

BEFORE THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
OF MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

In the matter of adopting the Sauvie Island/Multnomah) RESOLUTION
Channel Rural Area Plan Scoping Report C 6-95) 95-220
)

WHEREAS, in 1993, the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners directed the Planning Division to begin the Rural Area Planning Program to address land use issues faced by the rural areas of Multnomah County; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners requested five rural area plans, one being the Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel Rural Area; and

WHEREAS, County Planning Division staff has conducted meetings with key stakeholders, held interviews with other governmental agencies, solicited written comment and conducted a Community Open House on Sauvie Island in order to gain input on major issues facing Multnomah County; and

WHEREAS, the attached Scoping Report represents all of the issues identified by key stakeholders, other governmental agencies, the residents, and the Planning Commission for the Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel Rural Area Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission conducted a Public Hearing on August 7, 1995 and has forwarded a recommendation to adopt the Scoping Report;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Multnomah Board of Commissioners adopts the attached Scoping Report, containing issues to be addressed in the Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel Rural Area Plan.

APPROVED this 10th day of October, 1995.



By 
BEVERLY STEIN, CHAIR
MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

REVIEWED:

JOHN DUBAY, CHIEF ASSISTANT COUNTY COUNSEL
for MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

By: 
JOHN L. DUBAY

SAUVIE ISLAND/MULTNOMAH CHANNEL RURAL AREA PLAN

SCOPING REPORT

AUGUST, 1995

Prepared for: Multnomah County
Department of Environmental Services
Division of Planning and Development
2115 SE Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97214

Prepared by: Cogan Owens Cogan
10 NW Tenth Avenue
Portland, OR 97209-3120

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
A. Introduction	1
B. Agency Scoping	2
C. Stakeholder Scoping	5
D. Newsletter Questionnaire	8
E. Planning Commission Scoping	10
F. Open House	11
G. Common Themes	20
H. Issues Recommended for Analysis	21
a. Issues to be Addressed in the Plan	
b. Issues to be Referred to Other Agencies	
c. Issues Beyond the Scope of the Plan	
Appendices	
A. Compilation of Agency Questionnaire Responses	A-1
B. Compilation of Stakeholder Questionnaire Responses	B-1
C. Compilation of Newsletter Questionnaire Responses	C-1
D. Compilation of Open House Questionnaire Responses	D-1

A. INTRODUCTION

The Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel Rural Area Plan is the third in a series of land use plans for five rural areas in Multnomah County. Last year, the County completed and is currently in the adoption process for the West Hills Rural Area Plan. Development of rural area plans is part of the process of updating the Comprehensive Plan to address the state requirement that plans be updated and maintained to meet state mandates and reflect changing conditions. These planning efforts are intended to provide policy direction for rural, unincorporated areas, including how to accommodate predicted growth while preserving the qualities of livability that draw people to the area. The plans may result in development of new implementation measures or new ways of using existing measures to carry out rural area plans. Plans are expected to take about six to nine months each to develop, with the entire process completed in three years.

Planning Area

The Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel Rural Area includes those portions of Sauvie Island and the Multnomah Channel within Multnomah County. The Plan area is bounded by U.S. Highway 30 on the west, Columbia County on the north, the Columbia River on the east, and the Willamette River and the city of Portland on the south. The area is dominated by agricultural uses and a wildlife refuge, with various water-related uses on and along Multnomah Channel, ranging from protected wetlands to marinas.

The majority of the planning area is designated in the Comprehensive Plan as Exclusive Farm Use (EFU), with the remainder designated as Multiple Use Agriculture (MUA).

Scoping Process

Scoping is the process of identifying issues to be addressed in a planning project. The scoping process for the Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel Rural Area Plan began in May, 1995 with an agency scoping meeting and will conclude in Fall 1995 with approval by the County Board of Commissioners of the issues to be analyzed in the Plan.

Scoping activities have included:

- ♦ Agency scoping through both a questionnaire mailed to 84 local, state, regional, federal and Tribal agency representatives and a scoping meeting conducted on May 22, 1995;
- ♦ Stakeholder scoping through both a questionnaire mailed to 43 key stakeholder groups and a scoping meeting conducted on June 8, 1995;
- ♦ Planning Commission scoping at its May 3, 1995 meeting; and
- ♦ Public scoping through both a questionnaire included as part of a newsletter mailed to all addresses in the planning area and an open house conducted on June 13, 1995.

The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on a Draft Scoping Report on August 7, 1995. This document represents the Commission's Recommended Scoping Report.

Note: Scoping is an ongoing process and additional issues may be identified during Plan development.

Report Purpose and Organization

The purpose of this report is to (1) provide a compilation of all potential issues identified through scoping, (2) identify common themes among those issues, and (3) recommend issues for analysis in the Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel Rural Area Plan.

The report first presents a summary of issues identified by source, e.g. agency scoping and open house. These summaries are followed by an identification of common themes among all issues and then by recommendations on those issues to carry forward for analysis. Complete compilations of issues by source are included as appendices. Attached are copies of the newsletter, press release announcing the open house, open house program, and other scoping-related materials.

B. AGENCY SCOPING

The first step in the scoping process involved inviting 84 local, state, regional, federal and Tribal agency representatives to participate in an agency scoping meeting and/or complete a scoping issues questionnaire. The following six agencies participated in the May 22, 1995 meeting, conducted at the offices of the County Division of Planning and Development:

- ♦ Multnomah County Division of Planning and Development
- ♦ Multnomah County Division of Transportation
- ♦ Sauvie Island Drainage District
- ♦ Commissioner Saltzman's Office
- ♦ Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
- ♦ Scappoose Rural Fire District

In addition, completed questionnaires were received from the following eight agencies. A compilation of questionnaire responses is included as Appendix A.

- ♦ Sauvie Island Drainage District
- ♦ Natural Resources Conservation District
- ♦ USDA Forest Service
- ♦ Multnomah County Sheriff's Office
- ♦ Multnomah County Transportation Planning
- ♦ Historic Preservation Office, Oregon State Parks & Recreation
- ♦ Bonneville Power Administration

◆ Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department

The scoping issues which follow represent a combination of issues identified at the agency scoping meeting and through agency scoping questionnaires. (There is no prioritization associated with the order in which these issues are listed.)

a. Overall Issues

1. Recreation management

- ◆ Recognition/management of area as regional destination
 - High demand due to urban area proximity
- ◆ Access to recreational sites
 - Need for additional education, e.g., kiosks
 - Recreation guide to facilities/access points

2. Coordination with other land management programs

- ◆ ODFW refuge plan, including refuge carrying capacity
- ◆ Marine Board study of Multnomah Channel
- ◆ State Parks & Recreation resource data and trail planning
- ◆ Metro Greenspaces Plan
- ◆ DEQ non-point source pollution study
- ◆ Prior agreements on up-river issues that could affect the planning area

3. Overlapping jurisdictions, e.g. Multnomah and Columbia Counties

4. Equal representation in the process by Island and Channel residents and businesses

5. Wetland/riparian enhancement

6. Prehistoric and historic cultural resources

- ## ◆ Master Plan for Howell Territorial Park

7. Public services

- ◆ Need for additional law enforcement
- ◆ Need for consistent emergency response plan

b. Sauvie Island-Specific Issues

8. Transportation

- ◆ Safe and convenient access
- ◆ Accommodating all modes, including bicycle and pedestrian
 - Pedestrian Plan being developed
 - Bicycle Plan has been prepared
- ◆ Upgrading roads to rural standards

- Widening of Sauvie Island Road proposed
 - ♦ Congestion during peak periods
 - ♦ Need for safety improvements at high accident locations
9. Protection/maintenance of drainage ditches
 - ♦ Protection of right-of-ways to drainage ditches/structures
 - Notification to Drainage District of structures proposed within 100 feet
 - ♦ Trespass in drainage ditches
 - ♦ Burning and use of carp as maintenance options
 - ♦ Spoils disposal
 10. Maintenance of the area's rural character
 - ♦ Protecting commercial farmland
 - Limits on additional non-resource development
 - Maintaining tax deferral programs
 - ♦ Protection of open space
 11. User conflicts
 - ♦ Beach access across private land
 - ♦ Conflicts between hunting and watchable wildlife
- c. Multnomah Channel-Specific Issues**
12. Conflicts among various waterway users
 - ♦ Conflicts between recreational and commercial boating
 13. Conflicts between moorage residents and waterway users
 - ♦ Impacts of no-wake zones on general public use of waterways
 14. Emergency services to moorages/marinas
 - ♦ Adequacy of rural road standards for emergency access
 - ♦ Need for required fire protection measures for marinas
 15. Zoning/land use regulations
 - ♦ Providing opportunities for moorage/marina expansions
 - ♦ Identification of infill areas
 - ♦ Addressing illegal expansions
 16. Design standards for housing/boat houses to protect visual quality
 17. Need for Multnomah Channel management plan (per Lower Willamette River Management Plan)

18. Impacts to wildlife habitat from waterway uses
 - ◆ Protection of remaining undisturbed wildlife corridors
 - ◆ Effects of marinas/moorages on shallow water habitat for migrating juvenile salmonids
19. Erosion caused by boating
20. Access to waterfront development across railroad/crossings
21. Protection of Burlington Bottom natural area

C. STAKEHOLDER SCOPING

Input from 43 key stakeholder groups was solicited through a questionnaire mailing and through a stakeholder scoping meeting conducted on June 8, 1995 at the offices of the County Division of Planning and Development. Participating in the scoping meeting were:

- ◆ Waterfront Owners and Operators of Oregon
- ◆ Oregon Landowners and Waterfowlers
- ◆ Oregon Farm Bureau
- ◆ Burlington Water District/Larson's Marina
- ◆ A-1 Moorage
- ◆ River Bend Marina
- ◆ Casselman's Cove
- ◆ Happy Rock Moorage

Completed questionnaires were received from the following three groups. A compilation of questionnaire responses is included as Appendix B.

