

Proposed RAP Policies:

Policy 5.1 The Multnomah County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee should maintain continuous Sauvie Island representation to the extent possible.

Staff Comments: This policy is brought over from the current 1997 RAP and continues the commitment to ensuring Sauvie Island representation on the Committee.

Policy 5.2 Identify and implement short- and long- term solutions to safely accommodate bicyclists, pedestrians, and motor vehicles on Sauvie Island including on-road bikeways, separated multi-use paths, and funding options.

Staff Comments: This policy supports the implementation of solutions for bicycles and pedestrians on the Island.

Policy 5.3 Oppose placement of new regional roadways in the Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel Rural Area, should such roadways be contemplated by any regional transportation authority in the future.

Staff Comments: This policy is brought over from the current 1997 RAP and reaffirms the community desire to not allow new regional roadways through the plan area.

Policy 5.4 Consider context sensitive design when reviewing rural roadway standards to determine appropriate paved shoulder widths to preserve the rural character of roads. Shoulder widening should aim to achieve a minimum 3 foot paved width.

Staff Comments: This policy recognizes that while paved shoulders are desired, there are constraints such as levees and/or available right of way that may limit the overall shoulder width and therefore looking at a context sensitive solution to provide a facility for safe bike and pedestrian passage may be necessary.

Policy 5.5 Coordinate with ODOT Rail and Public Transit Division to promote appropriate safety devices at crossings.

Staff Comments: This policy recognizes that safety at rail crossing are a priority and the County should continue to coordinate with ODOT Rail on the issue.

Policy 5.6 Coordinate with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) and Columbia County to manage and reduce demand on the Sauvie Island transportation system, especially during peak use periods, by making more efficient use of capacity on the system through strategies such as user fees, shuttles, and parking management programs.

Staff Comments: This policy recognizes the value of coordination with ODFW and Columbia County regarding addressing traffic impacts generated by high levels of visitation the Wildlife Refuge and the beaches, which are located on the Columbia County side of Sauvie Island.

Policy 5.7 Promote a transportation system that prioritizes and supports the efficient and safe movement of farm vehicles and equipment.

Staff Comments: This policy recognizes that farming is a primary use of the Island and this should be considered when planning the transportation system.

Policy 5.8 Maintain and improve the transportation system for all modes of travel that reduce conflict and minimize impacts to the natural environment, and reflects the community's rural character while ensuring efficiency and connectivity.

Staff Comments: The Transportation System Plan should consider improvements that reduce conflict between all modes of transportation in the plan area. Consideration should be given to environmental impacts and the rural character of the plan area.

Policy 5.9 Implement a range of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) policies encouraging existing businesses and requiring new development (beyond single family residential use and agricultural uses) to help reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT), maximize use of existing facilities, increase walking, biking and transit use and alleviate congestion on US 30 and county roads caused by seasonal and special event traffic.

Staff Comments: New uses and developments other than single family dwellings and agricultural uses should be considered in the context of baseline traffic and TDM strategies should be employed in order to alleviate cumulative traffic effects. This policy also looks at working with existing business on developing TDM strategies.

Policy 5.10 Work with the Oregon Office of Emergency Management, Multnomah County Emergency Management and Multnomah County rural fire protection district to ensure that the transportation system supports effective responses to emergencies and disasters.

Staff Comments: Involves coordination with Emergency Management staff on road projects and transportation plan changes.

Policy 5.11 Promote effective use of signage designed to educate the public about farm equipment using roadways, wildlife crossings and bicycle and pedestrian safety and additional way finding signage.

Staff Comments: Promotes increased signage where appropriate for way finding and wildlife crossings.

Policy 5.12 Coordinate and work with transit agencies and service providers to identify existing transit deficiencies and the improvements necessary to increase access to transit services by potential users.

Staff Comments: This policy recognizes the need to coordinate with transit agencies to look at appropriate transit service and access to transit in the plan area.

Meeting #3:

PART VII. MARINAS AND FLOATING HOMES

The Multnomah Channel is home to 17 marinas/moorages which include a mix of floating homes and boat slips. All marina/moorage properties are located within the MUA-20 zone district. The majority of the moorages/marinas are located along the west side of the Multnomah Channel and east of Highway 30 and the Burlington Northern railroad. A number of topics were considered during the course of the planning project, which included four subcommittee meetings and two CAC meetings.