- ◆ BTA (Bicycle Transportation Alliance)
- ◆ FORCE (Friends of Retaining the Channel Environment)
- ◆ Waterfront Owners and Operators of Oregon

Issues identified include the following. (There is no prioritization associated with the order in which these issues are listed.)

a. Overall Issues

1. Maintaining the area's existing character while planning for future growth
 - ◆ Limitations on additional development, particularly large-scale commercial uses
 - ◆ Maintaining rural farmland
 - ◆ Preserving open space
 - ◆ Defining growth areas, types of growth

- Where land divisions allowed

2. Consistency in regulations
 - ♦ Clearly defining applicable regulations
 - ♦ Myriad of regulatory agencies
 - ♦ Notification of regulatory changes
3. Overlapping jurisdiction with Columbia County
 - ♦ Opportunities for additional public lands
 - ♦ Annexation of north half of Island to Multnomah County
4. Property rights
 - ♦ Defining impacts of regulations on property rights prior to adoption
 - ♦ Limiting public access across private properties
 - ♦ Defining public access expectations, e.g., trails, from water, from parking
 - ♦ Setasides for public uses, e.g. trails, wetland preservation
5. Protection of business investments
6. Balancing public and private services/uses
7. Need for additional law enforcement, especially in summer at beaches
 - ♦ Joint services with Columbia County
 - ♦ Mutual aid agreements
8. Wetlands protection
 - ♦ Requirements for wetlands protection on public vs. private lands
9. Wildlife protection
 - ♦ Preservation of existing open space as habitat
 - ♦ Conflicts between wildlife habitat protection and recreational access
10. Water quality
 - ♦ City sewage overflow effects on water quality
11. Growth in Highway 30 traffic
- b. Sauvie Island-Specific Issues**
12. Protection of high value farmlands
 - ♦ Impacts of residential uses on adjacent agricultural uses
 - ♦ Division of farmlands for relatives

13. Transportation system
 - ♦ What improvements are planned
 - ♦ Conflicts between autos and bikes
14. Better management of state lands to reduce geese impacts on private lands
- c. **Multnomah Channel-Specific Issues**
15. Study per Lower Willamette River Management Plan to define uses, regulations
 - ♦ Effects of Urban Reserves on Multnomah Channel area
 - ♦ Effects of West Hills Plan on this planning area
 - ♦ Effects of addition of Lower Columbia River to the National Estuary Program
16. Expansion of existing waterfront development
 - ♦ Maximizing existing areas through controlled growth and infill
 - ♦ Expanding in existing area vs. areas zoned for marine wildlife
 - ♦ Need for additional marina services to respond to growth in boating
17. Marine zoning
 - ♦ Zoning that recognizes all viable marine uses and clearly identifies allowable uses, e.g. MUM -- multi-use marine
 - ♦ Allowance of dry docking facilities on uplands
 - ♦ Simplified permitting process
 - ♦ Clarification of definition of floating structures
18. Potential DSL lease terminations
19. Need for additional law enforcement
 - ♦ Refuse, transient boaters, especially in middle stretch of Channel
 - Lack of response to enforcement requests
 - Navigation hazards
 - ♦ Security factor provided by houseboat/marina mix
 - ♦ Speed limit enforcement
20. Sewage pump out for boaters
 - ♦ Marine Board intentions re: pump out facilities
21. Dike erosion

D. NEWSLETTER QUESTIONNAIRE

A newsletter, with a scoping questionnaire, was mailed to all addresses in the planning area. The newsletter explained the rural area planning process, described the Sauvie

Island/Multnomah Channel planning area and current land uses, and announced the Community Open House.

Thirty-two (32) questionnaires were returned. A compilation of questionnaire responses is provided as Appendix C. Issues identified include the following. (There is no prioritization associated with the order in which these issues are listed.)

a. Overall Issues

1. Managing growth to ensure its compatability with the area's rural character
 - ♦ Focusing growth to developable areas
 - ♦ Balancing resource, business and recreation needs
 - ♦ Restricting polluting industries
 - ♦ Avoiding sprawl between Portland and Scappoose
 - ♦ Accomodating recreation demand without further impacting the area's livability
2. Retaining the area's rural character
 - ♦ Maintaining rural densities
 - ♦ Limiting large-scale commercial development
3. Natural resource protection
 - ♦ Protection of wildlife values
 - ♦ Protection of scenic values
 - ♦ Wetlands preservation/restoration
 - ♦ Water quality
 - Monitoring contaminants
 - Notification of spraying
4. Wildlife area management
 - ♦ Protection of wildlife refuge from incompatible uses
 - ♦ Redirecting non-wildlife oriented recreation to other areas
5. Transportation planning to address current and future needs
 - ♦ Increased traffic on Highway 30
 - Need for additional speed enforcement
 - Accommodating pedestrian safety crossings
 - ♦ Traffic congestion
 - ♦ Inability of large trucks to enter/exit bridge from single traffic lane
 - widening of bridge on-ramps
 - ♦ Pedestrian safety
 - ♦ Banning jake brakes on bridges
 - ♦ Public transportation needs

6. Increasing recreational demand
 - ♦ Need for comprehensive recreation plan
 - ♦ Providing additional multiple-use locations to meet growth demands
 - Funding additional recreational facilities through a use fee/bridge toll
 - ♦ Preserving hunting and fishing opportunities
 - ♦ Accommodation of additional recreational uses
 - Designating dog training areas
 - Providing additional mountain bike and equestrian trails
 - Providing additional beach access and parking
7. Zoning/land use regulations
 - ♦ Inconsistency in granting variances
 - ♦ Inconsistent enforcement
 - ♦ Flexibility in land use regulations
8. Public services
 - ♦ Continuing/expanding law enforcement activities
 - Control of inappropriate activities, e.g. nude beach
9. Property rights
 - ♦ Additional restrictions on the use of private property
 - Use restrictions which convert private lands into de-facto refuge areas

b. Sauvie Island-Specific Issues

10. Agricultural lands
 - ♦ Providing smaller minimum lot sizes
 - ♦ Maintaining current minimum lot sizes
 - ♦ Allowing development of smaller, non-productive farm parcels
11. Role of light industrial development
12. Managing traffic
 - ♦ Managing traffic flow, especially during peak periods
 - ♦ Limiting additional sport runs due to narrow road widths
 - ♦ Conflicts between agricultural operations and visitors
 - ♦ Permit parking
13. Bicycle/pedestrian uses
 - ♦ Bicycle/pedestrian path/trails around the island, to get bicyclists off roads
 - ♦ Avoiding development of costly, ineffective bicycle paths
 - ♦ Controlling the amount of bicycle traffic
14. Reintroduction of white-tailed deer

c. Multnomah Channel-Specific Issues

15. Designation of areas for marina/moorage development
 - ◆ Designation of areas for future development
 - ◆ Limiting additional development to protect remaining waterfront open spaces
 - ◆ Need for a management plan per Lower Willamette River Management Plan
16. Conflicts between houseboats and water traffic
 - ◆ Speed limit enforcement
 - ◆ Additional river patrols
 - ◆ Excessive waterway usage
17. Inappropriate application of MUA zoning to Channel area

E. PLANNING COMMISSION SCOPING

Planning and Development Division staff and the consultant briefed the Planning Commission on the planning process at its May 1, 1995 meeting. The Commission identified the following preliminary issues:

a. Overall Issues

1. Polarization between Channel and Island residents
2. Conflicts/shared issues with the West Hills Plan
3. Role/impacts of serving as regional recreation destination area
4. Public safety
 - ◆ Increased crime due to urban area proximity
5. Decreasing wildlife populations
6. Rural versus urban value system
 - ◆ Planning driven by urban value system
7. Cultural resources
 - ◆ Native American heritage/unique sites
 - ◆ Lack of access to historic resources
8. Lack of public facilities
 - ◆ Signage
 - ◆ Need for additional facilities to serve increased visitation

9. User conflicts
 - ♦ Boaters vs. houseboat owners
 - ♦ Canoeists vs. hunters
 - ♦ Residents vs. recreationists
 - ♦ Agriculture vs. recreationists
 - ♦ Beach users, e.g. nudists
10. Lack of rural commercial center
- b. Sauvie Island-Specific Issues**
11. Alternative uses for large agricultural parcels
 - ♦ Potential for golf courses
12. Activities which promote urban intrusions, e.g. agricultural operations which bring in part-time workers
13. Role of Refuge
14. Traffic impacts associated with agricultural retail operations
15. Bicycle traffic
 - ♦ Lack of paths, signage
 - ♦ Conflicts with automobiles
16. Rollerblade use of roads
17. Noise, odors from agricultural operations
- c. Multnomah Channel-Specific Issues**
18. Increased boat traffic
20. Potential/need for additional marine facilities

The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on a Draft Scoping Report on August 7, 1995. This document represents the Commission's Recommended Scoping Report.

F. OPEN HOUSE

A community open house was held on June 13 from 4 to 8 pm, at Sauvie Island School. Approximately 65 persons attended. The purpose of the open house was to provide information on the planning process and to solicit public comments on the key issues to be

addressed in the plan. Notification of the open house was provided through a newsletter mailed to all addresses within the planning area, press releases, and notice in the *Sauvie Island Outlook*.

The open house program included a variety of activities:

- ♦ Live/work map -- using dots, attendees indicated where they lived and worked;
- ♦ Maps of existing uses, zoning and Comprehensive Plan designations for the planning area;
- ♦ Site-specific issues -- using stickies, participants identified site-specific issues on a map of the planning area;
- ♦ Issue priorities -- using dots, participants prioritized the preliminary issues identified through agency and planning commission scoping; additional issues to be considered were also identified;
- ♦ Miscellaneous questions -- attendees responded to flipchart questions regarding the effects of growth on the area's economy, transportation system, and land uses;
- ♦ Small group discussions; and
- ♦ Questionnaires -- participants completed a questionnaire similar to that in the scoping newsletter.

Input received on scoping issues is organized below by type of activity. Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of times the issue was raised.

Site-Specific Issues

- ♦ Air quality problems
- ♦ Toxic waste dumping at south tip of Island
- ♦ Brewery dumping
- ♦ Drunk drivers coming back from beaches cause accidents
- ♦ Garbage on all beaches
- ♦ Opposed to rails to trails
- ♦ Massive road safety and parking problems would result from converting railroad to trail
- ♦ Yes for Rails-to-Trails
- ♦ Angell Brothers quarry creates silt on roadway every day (2)
- ♦ Waste from ocean-going ships in the river
- ♦ Pedestrian crossing needed at Reeder & Charlton Roads
- ♦ Keep waterfront undeveloped in Burlington Bottoms area

- ♦ High boat traffic/noisy boat traffic conflicts with residential (houseboat) livability, esp. jetskis, loud fishing boats at 5 am (2)
- ♦ Speeding boats too close to houseboats cause wake problems, safety problems
- ♦ Boats going much too fast in lower portion of Channel
- ♦ Need better signs re: wake problems and better enforcement

Issue Priorities

1. Prioritization

Participants were asked to prioritize preliminary scoping issues identified through agency scoping and by the Planning Commission. Each participant was provided with three dots for "voting" on priorities.

Issues	Responses	
	Number	Percent
Conflicts among a variety of uses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Boaters vs. houseboat owners - Wildlife viewing vs. hunting - Residents vs. recreationists - Recreational vs. commercial boating 	27	14.7
Protection of the area's rural character	18	9.7
Conflicts between autos and bike/pedestrians	18	9.7
Wildlife protection	17	9.2
Maintaining the integrity of dikes and drainage ditches <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preventing trespass - Preventing erosion 	15	8.1
Controlling public access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly defining public access points 	14	7.6
Better management of state lands to reduce impacts on private lands	13	7.0
Wetland preservation and enhancement	12	6.5
Recognition/management of the area as a regional recreation destination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of public facilities - Need for additional educational materials, e.g. kiosks and guides to facilities/access points 	11	6.0
Traffic improvements to accommodate increasing visitation	11	6.0
Need for a Multnomah Channel management plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly defining what regulations apply where 	8	4.3

Protection of high value farmland	8	4.3
Public safety, i.e. need for additional law enforcement	3	1.6
Protection of cultural resources	2	1.1
Development of Howell Territorial Park	2	1.1
Establishment of a new recreation marine zone	2	1.1
Expansion of existing marina and moorage facilities/need for additional facilities	2	1.1
Problems with overlapping jurisdictions, e.g. Multnomah and Columbia Counties	1	0.9
Traffic impacts associated with retail agricultural operations	0	0
Emergency access to moorages/marinas	0	0
Design standards for housing/boat houses to protect visual quality	0	0
TOTAL	184	100

2. Other Issues

In addition to the issues prioritized above, participants requested that the planning process address the following:

- ♦ Bicycles
 - Roads too narrow for bikes -- bikers have no respect for autos.
- ♦ Protect private property owners rights. (2)
- ♦ Heavy industry on island
- ♦ Pollution
 - Waste ash deposit near Alder Creek Lumber
 - Why are breweries allowed to dump waste out here -- does it improve water quality?
- ♦ Bridge light cannot be seen safely southbound on Hwy 30.
- ♦ Better wildlife viewing areas.
- ♦ Is this the plan in final form until 2040 plus -- or is it the beginning of further agendas?
- ♦ Improve relationship between assessed land value and actual value of farmland for agricultural protection.
- ♦ State conflicts and financial interest vs. farming.
- ♦ User fees for recreation users (limit numbers and impacts.)
- ♦ No rails to trails. (5)
- ♦ Liability to property owner -- "no more liable than are now" per lawyer for Metro. That means you're plenty liable!
- ♦ Excess of hunting vs. wildlife viewing.

Miscellaneous Questions

1. **What are the most important issues related to the effects of growth on the area's transportation system?**
 - ◆ Conflicts between autos and bicyclists
 - ◆ Access to the island
 - ◆ Rails-to-Trails will destroy rural nature. How can people not have favorable zoning for homes, but Metro can operate outside of boundaries and put tens of thousands of people on foot on the abandoned railroad?
 - ◆ I do not have a problem with the bicycles (I live on the island.) I do have a problem with the number of cars, the speed they drive, and the lack of consideration for cyclists and pedestrians.
 - ◆ We love bicycles! We love hiking trails!
 - ◆ I would like to see a lowered speed limit for cars, or at least more enforcement for the present speed limit.
2. **What are the most important issues related to the effects of growth on the area's economy?**
 - ◆ More retail agricultural operations
 - ◆ Commercial facilities for tourists
3. **What are the most important issues related to the effects of growth on the area's land uses?**
 - ◆ Protection of agricultural lands (2)
 - ◆ Zoning to forbid forced trails
 - ◆ Protect agricultural uses consistent with wildlife habitat
 - ◆ Air pollution and noise from BW Feed
 - ◆ More bicycle-only trails/paths
 - ◆ Land use laws (zoning laws) to protect natural environment and rural atmosphere

Small Group Issues

- a. **Overall Issues**
 - ◆ Increased Highway 30 traffic with Columbia County growth
 - ◆ Access to Island on north end
 - Potential for ferries
 - ◆ Protection of property owner rights (3)
 - Limit government intervention to public properties
 - Restricting public access to private property -- footpath, crime, liability, submerged/submersible rights

- ◆ Resolving conflicts between property owners and recreational users
- ◆ Limiting recreation/new development (3)
- ◆ Noise
- ◆ Capacity to accommodate increasing recreational use
- ◆ Limiting/charging for access
- ◆ Problems associated with growth
 - Garbage, sewer, crime, liability issues
- ◆ Maintaining the area's rural character (2)
- ◆ Outsiders dictating planning for the area
 - Ability to vote on Metro actions
- ◆ Wildlife habitat protection (2)
- ◆ Effects on historic uses
- ◆ Education on why the area is a special place
- ◆ Policing of dogs to reduce wildlife impacts
- ◆ Bicycling
 - Potential for bicycle permit fees
 - Make riding two abreast/drafting behind illegal
 - Develop bike paths
 - Advertise other, better places to ride
 - Limit bicycling to specific areas
- ◆ Controlling access
 - Education about other opportunities, e.g. brochures
 - Establish parking controls/limits
 - Assessment of whether user fees have really lowered visitation numbers
 - Bridge toll
 - Lottery for users
 - Signage re: no gas on island
- ◆ Education about where resources are/aren't
- ◆ Designate areas to focus recreational use
 - Develop another beach along Columbia to relieve pressures
 - Develop Government Island as a recreation area to relieve pressures
 - Examine where additional growth most appropriate
- ◆ Lack of interagency coordination
- ◆ Development of wildlife areas -- priority for wildlife vs. people
- ◆ Reduce bank erosion
- ◆ Weekend transportation

b. Sauvie Island-Specific Issues

- ◆ Conflicts between recreation and agriculture
- ◆ Excessive recreational automobile traffic for the area's roads
- ◆ Maintenance of dikes and drainage system
- ◆ Industrial uses near tip of Island
- ◆ Problems along dike road

- Safety on dike road with bicycles and parked vehicles
- ♦ Maintain rural character
 - Maintain agricultural land base
 - Emphasize wildlife refuge
 - Continue wildlife protection
 - Ensure taxation protects agricultural uses, e.g. maintain deferrals
- ♦ Bicycling
 - Roads are inadequate for bicyclists
 - Lack of bicycle paths
 - Bicycle/auto conflicts increasing, roads too narrow, rollerblades too
- ♦ Bridge
 - Bridge not earthquake safe
 - Bridge is inadequate
- ♦ Public transportation
- ♦ Speeding traffic
 - Speed limits lowered/established -- enforcement
- ♦ Continue ODFW management of refuge
- ♦ Dumping by ESCO of waste
- ♦ Emergency access problems getting off the island

c. Multnomah County-Specific Issues

- ♦ Boat traffic impacts on Channel residents
- ♦ Navigational problems -- Channel depth
 - Dredging/log removal
- ♦ Industrial traffic on Channel
- ♦ Water quality problems
 - Pollution from recreational boat traffic
 - Pollution from houseboats
 - Portland sewage overflows
- ♦ Conflicts between recreational boaters, residences, wildlife areas
 - Recreational boating impacts on Burlington Bottoms
- ♦ Incompatible recreational activities -- jet-skis, water skiing, loud motorboats
- ♦ Public access
 - Public access for fishermen and boaters
 - Trespass of moorages and private properties due to lack of public access
 - BN railroad limits access
- ♦ Compatability of proposed Burlington Bottoms trail with industrial areas and wildlife areas
- ♦ Overuse of waterway
- ♦ Reduce boat speeds/no wake zones
- ♦ Role of moorages in protecting embankments
- ♦ Zoning which allows expansion of existing marinas/moorages
- ♦ Privatizing of waterway

- ♦ Better define where development can/cannot occur
- ♦ Burlington Bottom management plan
- ♦ More policing
 - Boat stationed in Channel or authorize other enforcement measures
- ♦ Create more public waterfront access in downtown Portland to reduce demand in this area
- ♦ Bank erosion

Questionnaire Responses

A total of 15 questionnaires were completed at the open house or returned by mail. Issues identified include the following. (There is no prioritization associated with the order in which these issues are listed.) A compilation of responses is provided as Appendix D.

a. Overall Issues

1. Private property rights
 - ♦ Limiting land condemnation
 - ♦ Limiting additional land use regulations
2. Recreation uses
 - ♦ Accommodating growth while protecting resource values
 - ♦ Controlling public access
 - Designating adequate areas for public use to prevent private property impacts
 - ♦ Limiting development of public facilities
 - Limiting additional trail development
3. Transportation system
 - ♦ Traffic conflicts on both land and water
 - ♦ Inadequacy of roads to accommodate increased uses
 - ♦ Traffic safety
 - Speeding
 - Emergency access
4. Conflicts between residents and visitors
5. Preservation of rural character
6. Protection of fish and wildlife habitat
7. Protection of wetlands and riparian areas

8. Public safety
 - ♦ Controlling crime, vandalism, refuse dumping, trespassing
9. Designating alternative areas for recreational development, e.g., Government Island, to reduce demand in this area
10. Flood control

b. Sauvie Island-Specific Issues

11. Protection of resource lands
 - ♦ Limiting heavy industry
 - ♦ Development of lands unsuitable for resource uses
 - ♦ Conflicts between agricultural operations and recreational uses
 - ♦ No limitations on forestry
12. Environmental contamination
 - ♦ Limit additional pollution by existing industries, e.g., B&W Feed, Alder Creek Lumber, waste ash depository
 - ♦ Air and noise pollution
 - ♦ Toxic waste dumping
13. Conflicts between wildlife recreation and hunting
14. Bicycles
 - ♦ Adequate bicycle paths to reduce auto conflicts
 - ♦ Limiting additional bicycles
 - ♦ Establishing bicycle permit fees or increasing parking permit fee

c. Multnomah Channel-Specific Issues

15. Overuse of waterway
 - ♦ Conflicts among waterway users
 - ♦ Overcrowding, unsafe watercraft operations, noise, speeding, illegal uses
 - ♦ More policing at peak times
16. Land use regulations
 - ♦ Need for consistency, security to existing businesses
 - ♦ Designation of areas for growth and protected from growth
 - ♦ Enforcement of existing regulations
 - ♦ Zoning which reflects marine uses rather than MUA
 - ♦ Adequate notice of proposed regulations
 - ♦ Permit expansion of existing businesses, limit growth of new commercial facilities

17. Water quality
 - ◆ Houseboat and watercraft waste pollution
 - ◆ Sewer overflows
 - ◆ Effects of pollution on wildlife
18. Bank erosion
 - ◆ Effects of deepening channel
19. Impacts of marina/moorage development
 - ◆ Fish and wildlife habitat impacts
 - ◆ Reduction in public water surface
20. Public access
 - ◆ Limiting additional public access
21. Regulation of marina moorage doublestacking in channel
22. Regulation of illegal squatters
 - ◆ Remove abandoned boats
23. Plan for increasing Channel use of all kinds

G. COMMON THEMES

This section identifies the common themes among the issues identified through the various scoping forums.