Habitat:

The subcommittee and CAC recommend stronger standards for protection and enhancement of salmon and riparian habitat associated with any development and/or reconfiguration of marinas and moorages along the Multnomah Channel. NOAA Fisheries, the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, DEQ, and the West Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District among others have indicated willingness to work with County staff and the community in the development of enhanced habitat protection standards.

Health and Safety:

The CAC fully supports the development of health and safety standards for floating homes and live-aboard boats (boats occupied for short-term and long term stays within a marina/moorage). Future code amendments should include standards for floating homes similar to building codes applicable to dwellings on land. Code amendments should also include sanitation, plumbing, and electrical standards for floating homes, occupied live-aboard boats, and other floating structures such as boathouses. The subcommittee and many community members strongly recommend pump-out facilities for any boats that are occupied within a marina or moorage.

Residential Density at Marinas and Moorages:

Many of the marinas and moorages along the Multnomah Channel were established several decades ago. Since the mid 1970s a number of these facilities have added floating homes and expanded the number of slips for boat storage. A number of moorages gained approval for additional floating homes through the Community Service application process. However some moorages grew organically over time and did not necessarily gain approval for additional floating homes. In 1997 a reconciliation process (Policy 10 of the existing RAP) provided a path to gain recognition of the number of floating homes in existence as of July 1, 1997 at a participating moorage subject to other existing approvals (i.e. DSL water leases, and septic system approvals).

The current status of the marina/moorages is that all but one of the facilities are recognized through previous Community Service permit approvals and/or through Policy 10 reconciliation. The marinas/moorages are collectively approved for 337 floating homes and there are 255 existing floating homes according to the County Department of Assessment, Recording and Taxation (DART). There are 14 marina/moorage facilities that are currently at or below their approved number of floating homes, and four appear to have exceeded their approvals by a total of 18 floating homes.

Floating home moorages and expansions of existing moorages are permitted in the MUA-20 zone subject to the Community Service approval provisions. The County's Waterfront Uses code allows a

maximum number of floating homes based on a formula calculated at 1 floating home per 50 feet of waterfront. For example, a moorage associated with a property that has 500 feet of shoreline could potentially qualify for up to 10 floating homes. This formula is commonly referred to as the 1:50 density standard.

The subcommittee and the CAC contemplated a fundamental question: Can floating home moorages retain the ability to increase the number of floating homes up to the 1:50 standard with an updated Rural Area Plan? A second, related fundamental question was: Should moorages be able to increase the number of floating homes up to the 1:50 standard or should the moorages retain their existing approved number of floating homes without the possibility of adding floating homes?

Many marina/moorage owners, including those serving on the CAC, have expressed the desire to retain the 1:50 density standard into the new RAP. Moorage owners indicate that increasing the number of floating homes helps insure the financial viability of the moorage into the future. There are several factors when considering these questions:

1. Rural Reserve Designation. The entire plan area, including the Multnomah Channel is located within a designated Rural Reserve. A Rural Reserve prevents the Urban Growth boundary from being expanded into the area. Additionally, changes to zoning that would allow more intensive uses than currently allowed are generally prohibited. Another important feature of the Rural Reserve is that it generally prohibits the ability to take an exception to a statewide planning goal if that exception would result in more intensive uses – this is an important point to consider, because if any of the state goals would normally prohibit residential expansion of moorages the Rural Reserves designation would essentially prohibit the ability to take a goal exception to allow the expansion.
2. State Goal 14 – Urbanization. When the Rural Area Plan is adopted, it must comply with state planning laws. Goal 14 states that urban densities and services should be located within urban growth boundaries associated with urban areas and conversely limits the level of residential density in rural areas. State rules associated with Goal 14 generally prohibit counties from adopting zoning rules that would allow more than one single family dwelling on rural parcels. Interestingly these rules reference lots and parcels and do not specifically indicate how the rules might apply to floating home moorages. A recent County Hearings Officer decision (Exhibit C) found that Goal 14 does not apply to density calculations at moorages in part because the floating homes are located in a waterway and not on lots or parcels. The CAC was split on this issue. Many agree with the County Hearing Officer’s interpretation and many disagree. Additionally, Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) staff have indicated that they believe Goal 14 rules prohibit the ability to approve additional floating homes beyond existing approved numbers.
3. State Goal 15 – Willamette River Greenway. State rules govern development activities within and along the entire length of the Willamette River; these rules are applied as the Willamette River Greenway (WRG), which includes the entire length of the Multnomah Channel (a distributary of the Willamette River). The WRG requires most development to be located 150 feet from the river unless the development qualifies as water dependent. The question of whether a floating home is water dependent was debated among the members of the subcommittee and the CAC. Many believe that because dwellings do not necessarily need to be located on the water, floating homes do not qualify as water dependent (i.e. a dwelling does not