Accommodating Recreational Uses and Visitors

Participants in all scoping forums commented on conflicts between recreational users and area residents. Recreational opportunities such as boating, wildlife viewing, bicycling and hiking attract a significant number of visitors from the Portland metropolitan area. However, increased recreational use can negatively impact the area's natural resources and public infrastructure (roads, bridges, etc.).

Protection of Natural Resources

There is broad appreciation for the value of the area's natural resources and concern with preventing their degradation. Specific recommendations include protecting wetlands, reducing pollution, alleviating impacts on wildlife, enhancing wildlife viewing opportunities, and preventing erosion of river banks.

Waterway User Conflicts

Conflicts among waterway users, particularly between moorage residents and recreational boaters, are cited as a growing problem. Specific issues include riverbank erosion, water pollution, noise, effects of boat wakes, impacts on wildlife and safety concerns. A consistent request is for comprehensive management planning for the Channel that involves all the appropriate management/regulatory agencies and that clearly designates where future development can/cannot occur.

Preservation of Rural Character

Residents and visitors alike value the area's rural character. However, population growth as well as increasing recreational use, threaten to diminish it. Preserving open space, maintaining agricultural uses, and limiting population growth and urban/suburban sprawl are recommended to preserve the area's rural character.

Managing Increasing Traffic of all Types

According to scoping process participants, automobile and bicycle traffic on the Island has increased significantly in recent years. Most roads in the area are relatively narrow and do not easily accommodate large volumes of traffic or significant numbers of both bicyclists and cars. Residents report frequent conflicts between bicycles and automobiles, increasing traffic congestion and traffic safety concerns.

Access to Public Lands

Access to recreational and other public facilities presents difficulties for residents and visitors alike. Specific issues include crossing private lands to access public lands, the need for clear delineation of what land is public versus private, and inadequate access points to recreational or other public uses.

H. ISSUES RECOMMENDED FOR ANALYSIS

In this section, the issues raised in the various scoping forums are compiled and segregated into three classes:

- a. Recommended for analysis in the Plan;
- b. Recommended for referral to other agencies; and
- c. Beyond the scope of this planning process.

NOTE: There is no specific prioritization to the order in which these issues are listed; rather, they have been organized by common types of issues.

a. Issues to Be Addressed in the Plan

The following is a compilation of issues identified through the various scoping forums that are recommended for analysis in the Plan.

a. Overall Issues

1. Maintaining the area's rural character and quality of life
 - ♦ Limitations on additional development, particularly large-scale commercial uses
 - ♦ Maintaining rural densities
 - ♦ Maintaining the agricultural land base
 - ♦ Preserving open space
 - ♦ Defining growth areas, types of growth
 - ♦ Activities which promote urban intrusions, e.g. agricultural operations which bring in part-time workers
2. Managing growth to ensure its compatability with the area's rural character
 - ♦ Focusing growth to developable areas
 - ♦ Balancing resource, business and recreation needs
 - ♦ Restricting polluting industries
 - ♦ Avoiding sprawl between Portland and Scappoose
3. Recreation management
 - ♦ Recognition/management of area as regional recreation destination
 - Need for comprehensive recreation plan
 - ♦ Access to recreational sites
 - Need for additional education, e.g., kiosks, recreation guides
 - ♦ Providing additional multiple-use locations to meet growth demands
 - ♦ Preserving hunting and fishing opportunities
 - ♦ Accommodation of additional recreational uses
 - Designating dog training areas
 - Providing additional mountain bike and equestrian trails
 - Providing additional beach access and parking
 - ♦ User conflicts (Note: These are not mutually exclusive)
 - Boaters vs. houseboat owners
 - Canoeists vs. hunters
 - Residents vs. recreationists
 - Agriculture vs. recreationists
 - Conflicts among beach users
 - ♦ User fees to finance public services, particularly expanded law enforcement
4. Overlapping jurisdiction with Columbia County
 - ♦ Opportunities to jointly purchase/develop additional public lands
 - ♦ Annexation of north half of Island to Multnomah County

- Consistency in County planning/zoning
5. Coordination with other land management programs
 - ODFW refuge plan, including refuge carrying capacity
 - Marine Board study of Multnomah Channel
 - State Parks & Recreation resource data and trail planning
 - Metro Greenspaces Plan
 - DEQ non-point source pollution study
 - Prior agreements on up-river issues that could affect the planning area
 - Conflicts/shared issues with the West Hills Plan
 - Metro's Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives(adoption expected soon)
 - Multnomah County Interim Measures for implementing 2040 concept (when adopted)
 - Metro Open Space Bond Measure Program (process to begin soon)
 - Bonneville Power Administration's Burlington Bottoms Environmental Assessment/Management Plan
 - Willamette River Greenway Plan
 6. Controlling public access
 - Designating adequate areas for public access/use to minimize private property impacts
 - Limiting development of public facilities
 - Limiting additional trail development
 7. Zoning/Land Use Regulations
 - Inconsistency in granting variances
 - Inconsistent enforcement
 - Flexibility in land use regulations
 - Limiting additional land use regulations
 8. Property rights
 - Defining impacts of regulations on property rights prior to adoption
 - Public access across private properties
 - Defining public access expectations, e.g. trails
 - Set asides for public uses, e.g. trails, wetland preservation
 - Use restrictions which convert private lands into de-facto refuge areas
 9. Transportation planning to address current and future needs
 - Accommodating all modes, including bicycles and pedestrians
 - Improvements to address traffic congestion
 - Inability of large trucks to enter/exit bridge from single traffic lane
 - Widening of bridge on-ramps
 - Pedestrian safety
 - Banning jake brakes on bridges
 - Public transportation needs
 - Inadequacy of roads to accommodate increased uses
 - Traffic safety
 - Speeding
 - Emergency access
 - Need for safety improvements at high accident locations

10. Wildlife protection
 - ♦ Preservation of existing open space as habitat
 - ♦ Protection of wildlife habitat from incompatible uses
 - Conflicts between wildlife habitat protection and recreational access
 - Redirecting non-wildlife oriented recreation to other areas
 - ♦ Decreasing wildlife populations
11. Wetlands protection
 - ♦ Wetland/riparian enhancement opportunities
 - ♦ Requirements for wetlands protection on public vs. private lands
12. Prehistoric and historic cultural resources
 - ♦ Protection of Native American heritage/unique sites
 - ♦ Lack of access to historic resources
13. Protection of scenic values
14. Water quality
 - ♦ Monitoring contaminants
 - ♦ Notification of spraying
15. Lack of public facilities
 - ♦ Need for additional facilities to serve increased visitation
 - ♦ Signage
16. Lack of rural commercial center
17. Equal representation in the process by Island and Channel residents and businesses
18. Need for additional law enforcement
 - ♦ Increased crime due to urban area proximity
 - ♦ Potential for joint services with Columbia County
 - ♦ Lack of response to enforcement requests
 - ♦ Security factor provided by houseboat/marina mix
 - ♦ Speed limit enforcement - land and water
 - ♦ Regulation of illegal squatters and transient boaters
 - Removal of abandoned boats
 - ♦ Control of inappropriate activities, e.g. rowdy beach parties

b. Sauvie Island-Specific Issues

19. Transportation
 - ♦ Safe and convenient access to/from the Island
 - ♦ Upgrading roads to rural standards

- Widening of Sauvie Island Road
 - ♦ Congestion during peak periods
 - ♦ Limiting additional sport runs due to narrow road widths
 - ♦ Conflicts between agricultural operations and visitors
 - Traffic impacts associated with agricultural retail operations
 - ♦ Permit parking
20. Bicycle/pedestrian uses
- ♦ Bicycle/pedestrian paths/trails to reduce auto conflicts
 - Lack of paths, signage
 - ♦ Controlling the amount of bicycle traffic
 - ♦ Rollerblade use of roads
 - ♦ Establishing bicycle permit fees or increasing parking permit fee
21. Protection/maintenance of drainage ditches
- ♦ Protection of right-of-ways to drainage ditches/structures
 - Notification to Drainage District of structures proposed within 100 feet
 - ♦ Trespass in drainage ditches
 - ♦ Spoils disposal
22. Protection of commercial agricultural lands
- ♦ Need for an overall vision that reflects the area's role as an agricultural center
 - ♦ Impacts of residential uses on adjacent agricultural uses
 - ♦ Division of farmlands for relatives
 - ♦ Minimum lot sizes
 - Smaller minimum lot sizes
 - Maintaining current minimum lot sizes
 - ♦ Allowing development of smaller, non-productive farm parcels
 - ♦ Alternative uses for large agricultural parcels
 - Potential for golf courses
 - ♦ Noise, odors from agricultural operations
 - ♦ Conflicts between agricultural operations and recreational uses
23. Role of light industrial development
24. User conflicts
- ♦ Public access across private land
 - ♦ Conflicts between hunting and watchable wildlife
25. Environmental contamination
- ♦ Limit additional pollution by existing industries, e.g., B&W Feed, Alder Creek Lumber, waste ash depository
 - ♦ Air and noise pollution
 - ♦ Toxic waste dumping (ESCO)