need to float on the water and can be located on land). Others believe that floating homes are water dependent because they are designed for placement in the water. Multnomah County has found in previous cases that floating homes are water dependent, however, DLCD staff has indicated that they do not interpret floating homes to be a water dependent use.

4. State Goal 11 – Public Facilities Planning. The implementing rules for Goal 11 generally prohibit the ability to extend sewer service to new uses outside of the Urban Growth Boundary. The applicability of Goal 11 with respect to adding additional floating homes to moorages can be a complicated question subject to interpretation. The definition of ‘sewer system’ means in part, a sanitary system serving more than one lot. It is possible that in some or possibly all instances, an exception to Goal 11 would be required for the addition of floating homes. The Rural Reserves rules however, would likely prohibit the goal exception.
5. Portland/Multnomah County Climate Action Plan. 2030 Goal 6 of the plan is to ‘Reduce per capita daily vehicle-miles traveled (VMT) by 30 percent from 2008 levels.’ Additional dwellings outside of the UGB (relatively far from jobs and services) would certainly result in an increase in VMT contrary the objective of 2030 Goal 6.

As outlined above, the issues surrounding the question of whether to create policy advocating for retention of the 1:50 floating home density standard vs. policy advocating for capping the existing number of floating homes at existing approved numbers is complicated. The question is further complicated by the fact that a clear consensus on the issue by the CAC was never achieved.

Proposed plan Policy 2.1 supports the continuation of moorages but also make clear that no new floating homes over and above the existing approved number will be allowed moving forward. Additionally, the 1:50 standard is no longer applicable and the Waterfront Uses section of the Multnomah County Code will be amended accordingly.

Live-aboard Boats:

It is reported that there are a significant number of boats that have the features of a live-aboard vessel (cooking, sleeping, bathing, and toilet) are being used as full time residences within their respective boat slips along the Multnomah Channel. The subcommittee and the CAC pondered the issue as well as how the use should be considered. The CAC favored creating standards to accommodate live-aboard boats as residences within a marina but there was not full consensus on just how this should be accomplished. The CAC did agree that regardless of how the use is considered, there ought to be standards that ensure safe water and electrical connections, as well as appropriate handling of sewage generated by live-aboards. The general policy options contemplated by the CAC were:

1. Allow full time residential use of live-aboards within a marina subject to the total number of residences approved in the marina. This option requires Community Service (CS) approval and requires that boats meet health, safety, and environmental standards (i.e. electrical, water and sanitation) for occupied boats docked in a marina.
2. Do not allow full time residential use of live-aboards.
3. Allow full time residential use of live-aboards, but do not count them towards number of approved residences at the facility, do not provide specific caps on the number of live-aboards and do not apply the 1:50 standard.

The majority of the CAC preferred the third option, while staff recommended the first option because the third option presents issues with the rural reserve rules by allowing a change to the zoning to allow greater residential density. The third option also presents a compliance issue with Goal 14 by allowing urban residential density outside of the Urban Growth Boundary. Further, the third option is contrary to the Climate Action Plan's goal of reducing VMTs because the option would likely result in an increase in the number of daily trips by single occupancy vehicles.

Part-time occupancy of live-aboards was also considered. Most of the CAC favored allowing an option for temporary occupancy of boats. Some on the CAC favored similar standards to the existing campground standards, which allow for occupancy of sites for up to 90 days per year subject to CS approval, however some on the CAC preferred different thresholds such as 30 days per year. Code updates to the campground standards could include provisions for temporary occupancy of live-aboards subject to CS approval and health, safety, and environmental standards. This option would essentially provide for camping within a marina. The question of maximum duration for temporary occupancy of live-aboards would be considered as part of any code amendments considering residential occupancy within boat slips.