26. Control of noxious weeds

c. Multnomah Channel-Specific Issues

27. Conflicts among various waterway users

- ♦ Increased boat traffic
 - Overcrowding, unsafe watercraft operations, noise, speeding, illegal uses
- ♦ Conflicts between recreational and commercial boating
- ♦ Conflicts among waterway users

28. Conflicts between moorage residents and waterway users

29. Multnomah Channel management plan

- ♦ Study per Lower Willamette River Management Plan
 - Definition of uses, regulations
- ♦ Designation of areas for future development
 - Providing opportunities for moorage/marina expansions
 - Identification of infill areas
 - Maximizing existing developed areas through controlled growth and infill
- ♦ Limiting additional development to protect remaining waterfront open spaces
- ♦ Assessment of effects of Urban Reserves
- ♦ Assessment of effects of addition of Lower Columbia River to the National Estuary Program
- ♦ Need for additional marina services to respond to growth in boating
- ♦ Reduction in public water surface

30. Zoning/land use regulations

- ♦ Inappropriate application of MUA zoning to Channel area
- ♦ Addressing illegal expansions
- ♦ Zoning that recognizes all viable marine uses and clearly identifies allowable uses, e.g. MUM -- multi-use marine
- ♦ Allowance of dry docking facilities on uplands
- ♦ Clarification of definition of floating structures
- ♦ Design standards for housing/boat houses to protect visual quality
- ♦ Regulation of marina moorage doublestacking in channel
- ♦ Enforcement of existing regulations

31. Emergency services to moorages/marinas

- ♦ Adequacy of rural road standards for emergency access
- ♦ Need for required fire protection measures for marinas

32. Impacts to wildlife habitat

- ♦ Protection of remaining undisturbed wildlife corridors
 - Protection of Burlington Bottom natural area

- ♦ Effects of marinas/moorages on shallow water habitat for migrating juvenile salmonids
 - ♦ Expanding in existing area vs. areas zoned for marine wildlife
 - ♦ Effects of pollution
33. Bank/dike erosion
- ♦ Effects of deepening channel
 - ♦ Effects of increased boat traffic
34. Access to waterfront development across railroad/crossings
35. Water quality
- ♦ Houseboat and watercraft waste pollution
 - ♦ Sewer overflows

b. Issues to Be Referred to Other Agencies

The following are issues over which the County has no regulatory authority. It is recommended that these issues be forwarded to the appropriate federal or state agencies, with a request for formal response.

1. Need for consistent emergency response plan
2. Sewage pump out facilities for boaters
 - ♦ Marine Board intentions re: pump out facilities
3. Growth in Highway 30 traffic
 - ♦ Need for additional speed enforcement
 - ♦ Accommodating pedestrian crossings
4. City sewage overflow effects on water quality
5. Flood control
6. Designating alternative areas for recreational development, e.g., Government Island, to reduce demand in this area
7. Better management of state lands to reduce geese impacts on private lands
8. Reintroduction of white-tailed deer
9. Potential lease terminations by the Division of State Lands

10. Consistency in regulations among the various management agencies
 - ♦ Myriad of regulatory agencies
 - ♦ Notification of regulatory changes
11. Master Plan for Howell Territorial Park
12. Impacts of no-wake zones on general public use of waterways

c. Issues Beyond the Scope of the Plan

The following issues are beyond the scope of this planning effort. It is recommended that these issues be dropped from any further consideration.

1. Rural versus urban value system
 - ♦ Planning driven by urban value system
2. Protection of business investments
3. Funding additional recreational facilities through a use fee/bridge toll
4. Limiting land condemnation
5. Burning and use of carp as dike/ditch maintenance options
6. Maintaining tax deferral programs

APPENDIX A: COMPILATION OF AGENCY SCOPING QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Number of responses: 8

Respondents:

- ♦ USDA Forest Service, Richard J. Pedersen
- ♦ Multnomah County Sheriff's Office, Captain Pieter Van Dyke
- ♦ Multnomah County Transportation Planning, Karen Schilling
- ♦ Historic Preservation Office, State Parks & Recreation, Dr. Leland Gilsen
- ♦ Department of Energy, Bonneville Power Administration, Julie Rose
- ♦ Sauvie Island Drainage District
- ♦ Natural Resources Conservation Service, Steve Fedje
- ♦ Metro Regional Parks & Greenspaces, Jane Hart

1. What are the most significant issues that should be addressed in planning for the Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel rural area?

- ♦ Waterways and associated travel/recreation; open space; rural agriculture; wetlands and associated waterfowl habitat; and waterfowl hunting.
- ♦ The need for law enforcement both on the Island and on the water. This area has a large number of people using it for recreational purposes, e.g. biking, swimming, hunting, fishing, boating.
- ♦ Access to land uses by various modes. Congestion during peak periods (weekends) and resulting conflicts. Safety (locations with history of accidents.) Developing roads to rural road standards.
- ♦ Cultural resources - prehistoric and historic sites. Sauvie Island had perhaps the densest population of Indians in Oregon -- many habitation/village sites.
- ♦ The Board of Directors of the Company [Sauvie Island Drainage District] has the responsibility to maintain a series of protective dikes and drainage ditches inside Company boundaries to provide flood control and drainage on Sauvie Island. The Company holds numerous maintenance easements on all dikes and internal drainage ditches. The ditches are, of course, situated on private property. The most significant issue for the Board is to maintain the integrity of the dikes and ditches through the control of building or excavation on dike easements with enforcement from the Corps of Engineers and the protection of Company ditches from trespass and the use of the ditches for anything other than drainage or irrigation for the property owners. The Board is also concerned with river traffic from commercial ships and sport boats which, if not controlled and regulated, can result in erosion to Company dikes.
- ♦ Agricultural land conversion to non-agricultural land. Wetland preservation and enhancement. Access to recreation areas.
- ♦ Protect the lowland area that lies between Highway 30 and Multnomah Channel and reaches from the lower end of the island north to the County line. This area includes the Burlington Bottom natural area, a Multnomah County Goal 5 resource.

Detrimental impacts to wildlife habitat from proliferation of house boat moorages and marinas along Multnomah Channel. Increased moorages and marinas will further diminish any semblance of undisturbed wildlife corridor for wildlife that require contiguous riparian area for migration purposes. Construction for moorages and marinas requires deep water close to the river bank, which conflicts with the need to maintain shallow water habitat for migrating juvenile salmonids. It is important to look at cumulative impacts of residential and commercial developments that reduce the ability of wildlife to utilize the corridor. Proliferation of moorages and marinas would further reduce the open water space available for recreational purposes along a public waterway. The more space taken for moorages and marinas, the narrower the width of the channel and the more no wake zones. No wake zones infringe on the right of the public to use the public waterway for water-skiing, power boating and angling activities. Wildlife habitat and agricultural uses are the highest and best uses of land on the island and that should continue to be the primary focus.

2. What are the regulatory or other opportunities that will help us address these issues?

- ◆ North American Wetlands Conservation Act; Clean Water Act; and Migratory Bird Treaty Act.
- ◆ Working with island associations to find solutions to transportation problems.
- ◆ ORS 97.740; ORS 358.905; ORS 390.235; some survey.
- ◆ Soil and Water Conservation District, coordinated planning. Resource conservation and development, coordinated planning. These groups can facilitate public involvement.
- ◆ Multnomah County approval criteria for: Community Service Uses (MCC 11.15.7015); Conditional Uses (MCC 11.15.7120); Zoning Code criteria for houseboats and houseboat moorages (MCC 11.15.7505); and the Willamette River Greenway development criteria (MCC 11.15.6366.372). The Bonneville Power Administration, owner of the Burlington Bottom natural area, has prepared the *Burlington Bottom Environmental Assessment/Management Plan* which provides a framework for protection of the unique qualities of the resource. Metro's Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives and the 2040 Growth Concept Map.

3. What are the regulatory or other constraints that will make it difficult to address these issues?

- ◆ LCDC; National Farm Bureau; commercial interests.
- ◆ Community relations with government staff.
- ◆ Little systematic survey, so extent and location and significance (quantity and quality) of sites unknown -- but expected to be large and very significant.
- ◆ Note that BPA imposes certain restrictions and/or prohibitions on the use of wildlife facilities and property encumbered by our transmission line rights-of-way. Applications must be submitted to BPA for any use proposed within the rights-of-way. You may

call me [Julie Rose] at 1-800-836-6619 toll free or directly at (503) 230-3291 for information on this application process.

- ♦ Pressure to develop. Landowner and property rights issues. Traffic and unsocial behavior from off islanders. Agriculture vs. urbanizing.
 - ♦ The northern half of the island is in Columbia County and therefore is not included in the planning area. Natural resource and social issues cross jurisdictional boundaries and should be looked at for the whole island in order to put the best plan together. Strong coordination and collaboration with Columbia County during the plan development should occur. Strong local resistance to embrace inevitable pressures from forecasted future growth in the Portland area.
- 4. How can we best inform and involve in the planning process those persons and organizations that may have an interest in the Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel Rural Area Plan?**
- ♦ Local area meetings.
 - ♦ Contact tribes, SHPO (us), Association of Oregon Archaeologists, PSU Anthropology Department.
 - ♦ Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department is in the process of contracting with an outside consultant for assistance in preparing a master plan for the Howell Territorial Park on Sauvie Island. Close coordination with that process would benefit both plans. Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department owns and operates the Sauvie Island Boat Ramp. Continued use of this facility should be considered in the Rural Area Plan.

APPENDIX B: COMPILATION OF STAKEHOLDER SCOPING QUESTIONNAIRES

Number of responses: 2

Respondents:

- ♦ BTA
- ♦ FORCE (Friends of Retaining the Channel Environment)

1. What are the most significant issues that should be addressed in planning for the Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel rural area?

- ♦ Keep Sauvie Island rural farmland.
- ♦ Open spaces -- preserve them. Restrict development on the island, especially waterborne development. Preserve the rights of boaters to ski -- to motor through the channel at a reasonable speed and time.

2. What are the opportunities that will help us address these issues?

- ♦ Keep taxes low. Keep developers out.
- ♦ One land use lawyer with Multnomah County denied a permit for a marina using "not consistent with the nature of the area" thus leaving one of the few undeveloped spaces in Multnomah County in the channel. Also, some zoning laws help.

3. What are the constraints that will make it difficult to address these issues?

- ♦ Greed.
- ♦ Zoning. There are no guidelines or laws on zoning ordinances to stop the channel from becoming a string of marinas.

4. How can we best inform and involve in the planning process those persons and organizations that may have an interest in the Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel Rural Area Plan?

5. Other comments or suggestions?

No comments received.

APPENDIX C: COMPILATION OF NEWSLETTER QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Number of responses: 32

1. **What are the most significant issues that should be addressed in planning for the Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel rural area?**
 - ◆ How to mesh the needs of the rural area with the needs of the urban area. Environmental requirements.
 - ◆ Transportation -- no public transportation at this time and U.S. 30 traffic has increased tremendously. Has anyone thought about train service for passengers on Burlington Northern lines along U.S. 30 and Cornelius Pass Road. How to avoid land being divided into huge developments. 80 acres is too much -- what about less. No huge projects like Fred Meyers etc. along side of road. Avoiding sprawl where Portland runs into Scappoose for example.
 - ◆ The increased recreational use of this area. The latest statistics show over 750,000 persons use this area each year.
 - ◆ The issue is that you shouldn't be doing any planning for Sauvie Island. You people think that our Island is Multnomah's play ground. You have developed it so much that traffic is bad and dangerous with all the bikers, bladers and garbage dumpers and trash droppers.
 - ◆ Wildlife area management. Marina development. Wetlands preservation/restoration. Role of light industry on Sauvie Island.
 - ◆ One issue is the abuse by the Planning Commission in allowing variances to the "friends" and disallowing them to their "enemies."
 - ◆ Encouraging growth compatible with current communities. Mitigating the impacts of heavy industry in the area. Recognize developable areas and focus development in those areas. Encourage methods to decrease traffic on Highway 30. Develop a recreation plan for the area.
 - ◆ Managing the significant number of visitors who come onto the island each year. Traffic flow, need for bike/pedestrian path around the island, possible need for additional on-island services.
 - ◆ Keep it EFU zoning -- minimum 76 acre lot size. Ensure good water quality and monitor for contaminants/pollution. Neighbor notification of aerial and ground spraying. Increased police presence.
 - ◆ Maintaining the rural nature of the island. Maintaining as a high priority the farming and wildlife features of the island.
 - ◆ Highways and bridge congestion, traffic, safety on the channel -- considering houseboat owners -- more boaters speeding through the channel.
 - ◆ Control the biking. Control the amount of traffic on the Island -- no more runs because of the narrow roads.
 - ◆ Protect property rights of private land owners. Preserve hunting and fishing that exists on the island.
 - ◆ How to maintain rural/agricultural character of area.

- ♦ Population growth in Metro area. Recreational use of Sauvie Island. Development pressures on Sauvie Island.
- ♦ On Sauvie Island growth is inevitable, the question is what type of growth will be allowed/encouraged. Ideally, farmland would be preserved, as would the game preserve. The unfarmed/unused land could ideally be partitioned for nice homes. What sense is there in allowing farmland to be partitioned into mobile homes? This is the current reality.
- ♦ Number 1 -- property owners' rights. Respect for Game Commission property.
- ♦ Proper balance of business and residential growth within a rural area. Protection of wildlife areas, but not at the expense of property owners rights. Traffic on the Sauvie Island Bridge -- lack of large trucks ability to approach and negotiate the bridge on and off ramp without using two lanes of traffic.
- ♦ Future planning of Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel in dealing with the complex issues of balancing agriculture needs/other business needs/and resident needs as in keeping with the rural atmosphere that is enjoyed by all. Too many houseboats!
- ♦ Maintaining the natural wildlife and scenic values and preventing urban sprawl from overtaking this rural area. Limiting marina and development along the too-few miles of undeveloped waterway that are left along Multnomah Channel.
- ♦ Although attached geographically, the island and the channel are distinctly different in usage and economics. Even though the channel is zoned MUA, there is no farming on the water. Uses on the water are recreational and residential only. What little commercial activity there is is recreation related.
- ♦ Government should work with land owners and decide what is the best use for the land situation.
- ♦ Portland and the surrounding area uses us for their private playground. The nude beach attracts very unsavory people. There are X-rated videos available in St. Johns shot on our beach. It makes our heavy traffic much worse. We do not want bicycle paths -- they are too costly and ineffective.
- ♦ Any plans must take into consideration all of the present uses: agricultural, wildlife, and floating home and boating communities.
- ♦ Future growth. Is current land fully utilized. Property rights. Maintaining environment.
- ♦ Island development that adversely affects agriculture and wildlife habitat. Rampant moorage/marina development along channel. Over-use of channel waterway. 800,000 plus visitors to wildlife area annually; more to total island.
- ♦ Keep the island as farm land not for urban growth. We need this open space now and more so in future. Diversity of wildlife on the island needs room to exist. Plan for increased use in area of recreation (bikes, jog, hunting, beach.) Plan for better farm/visitor mix at times, especially on roads.
- ♦ Keep government interference minimal -- we live out here to get away from that! More river patrols to control crazed boaters who make houseboat living hell on weekends. Strong protection for birds and wildlife on Sauvie Island. Ban jake brakes on bridges. Restrictions on polluting industries. Maintain rural densities. More cops

on Hwy 30 afternoons when the blue collar crowd and their pickups head for the tavern at warp speed.

- ◆ In January, 1993 the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission adopted a management plan for Sauvie Island Wildlife Area that directed us to "plan and regulate human use and recreational opportunities so they are compatible with maintaining a high quality wildlife resource." The plan further directed us to control, discourage, or eliminate non-wildlife oriented recreation. As we implement this plan and reestablish our identity as a wildlife area we hope to see many of our non-wildlife oriented recreation use days shift to other locations. Growth projections in the county require additional multiple use recreation areas to be established.
- ◆ The impact of evergrowing vehicle traffic on the island and boat traffic on the Channel. Also proposals for development in open spaces and on existing farmland.
- ◆ Land use planning should take into consideration the density of development, farming uses, recreational uses, and possible commercial applications -- an effort should be made to accommodate all factions.
- ◆ These issues are intertwined. Impact of growth in metropolitan area and increased pressures on the rural character of Sauvie Island/Channel area. Preservation of farmland and wildlife habitat. Control of an wise planning for recreational use. Preservation of historical values associated with island.

2. What are the opportunities that will help us address these issues?

- ◆ The input from the people who live and work within the rural areas.
- ◆ Give residents a brief rundown of where things stand now in terms of allowable land use -- recent changes proposed by legislature -- what's going on that residents need to know now -- not after it's too late.
- ◆ Local land use laws are changing. We no longer have a clear vision of this area's needs. Farming is becoming a difficult way to make a living.
- ◆ You people put bike lanes here and no place for them to ride on the sides safely -- then ride 2 to 3 abreast and yell at us and give us the finger when we go around them - - this is our home. They are the intruders.
- ◆ This process.
- ◆ Review the allowance of a building permit to the Lerch children on Sauvie Island on the same day that Bob Hall told the Court that a variance was not available.
- ◆ The funds needed to construct bike path and provide more adequate public restroom facilities could be paid for by a daily island usage fee/bridge toll.
- ◆ Give input that the Urban Reserve not include Sauvie Island. Sauvie Island provides important resource and wildlife habitat on public and private lands therefore EFU zoning should be kept as is. Put a toll booth on Sauvie Island bridge for all non-residents to help pay for increased police presences and due to Portland's heavy use of the island.
- ◆ The fact that there is minimal development at this point should make it easier to preserve the rural character of the island for residents and visitors alike.

- ♦ Come here and view the traffic on our island's roads -- the bridge -- log trucks, produce trucks, bikers, etc.
- ♦ The public thinks the Island is all public -- but it is mostly private land in Multnomah County. We need a toll bridge.
- ♦ Planning in advance of a real emergency.
- ♦ State and local regulations and guidelines.
- ♦ A little common sense applied to your land planning might be nice. The immediate end of letting those in power do what they want for their friends seems like a good opportunity.
- ♦ Island residents voting on decisions concerning the island. Island residents, whose judgement is respected, and who represent a wide variety of interests that will need to be addressed in this complex area, should be on the Scoping Committee.
- ♦ Develop plans that allow flexibility in growth without compromising the rural atmosphere. For example, allow the small parcels that do not represent value for farming to be developed. Maintain the large, valuable farm parcels to remain as such. Develop transportation plans, e.g. widen bridge on-ramps, to accommodate the current and future traffic needs. Maintain the current wildlife areas as managed by ODFW and do not restrict private lands into "refuge areas."
- ♦ Planning for transportation needs -- Sauvie Island bridge traffic concerns. Planning for development needs -- houses, businesses. Plans for protection of natural resources -- wildlife areas.
- ♦ We need to act now -- there is only around 2 miles of Multnomah Channel left for open spaces -- about 8 years ago there was double this. We must act quickly now to foresee what we want this area to look like in the future or it will be too late.
- ♦ Multnomah Channel deserves a study similar to the lower Willamette study recently completed by the Marine Board.
- ♦ Have agency people meet with land owners and decide the proper use of the land.
- ♦ Our ODFW is trying to regain control. Continue with the Safety Action Committee and the coordinatin of Multnomah, Columbia County and State Police. It is the first hope we have had not to be inundated.
- ♦ Study to make plans that take marine, agriculture and wildlife needs into consideration. Efforts to make permit parking and have better law enforcement.
- ♦ Strong foundation in place. Public awareness of this area.
- ♦ First a good bike trail (can be done -- old road on dike next to present road could be utilized -- get the bike joggers off narrow dike road -- widen road now on flat areas of island for bikes -- 30-40 miles of bike trails in Portland area of way below cost of any other trail -- no right of way problem.)
- ♦ Meet with marina association and neighborhood groups. Send out bulletins on what you are up to. Ask us what we want instead of telling us what you want for our marine neighborhoods. Marine ecosystem is fragile -- we who live here know this and respect it. It is tourists and outsiders who make problems for everyone.
- ♦ Opportunities to address this issue are already being discussed in light of recent talk of establishing designated dog training areas within city parks. Other areas need to be set aside for the many dog clubs in the county to hold licensed dog trials. There

will also be a need for additional mountain bike and equestrian trails as well as additional beach use areas. The parking areas provided for beach use on Sauvie Island often reach capacity.