Inventory:

Though the County has an inventory of the number of floating homes and infrastructure at moorages and marinas, the last time county land-use staff conducted a field inventory of the facilities was in 1997 after the adoption of the 1997 plan. Many on the CAC feel that the County should conduct a new field inventory to take account of any unknown quantities such as the number of live-aboard boats and/or to verify the number of floating homes and other structures that may be being utilized as dwellings.

Proposed Moorages and Marinas Policies:

Policy 2.1 Multnomah County recognizes the 17 existing marinas in the Multnomah Channel within the area designated in Comprehensive Plan Policy 26 as appropriate for marina development. Existing marinas may be reconfigured within their respective DSL lease areas. No new floating homes will be approved beyond the existing approved number of dwelling units.

Staff Comments: This policy supports the ability to reconfigure marina infrastructure within existing DSL lease areas but makes it clear that no additional floating homes will be approved beyond existing approvals. This policy comports with staff's understanding of state law with respect to density.

Policy 2.1(a) Significant reconfigurations within existing marinas should only occur through the Community Service and Conditional Use process subject to all applicable County zoning standards.

Staff Comments: This policy supports developing review standards for alterations to marinas and moorages through the CS and CU process. Standards may include environmental/fish habitat standards as well as building, electrical, plumbing, and sanitation standards.

Policy 2.1(b) Coordinate with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries Division (NOAA Fisheries) to amend the Willamette River Greenway overlay zone to include objective design standards that protect salmon habitat and fish passage within and along the Multnomah Channel.

Coordinate with the Oregon Department of State Lands (DSL) to ensure compliance with the Endangered Species Act (ESA) through its in-water leasing program.

Staff Comments: This policy supports developing review standards for the protection of salmon habitat along the Multnomah Channel in consultation with NOAA Fisheries.

Policy 2.1(c) Consider building, plumbing, electrical and mechanical standards for floating structures.

Staff Comments: Staff will coordinate with the City of Portland in the development and adoption of building, plumbing, and electrical connections for floating structures.

Policy 2.1(d) As directed by Portland's Bureau of Environmental Services and/or Oregon's Department of Environmental Quality, marina owners must provide for safe and easy collection and disposal of sewage from marine uses in Multnomah Channel.

(1) Require marinas with floating structures to meet state standards for sewage collection and disposal similar to those standards that apply to dwellings on land.

(2) Boat slips serving boats with onboard cooking and/or sanitation facilities must be provided with an on-site mechanism for disposal of sewage, either through connections at each slip or through the availability of on-site alternative pump out facilities which are reasonably safe from accidental spillage.

Staff Comments: Staff will coordinate with the City of Portland Bureau of Environmental Services in the development and adoption sanitation standards serving floating structures in the Multnomah Channel.

Policy 2.2 Maintain a current inventory of all marinas and moorages. Include all dwellings, boat slips, floating structures, live-aboards and supporting infrastructure in the inventory.

Staff Comments: This policy commits the Planning Office to maintain an up-to-date inventory of moorages and marinas along the Multnomah Channel.

Policy 2.3 Review consistency of definitions of floating home, houseboats, boathouses, live-aboards, combos, etc. used by agencies such as the Multnomah County Assessor, the City of Portland and the State when amending the Zoning Ordinance.

Staff Comments: Updates to County Code should include review of definitions of floating structures for consistency across agencies.

Policy 2.4 Allow live-aboards to be used as full time residences within a marina and count the live-aboard slip in the total number of residences approved for the marina. This option requires Community Service (CS) approval and requires that boats meet health, safety, and environmental standards (i.e. electrical, water and sanitation) for occupied boats docked in a marina.

Staff Comments: This policy directs staff to develop standards to allow the conversion of boat slips to full time residential use by boats subject to CS approval.

Policy 2.5 Consider standards to allow temporary use of live-aboard boats within marinas. This option requires that boats meet health, safety, and environmental standards (i.e. electrical, water and sanitation) for occupied boats docked in a marina.

Staff Comments: This policy directs staff to develop standards to allow the conversion of boat slips to temporary residential (camping) use by boats subject to CS approval.

Policy 2.6 Amend Comprehensive Plan Policy 26 to be consistent with policy 2.1.

Staff Comments: Comprehensive Plan Policy 26 indicates the areas along the Multnomah Channel that are appropriate for marinas and moorages. The policy should be amended to be consistent with the policies in the SIMC plan. The Comprehensive Plan update will include updates for consistency with the SIMC plan where appropriate.

PART VIII. EQUITY POLICY

Throughout the process the concept of equity and impacts were raised, especially during transportation policy conversations. This included concerns of impacts of any policies exploring the development of user fees and impacts to low-income and minority groups and their access to the area. In addition to impacts to users, there was interest in ensuring that accountability measures to ensure that transportation investments account for impacts on health and safety, in addition to equity are in place. There were also discussions around prioritization of investments to the degree to which they provide basic access (emergency services, public services, and health care) to disadvantaged communities.

Equity policies were initially proposed only under the Transportation Chapter but have since been pulled out to serve as a general policy for the whole Rural Area Plan. This recognizes the importance of ensuring equitable decision making and the need to consider the needs of low-income and minority populations for all policies and in moving forward with implementation of the plan.

Proposed Equity Policy:

Policy 1.0 Acknowledge the needs of low-income and minority populations in future investments and programs, including an equity analysis consistent with required federal, state and local requirements.

Staff Comments: This general policy ensures that equity is addressed in implementation of all SIMC Rural Area Plan policies, including the development of standards and procedures.

PART IX. ISSUES TO BE FORWARDED

Enforcement—FORWARD TO MULTNOMAH COUNTY SHERIFF’S OFFICE

Multnomah County Sheriff’s office should increase patrol and service to the Island during identified peak periods (day and season).

Marine Transportation—FORWARD TO COUNTY COMP PLAN UPDATE PROCESS

Update Policy 33B Marine Transportation System in the Comprehensive Framework Plan. Policies should look at environmental protections and address increased freight traffic. Multnomah County should implement this policy through the budgeting process for the Division of Transportation and Land Use Planning.

Sauvie Island RFPD Coordination – FORWARD TO COUNTY EMERGENCY MGMT

(a) Coordinate with the Sauvie Island RFPD on disaster preparedness planning and assist in formulating multi-lingual communication and evacuation plans for Sauvie Island.

(b) Study methods by which the Sauvie Island RFPD can be reimbursed for providing fire and emergency medical services to island visitors.

PART X. POLICY TASKS

The policies may trigger one or more general tasks including new or improved county processes and/or changes to the Multnomah County Code. The policy task table begins on the following page.

Policy	PC Work Program	County Process - Operation Improvement	Agency or inter-departmental Coordination	Legislative Tracking	TSP
Equity					
Policy 1.0 Acknowledge the needs of low-income and minority populations in future investments and programs, including an equity analysis consistent with required federal, state and local requirements.		✓			
Agriculture and Agri-Tourism					
*Policy 1.1 Maximize retention of Sauvie Island’s agricultural land base for productive farm use.	✓				
*Policy 1.2 Consider standards for limiting the area, location, design, and function of farm stand promotional activities to the extent allowed by law to retain a maximum supply of land in production for farm crops or livestock, to ensure public health and safety, and to minimize impacts on adjacent farming operations, residents, roads, traffic circulation, wildlife and other natural resources.	✓				
Policy 1.3 Consider a tiered review process for farm stand operations on EFU land distinguishing between operations that include promotional activities and those that do not.	✓				
Policy 1.4 Consider amending the Multiple Use Agriculture zoning code to include deed restrictions protecting surrounding agricultural practices as a requirement for approval of new and replacement dwellings and additions to existing dwellings.	✓	✓	✓		

Policy	PC Work Program	County Process - Operation Improvement	Agency or inter-departmental Coordination	Legislative Tracking	TSP
<p>*Policy 1.5 Consider developing a unified, multi-agency permitting process for review of mass gatherings and other gatherings. Consider more restrictive permitting thresholds for number of visitors, frequency and duration than the maximums authorized by state law.</p>	✓	✓	✓		
<p>*Policy 1.6 Do not adopt the agri-tourism provisions of ORS chapter 215 due to the island's limited road infrastructure and already high levels of visitation.</p>				✓	
<p>Marinas and Moorages</p>					
<p>*Policy 2.1 Multnomah County recognizes the 17 existing marinas in the Multnomah Channel within the area designated in Comprehensive Plan Policy 26 as appropriate for marina development. Existing marinas may be reconfigured within their respective DSL lease areas. No new floating homes will be approved beyond the existing approved number of dwelling units.</p> <p>2.1 (a) Significant reconfigurations within existing marinas should only occur through the Community Service and Conditional Use process subject to all applicable County zoning standards.</p>	✓		✓		