- ♦ Meetings with the community; addressing the issues as they come up before the board.
- ♦ If a plan is correctly put together, all of the above can be worked out.
- ♦ Careful long-term land use planning -- integrated approach is essential -- coordinate with State parks and State Fish & Wildlife. Education of islanders as well as metropolitan residents of the consequences of failure to preserve unique attributes of Sauvie Island/Channel area. Involvement of groups that have traditionally sought input on variety of issues impacting area, e.g. Sauvie Island Grange, West Hills/Island Neighbors, Sauvie Island Conservancy, Audubon Society, dog trial people, etc.

3. What are the constraints that will make it difficult to address these issues?

- ♦ The great needs of the people in the urban area to use the rural areas for recreational needs.
- ♦ Lack of enough people to make public transportation pay for itself in near future. If people wanted an urban area -- they would move to one. People here like the rural quality. Metro wanted the dump here years ago. They thought this would be an area which didn't matter but people care about what happens here. Changing the rules to 80 acres without even notifying residents makes people angry and suspicious of government. Are sewers in the planning? What about those of us on septic tanks and who have wells?
- ♦ The need to preserve an open space area for wildlife and clean water balanced against a rapid growth in property values that have raised property taxes.
- ♦ Above/space -- this is not your playground.
- ♦ Entrenched economic interests. Population pressures.
- ♦ The desire to abuse power by those possessing same.
- ♦ Communities have enjoyed a way of life that is threatened as more people move into rural areas. Planning can be difficult and take more time than anticipated.
- ♦ Some of the landowners who must give up substantial property to enable path construction are concerned about being adequately/fairly compensated for that property.
- ♦ Population pressure from Portland to use the island as its playground in the country.
- ♦ The increasing use of the island by weekend visitors particularly in the summer on the Columbia River side. Increasing pressures for residential and waterfront development.
- ♦ That the island people are against any more traffic congestion. That our local sheriff has all he can do now to keep up with island visitors.
- ♦ Too many people come on this Island and they don't live here. They don't obey the speed limit -- and rules and regulations.
- ♦ Lack of funds/space to accommodate pressures of recreational users.
- ♦ Population pressures. Increasing land values. Decreasing support for environmental agencies.

- ◆ The big landowners on the Island have a separate set of rules than the smaller landowners. It seems the commissioners are in bed together. And, you are asking those in power to police themselves.
- ◆ Decisions that are made by people that do not have sufficient knowledge of the agricultural community to grow and provide protection for farmers, from the pressures of urbanization, the diking problems, the soil conservation, varied industries, Oregon Fish and Wildlife, school situation, our fire protection, Sauvie Island Community Church, and the respect and caring that each island family has for the other -- all working together for the betterment of people.
- ◆ Money, time and the flexibility of committee members to achieve the result of a fair plan.
- ◆ Variety of opinions of various interest groups! Economies -- what is feasible, what is actual! Time -- limit of county time available to address these issues.
- ◆ Development pressures work against the protection of natural resources. Short term economic gains seem to carry more weight than long term ecosystem gains.
- ◆ Government appears not to cooperate.
- ◆ Our single entrance and exit by our bridge makes solutions difficult. If we have an earthquake that renders it unusable -- we are all in big trouble.
- ◆ Recreational over-use and abuse cause problems for island residents, wildlife, and agriculture. For example, we have had people visiting the island steal from our mail boxes and vandalize cars.
- ◆ Multnomah Planning Department's reluctance to evenly and fairly apply and use tools bestowed on them.
- ◆ Some development -- like golf course -- already approved. Mainland side of channel is totally zoned for development. These are public roads and public areas and very well-known, attractive and increasingly popular.
- ◆ Convince island community this is what they need. The people are going to keep increasing. Now is the time to solve the problems.
- ◆ Independence of people out here and lack of communication between moorage associations and island dwellers and others in the corridor. Resistance to any more government rules/regulations/crap that tries to control every aspect of our lives.
- ◆ Lack of communication and cooperation between various user groups.
- ◆ I don't foresee any.
- ◆ Opposition from various environmental groups.
- ◆ "Seige mentality" of certain islanders -- "us" vs. "them" that engenders suspicion that outsiders are imposing their agenda on islanders. This group is a minority but a very vocal one. Lack of recognition that if everyone is permitted to do whatever they want with their property the character of the area will be lost. Burgeoning population in metropolitan area creates tremendous pressures on island in terms of recreational use. People want and need places outside the city to observe wildlife, relate to nature, pick berries, bicycle, kayak, swim, hike, etc., etc. but the quality of these experiences has already been severely undermined by heavy use. Limits need to be imposed or the beaches and wildlife areas will be slowly (actually, not so slowly) reduced to crowded city parks.

4. Other comments?

- ◆ Difficult decisions must be made by interested and informed people.
- ◆ I am a fourth generation Sauvie Islander. My family has lived here since 1849. I feel my voice should be heard on planning issues.
- ◆ At least, put the park point charge on biker's cars that clog the bridge parking lot -- they use it more than others and drop trash as they ride and piss at our mail boxes and could care less about us real Islanders -- charge them as you do others and use the money to clean up their mess. Last time I commented, I got calls to explain, then my name must have been given out, as I got crank calls.
- ◆ Public Myth: Sauvie Island is a good place to ride bicycles -- there's no shoulder, cars often exceed 45 mph speed limit, and unfortunately, only a serious accident will wake people up.
- ◆ Providing compatible recreation uses considering the farming and wildlife priorities on the island. Increasing bicycle use requires a separate bike path or wider shoulders on existing roads.
- ◆ The bikers should go only one direction. When you meet them there is no place to travel for the Islanders.
- ◆ I have a strong belief in our governmental process. I feel this review is a positive sign. I believe you can bring common sense and public good back to Sauvie Island land use.
- ◆ I feel that the scoping committee should consist of many islanders, as we are the very people that will have to live with the committee's decisions, which is ultimately approved by the board.
- ◆ These last several years the Multnomah Channel has experienced an explosion in the number of houseboats, moorages and boat traffic -- it's really dangerous to homes and for recreation and pleasure boaters/fishermen because of the influx of homes restricting the width of the channel.
- ◆ This is a long overdue process.
- ◆ This is an excellent opportunity to recognize the legitimate existing uses of the waterfront properties by creating new zones that address the "marine" uses presently there. Floating home moorage, boat moorage, marine repairs and services. Zone the open, undeveloped areas in a way that protects them from development.
- ◆ Meetings are informative.
- ◆ We are classified rural and then your restraints make farming very difficult. We do not want to be developed! We want our golf course -- it would keep nice open areas. Even rural areas have a few amenities like a restaurant. Keep the environmentalists off our backs!
- ◆ Need to restrict and regulate development and traffic. Thank you for your attention to these things.
- ◆ Please do not sacrifice property rights. We as landowners have paid taxes and improved our land, let use realize full potential. Taking of land through zoning must not be allowed. In our opinion the Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel planning process should strive for improved accommodation between the County's Comprehensive Framework Plan and the land owners. The current plan guidelines,

while attempting to be fair, are too expensive and cumbersome for most land owners. On the enforcement side, there appears to be only selective and token enforcement of compliance with the plan guidelines. The results of land use hearings often do not allow for full utilization of land potential and often result in de facto land "taking" by restricting full land potential or adding special clauses. We feel that the failure to allow full land potential is a denial of property rights, specifically on land bordering Multnomah Channel. It is our belief that once the State and Federal agencies have addressed environmental, fish and wildlife, and safety issues, the County should -- with a minimum of red tape -- approve the land use within County guidelines and enforce compliance with these guidelines. This does not happen today. Neither does equitable enforcement of existing rules and guidelines for all land owners. Multnomah County further burdens the land owner with many expensive processes. The processes often produce restrictions, enhancements and requirements that negatively effect property rights and property values. The net effect is reduced property tax and revenues. Once zoning and land use criteria for specific properties are established, Multnomah County Planning should enforce zoning compliance. Mr. Pemble has stated that the enforcement process is complaint generated but our personal experience has demonstrated that this is not a true description of how the process works. It appears that who makes the complaint about a zoning violation dictates whether action is taken or not taken. This general lack of equal enforcement by the County penalizes complying land owners. Non-complying land owners have a substantial economic advantage over complying land owners. We feel strongly that Multnomah County's lack of uniform enforcement is encouraging the blatant ignoring of planning and zoning rules which exist today. In its review process, Multnomah County Planning Department should strive for a balance between future growth, environmental issues and property rights. It should also enforce compliance with existing rules and guidelines. We believe that the planning department can better use the tools it already has before we bestow more tools on them. We as landowners can certainly practice better land use and Multnomah County Planning Department can either assist or hinder. Which is it to be?

- ◆ Reintroduce white tail deer -- there may be some on island but I doubt it. Was not so long ago, this is a natural environment for this species. Area is same as Puget/Walker Islands on lower Columbia River.
- ◆ Keep it simple. Give us a say. We know plans are a necessary evil -- we can swallow it better if we are involved. Everybody out here wanted Costco, but government caved in to a few business special interests and ignored us. Why ask us if you aren't going to listen?
- ◆ I am very concerned that this area remain "rural."
- ◆ Metropolitan area needs to set aside other areas than can offer recreational opportunities similar to Sauvie Island. The Island is embroiled in a volatile local political issues over the future of the Sauvie Island School District. This issue has involved a large number of islanders over a period of time with many meetings, discussions and letter writing campaigns. As a result, you may find somewhat less involvement and interest in planning issues than you might have seen exhibited at

other times. A lot of people are feeling "burnout", are tired of attending meetings and may feel a certain level of frustration at their individual impact on the political process.