Policy	PC Work Program	County Process - Operation Improvement	Agency or inter-departmental Coordination	Legislative Tracking	TSP
<p>2.1(b) Coordinate with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries Division (NOAA Fisheries) to amend the Willamette River Greenway overlay zone to include objective design standards that protect salmon habitat and fish passage within and along the Multnomah Channel. Coordinate with the Oregon Department of State Lands (DSL) to ensure compliance with the Endangered Species Act (ESA) through its in-water leasing program.</p> <p>2.1(c) Consider building, plumbing, electrical and mechanical standards for floating structures.</p> <p>2.1(d) As directed by Portland’s Bureau of Environmental Services and/or Oregon’s Department of Environmental Quality, marina owners must provide for safe and easy collection and disposal of sewage from marine uses in Multnomah Channel. (1) Require marinas with floating structures to meet state standards for sewage collection and disposal similar to those standards that apply to dwellings on land. (2) Boat slips serving boats with onboard cooking and/or sanitation facilities must be provided with an on-site mechanism for disposal of sewage, either through connections at each slip or through the availability of on-site alternative pump out facilities which are reasonably safe from accidental spillage.</p>	✓		✓		
<p>Policy 2.2 Maintain a current inventory of all marinas and moorages. Include all dwellings, boat slips, floating structures, live-aboards and supporting infrastructure in the inventory.</p>		✓			

Policy	PC Work Program	County Process - Operation Improvement	Agency or inter-departmental Coordination	Legislative Tracking	TSP
<p>Policy 2.3 Review consistency of definitions of floating home, houseboats, boathouses, live-aboards, combos, etc. used by agencies such as the Multnomah County Assessor, the City of Portland and the State when amending the Zoning Ordinance.</p>	✓		✓		
<p>Policy 2.4 Allow live-aboards to be used as full time residences within a marina and count the live-aboard slip in the total number of residences approved for the marina. This option requires Community Service (CS) approval and requires that boats meet health, safety, and environmental standards (i.e. electrical, water and sanitation) for occupied boats docked in a marina.</p>	✓		✓		
<p>Policy 2.5 Consider standards to allow temporary use of live-aboard boats within marinas. This option requires that boats meet health, safety, and environmental standards (i.e. electrical, water and sanitation) for occupied boats docked in a marina.</p>	✓		✓		
<p>Policy 2.6 Amend Comprehensive Plan Policy 26 to be consistent with policy 2.1.</p>	✓				
Natural and Cultural Resources					
<p>Policy 3.1 Collaborate and partner with private, public and non-profit organizations and tribes to address natural resource issues including but not limited to hydrology, climate change, changes in regional geography, wildlife and habitat conservation, restoration enhancement, educational programs and inventory of natural systems.</p>			✓		

Policy	PC Work Program	County Process - Operation Improvement	Agency or inter-departmental Coordination	Legislative Tracking	TSP
<p>Policy 3.2 Consider extending the Wildlife Habitat tax deferral to MUA-20 lands, and community-based restoration projects) that complement Multnomah County’s Goal 5 (Natural and Cultural Resources) and Goal 15 (Willamette River Greenway) regulatory programs.</p>	✓	✓	✓		
<p>*Policy 3.3 Coordinate with federal and state agencies, including National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries Division (NOAA Fisheries) in considering development of design standards that protect salmon habitat and fish passage within, and along the Multnomah Channel and tributaries and ensure compliance with the Endangered Species Act (ESA).</p>	✓		✓		
<p>*Policy 3.4 Update the surface water resources inventory, and associated riparian areas, and apply appropriate protections in compliance with Goal 5 requirements (based on an evaluation of economic, social, environmental and energy (ESEE) consequences).</p>	✓		✓		
<p>Policy 3.5 Consider exemptions and process efficiencies to provide and encourage fish and wildlife habitat restoration and enhancement projects on public and private lands conducted by natural resource public agencies such as Metro, Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation Districts and Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife.</p>	✓		✓		
<p>Policy 3.6 Multnomah County should work collaboratively with the Sauvie Island Drainage Improvement Company, state and federal agencies, and non-profit organizations to maintain the drainage and flood-control functions provided by the Company while restoring natural systems where appropriate.</p>			✓		

Policy	PC Work Program	County Process - Operation Improvement	Agency or inter-departmental Coordination	Legislative Tracking	TSP
<p>Policy 3.7 Consider a “dark sky” ordinance for the planning area and work with the City of Portland, Port of Portland, and other adjacent jurisdictions and agencies towards reducing light pollution from sources beyond the plan area.</p>	✓		✓		
<p>Policy 3.8 Support protection of cultural areas and archaeological resources and consider a process that includes notification protocols and standards to evaluate comments received from tribes and the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office.</p>	✓		✓		
<p>Policy 3.9 Support the inventory, recovery and protection of archaeological and cultural resources, and coordination with affected agencies during the land use process.</p>			✓		
<p>Policy 3.10 Consider standards to address comments received from SHPO and Native American Groups and support efforts to report the discovery of cultural resources to SHPO and the Native American groups.</p>	✓		✓		
<p>Policy 3.11 Encourage proposed development on areas of cultural significance to evaluate alternative sites or designs that reduce or eliminate impacts to the resource.</p>			✓		
<p>Policy 3.12 Recognize the heritage value of natural resources for Native American groups and encourage protection and restoration of historic wetlands, riparian areas, water bodies, and oak uplands. Encourage and support efforts for natural resource restoration and historic activities such as plant harvesting for heritage value.</p>			✓		

Policy	PC Work Program	County Process - Operation Improvement	Agency or inter-departmental Coordination	Legislative Tracking	TSP
<p>Policy 3.13 Continue to explore and encourage opportunities to conduct selected dredging to increase depth, flows, flushing, and circulation action in Sturgeon Lake in coordination with partner agencies and organizations.</p>			✓		
<p>Policy 3.14 The Multnomah County Health Department Vector Control staff is encouraged to coordinate with Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, using that agency’s map of sensitive areas and their Vector Control Guidance for Sensitive Areas to identify important habitat for sensitive species like red-legged frogs and painted turtles where an altered protocol should be used.</p> <p>The county's vector control staff are encouraged to act as a resource in efforts to educate and collaborate with landowners about natural means of mosquito control.</p>			✓		
<p>Policy 3.15 Recommend that any fill generated as a result of dredging activities be located on Sauvie Island only under the following conditions: (a) To assist in flood control (b) Not on designated wetlands (c) Not on high value farmland unless placement of such fill improves a farm's soils or productivity (d) In areas where it will not negatively impact wildlife habitat.</p>	✓				

Policy	PC Work Program	County Process - Operation Improvement	Agency or inter-departmental Coordination	Legislative Tracking	TSP
<p>Policy 3.16</p> <p>Review internal protocols related to road and right-of-way maintenance, including roadside hedgerow trimming and weed eradication. Work with the West Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District, ODFW and the Sauvie Island Habitat Partnership to protect wildlife, manage invasive plant species, to ensure that habitat and water resource restoration projects are coordinated with county road maintenance and drainage control programs.</p> <p>Ensure that non-profit organizations and property owners are aware of country programs that may limit wildlife habitat restoration projects, and that road county staff are aware of existing and completed habitat restoration projects when they conduct their operations.</p> <p>To implement this policy, the County Road Maintenance program will review the following recommendations:</p> <p>(a) Except in emergency situations, County road mowing should be done between August 15 and March 15 to minimize impact to nesting birds, and workers should avoid mowing at identified turtle, frog and salamander crossings during nesting season (May and September).</p> <p>(b) Culverts under county roads should be surveyed, then repaired and replaced as needed to limit barriers to fish and wildlife passage.</p> <p>(c) County staff should work with ODFW and the Sauvie Island Habitat Partnership to identify and mitigate in areas where concentrations of small wildlife cross county roads.</p>			✓		

Policy	PC Work Program	County Process - Operation Improvement	Agency or inter-departmental Coordination	Legislative Tracking	TSP
<p>(d) Mowing equipment should be regularly cleaned so that seeds of invasive plants are not spread into areas where they have not yet been introduced.</p> <p>(e) County staff should confer with the West Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District on best management practices before removing invasive weeds along road right-of-way.</p> <p>(f) County staff should be trained to recognize invasive and desirable native plant species; Multnomah County should prioritize plant species for control.</p> <p>(g) County staff should inform property owners of the existing Owner Vegetation Maintenance Agreement, which allows abutting property owners to maintain right-of-way vegetation.</p>			✓		
Public and Semi-Public Facilities					
<p>Policy 4.1</p> <p>Cooperate with state and local agencies to address drainage, flood control, and roadway functions of existing levees while restoring natural systems where appropriate.</p> <p>Provide notice to the Drainage Company of any proposed code amendment or development on lands on and/or adjacent to Drainage Company infrastructure.</p>		✓	✓		✓
<p>Policy 4.2</p> <p>Continue to coordinate with Metro to ensure compliance with Rural Reserve designations, implementation of Metro’s Greenspaces Master Plan and planning for Howell Park. In particular, work with Metro to:</p> <p>(a) Ensure activities will complement natural and environmental resources of local and regional significance; and</p> <p>(b) Ensure that Howell Territorial Park uses and improvements maintain harmony with the rural character of the plan area as well as natural and cultural resources.</p>			✓		

Policy	PC Work Program	County Process - Operation Improvement	Agency or inter-departmental Coordination	Legislative Tracking	TSP
<p>Policy 4.3 Support only those recreational activities within the rural plan area that are complimentary to and do not negatively impact natural and environmental resources on Sauvie Island and along the Multnomah Channel and its tributaries that are identified in Goal 5 and in the Metro Greenspaces Master Plan and lands approved in Metro's Acquisition Refinement Plan.</p>			✓		
Transportation					
<p>Policy 5.1 The Multnomah County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee should maintain continuous Sauvie Island representation to the extent possible.</p>		✓			
<p>Policy 5.2 Identify and implement short- and long- term solutions to safely accommodate bicyclists, pedestrians, and motor vehicles on Sauvie Island including on-road bikeways, separated multi-use paths, and funding options.</p>		✓	✓		✓
<p>Policy 5.3 Oppose placement of new regional roadways in the Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel Rural Area, should such roadways be contemplated by any regional transportation authority in the future.</p>				✓	
<p>Policy 5.4 Consider context sensitive design when reviewing rural roadway standards to determine appropriate paved shoulder widths to preserve the rural character of roads. Shoulder widening should aim to achieve a minimum 3 foot paved width.</p>		✓	✓		✓
<p>Policy 5.5 Coordinate with ODOT Rail and Public Transit Division to promote appropriate safety devices at crossings.</p>	✓	✓	✓		✓

Policy	PC Work Program	County Process - Operation Improvement	Agency or inter-departmental Coordination	Legislative Tracking	TSP
<p>*Policy 5.6 Coordinate with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) and Columbia County to manage and reduce demand on the Sauvie Island transportation system, especially during peak use periods, by making more efficient use of capacity on the system through strategies such as user fees, shuttles, and parking management programs.</p>		✓	✓		✓
<p>Policy 5.7 Promote a transportation system that prioritizes and supports the efficient and safe movement of farm vehicles and equipment.</p>					✓
<p>Policy 5.8 Maintain and improve the transportation system for all modes of travel that reduce conflict and minimize impacts to the natural environment, and reflects the community's rural character while ensuring efficiency and connectivity.</p>		✓	✓		✓
<p>*Policy 5.9 Implement a range of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) policies encouraging existing businesses and requiring new development (beyond single family residential use and agricultural uses) to help reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT), maximize use of existing facilities, increase walking, biking and transit use and alleviate congestion on US 30 and county roads caused by seasonal and special event traffic.</p>	✓	✓	✓		✓
<p>Policy 5.10 Work with the Oregon Office of Emergency Management, Multnomah County Emergency Management and Multnomah County rural fire protection district to ensure that the transportation system supports effective responses to emergencies and disasters.</p>		✓	✓		✓

Policy	PC Work Program	County Process - Operation Improvement	Agency or inter-departmental Coordination	Legislative Tracking	TSP
<p>Policy 5.11 Promote effective use of signage designed to educate the public about farm equipment using roadways, wildlife crossings and bicycle and pedestrian safety and additional way finding signage.</p>		✓	✓		✓
<p>Policy 5.12 Coordinate and work with transit agencies and service providers to identify existing transit deficiencies and the improvements necessary to increase access to transit services by potential users.</p>		✓	✓		✓

PART XI. EXHIBITS

Exhibit A: Sauvie Island/Multnomah RAP

Exhibit B: T2-2013-3238

Exhibit C: Written Testimony

Exhibit D: Links to Appendices (Background Reports)