APPENDIX D: COMPILATION OF OPEN HOUSE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Number of responses: 15

1. **For the Sauvie Island area, what are the three most important issues to address in the Plan?**
 - ◆ No more trails -- people on foot, horseback or bicycles have immensely greater adverse impacts. Do not infringe on private property rights -- see U.S. Constitution. Do not use condemnation -- buy only from willing sellers. Buying rather than stealing is better politics.
 - ◆ Maintain farms as they now are. Class I & II soils are now disappearing in industrial, apt. complexes -- just look at Washington County at Dawson Park and Hawthorn Farm. Get Metro and all forms of government to not include private property in their grandiose plans. Government (state, county, federal) owns or controls 3/4 of all the land in Oregon. Why don't they plan and zone their own land? Government bureaucrats have all kinds of plans on what private property owners can and cannot do on their own land and constantly change the rules. If Metro wants to change the rules under which we bought the property years ago, why don't they buy the land from us or exempt us (the private property owner) from new rules that didn't exist previously.
 - ◆ Transportation. The main arteries are becoming over travelled and water a hazard environmentally. Protection for the Dike. The dike maintenance is important to the survival of the agricultural farmland. What is the impact of high water volumes to any on the road?
 - ◆ Conflicts between residents and visitors, on both land and water. Residents want freedom of movement and peace and quiet. Visitors want access to various amenities and often are in a "let's party" mood, e.g. beach visitors, boaters on the Channel. Parties and peace don't mix well. Traffic problems on both land and water. Too many people on too small arteries. Island roads can't accommodate cars, bikes, and farm implements; the Channel can't accommodate houses, kayakers, scullers, speedboats, waterskiers, jet-skis, fishermen, etc. and ensure a pleasant experience for all. Preservation of rural character and wildlife values. Farmland is an important resource that we're rapidly losing to housing, e.g. Washington County. Wildlife areas are rapidly disappearing. Some land/water uses are compatible with preservation of these values, others are not.
 - ◆ Heavy industry should not be located on the island. Purina, Alder Creek Lumber, waste ash repository. Not compatible to have toxins introduced into an area where agricultural products are produced. Recreational traffic. Roadways are not built for the current uses. It's unsafe.
 - ◆ Continue agriculture. Continue wildlife protection. Rural protection.
 - ◆ Protection of area's rural character. It is the essence of the island. Controlling public access. It is involved with issue #1 because of the behavior of too many visitors. Conflicts among users i.e. floating homes and boaters. Until the state requires motor boat operators to take water safety courses, this problem will continue.

- ♦ Wildlife vs. hunting, dog training, and recreation management. Hunting interests dominate decisions then, now they need to be more balanced. Beach problems -- drinking and driving with bike riders on narrow roads. People are more in danger and don't often know it. Boating problem for same reasons.
- ♦ Wildlife protection. We must protect all wildlife. Bicycles -- too many. Respect property rights. People own the land, pay taxes and should not be dictated to by government bodies.
- ♦ Protect fish and wildlife habitat. Over 300 species of wildlife live on the island at various times of the year; many developments have an adverse impact. Maintaining agricultural base and rural character of the island. It's important to protect prime farmland. The island is well-loved for its rural character. Speeding/road safety. The roads often have a dangerous feeling -- speed limits are very high and traffic exceeds those limits with regularity.
- ♦ Presence of industry on the island. BW Feed is a polluter -- both air quality and noise -- as well as an eyesore. They have not lived up to the promises they made when DEQ renewed their permit 2 years ago, and their behavior detracts from the quality of life for all their (many) neighbors. Dumping of toxic waste on floodplain and in channel (by Esco and others.) Sauvie Island is a significant wildlife area. Is it really necessary to explain why we should have clean soil and water? Use of wildlife areas by hunters as opposed to hikers, bird watchers, fishermen and women, horseback riders, and bicyclists. Hunters require exclusive use of land. All others can share. At present a large majority of the public lands on Sauvie Island are reserved for hunters. Their numbers diminish (as do the numbers and variety of wildlife), while the numbers of those wishing other recreational uses are growing. The present situation is an anachronism that should be corrected.
- ♦ Respect and protect personal property rights. Personal property should not be treated the same as public property. The owner pays for his rights and should be entitled to it. The public brings in issues such as liability, sanitation problems, vandalism, more traffic, no privacy, opens up the wildlife habitat. The public uses the privately paid for facilities. Agriculture protection. Many of these farmers and small businesses have been here for several generations and should have consideration for them to survive. Wildlife protection. This is a natural wildlife area and should be set aside for this. Public facilities should be limited on the island itself.
- ♦ Privacy, protect landowners rights. People purchase land to enjoy and use without public intrusion. Protect environment and wildlife. It's significant for our future.
- ♦ Retain rural character, viable agricultural operations, and wildlife habitat. Unique resource, unlikely to be recovered if lost. Continue recreational uses while limiting impact to #1. Beaches, wildlife viewing areas, bicycling, jogging are unlike any in the area accessible by public transportation. Limit noise and air and water impacts of island based and surrounding industries. Oregon Steel Mills, Angell Bros. Quarry, B&W Feeds, the new Hall-Buck facility are serious threats to #1 and #2.
- ♦ Bike paths -- no area now for bikes to travel with autos. Public use of island -- residents should not be impacted by inconsiderate users who are not property owners. Crime, refuse dumping, trespassing. Unsafe for bikers and auto drivers on dike and

on all narrow roads. Land must be assessed for its suitability to use. Land not suitable for farming or agricultural use should be allowed to develop. Island properties are very expensive and farming cannot pay for the land. Because of the island growth, possibly another bridge in Columbia County. Too much traffic with the growing use of the island -- traffic jams -- hampers emergency assistance to the island residents.

2. For the Multnomah Channel area, what are the three most important issues to address in the Plan?

- ♦ See first page. Revert use laws to 1986 and leave them.
- ♦ Leave all zoning as is. Owners bought property under one set of rules and shouldn't be subjected to new zoning or requirements. Zoning -- changing regulation. All hearings and input will be ignored. What we say doesn't make a difference.
- ♦ Accessibility. Increase industry.
- ♦ Water quality issues -- houseboat pollution, sewage problems in Portland affecting water users and residents downstream, industrial pollution affecting same. Those of us who live on the water like to swim and boat in it too. Water quality affects the wildlife, too -- we have otters, beavers, herons, ducks, geese, eagles, kingfishers, swallows, cormorants, ospreys, etc., etc. -- all of which are in the water or feeding from it and supposedly are a focus of protection.
- ♦ Integrity of riparian areas should be protected. A healthy riparian area is aesthetically pleasing, protects wildlife and water quality. Waste should not be deposited within feet of the riparian area. Toxins can enter into aquatic ecosystem impacting water and wildlife quality. Loud boats. Noise impacts residents.
- ♦ Reduce impact on private lands. If the state lands are not managed properly, private land will deteriorate. Wetland preservation. Due to the impact on wildlife. Wildlife protection. We have seen return of several species which were approaching endangered list.
- ♦ Need to keep wildlife areas along the river -- we do not need houseboats all down the river. Deer and other animals go back and forth. Speed of boats -- the county needs to look at other areas to develop for recreation, i.e. Government Island.
- ♦ Personal property. Land owners should have some say about the use of their land. Bank erosion on the channel. Erosion is a big problem. Deepening the channel would lessen this. Vandalism and trespass. I am tired of cleaning up after people -- dumping refuse, etc.
- ♦ Marina/moorage development. Development impacts the fish and wildlife habitat in the water, riparian zones and wetlands. Development takes water surface away from public and public use. Over-use of channel waterway. Results in: unsafe operation of watercraft, excessive noise, illegal operation, harassment, over-crowding (as documented in Oregon Marine Board Report, Nov. 1994.) Zoning and lack of environmental overlays. Current zoning allows for marina/moorage development along the length of the mainland side of the channel. No one oversees wetland destruction, whether mitigation works, etc.

- ◆ Dumping of waste into channel. Water should be clean. We know where this leads, and we know how waste should be disposed of. Marinas vs. greenways. Marinas are growing -- the places where hikers or wildlife can come to water's edge are decreasing. Noisy jetskis and motorboats. Those of us living near the channel are as entitled to peace and quiet as anyone else.
 - ◆ Respect and protect personal property rights. Personal property should not be treated the same as public property. The owner pays for his rights and should be entitled to it. The public brings in issues such as liability, vandalism, more traffic, congestion on private parking and roadways, trespassing. The public uses privately paid for facilities. Define and establish areas for development and preservation of water-related activities. To maximize their use -- within those restricted areas in order to set aside specific areas to be left natural and protected. Enforce existing rules and regulations originally set up to preserve and protect the private and public properties.
 - ◆ Privacy, protect property owner's rights. Do not force public access. People purchase land to enjoy and use without public intrusion. Protect existing business, maximize the use of existing sites. Existing businesses at this time are kept in a state of frustration as to knowing if there is a future for them. Issues concerning waterfront property should not be allowed to be settled without property owner's knowledge and input. Too many laws have been enacted that affect waterfront property owners that they have not had knowledge of.
 - ◆ Water quality. All other uses depend on it. Recreational uses need to be retained while minimizing bank erosion and water quality impacts. Great water playground away from commercial water transportation conflicts, but banks are habitat that need protection. Enforce existing regulations concerning residential (houseboat) moorages - particularly septic requirements/maintenance. Excessive development, squatting and illegal septic runoff will degrade channel for all.
 - ◆ Promote enhancement of existing facilities and limit growth of new facilities. Allow marina owners to develop within their boundaries to maximize waterfront use and support of the growing need of services. Do not allow moorages for marinas to double stack in the channel -- keep open spaces that are now available, but allow the existing ones to expand. Provide for care of the banks and eliminate squatters who are living along the channel illegally. Too many abandoned boats, unattended shoreline, trash dumping, and people irresponsible for the waterfront are using it for nothing. Plan for the increasing use of the channel for all forms of recreational boaters and watercraft users -- more enforcement laws, etc. The increase of population in Oregon will result in an ever increasing demand for water-related recreational uses. These must be identified and planned for to eliminate hazardous situations, etc.
3. **What other issues (for either area) should be addressed?**
- ◆ The agricultural vs. recreational uses.
 - ◆ Lots -- it's hard to know which are most significant. Somehow the island and channel as residential areas and places where people earn their livings need to be preserved along with visitors' hunger for open space and a place to play.

- ♦ How about a bicycle permit fee? Raise the parking permit fee! Could use additional public access to island and channel.
- ♦ Keep government bodies out and let the landowners do some planning.
- ♦ Management of wildlife areas is getting rather heavy-handed and insensitive to those of us who aren't hunters.
- ♦ More policing on the waterways during congested times of year such as fishing season. Educate the Marine related public with safely rules and respect for the channel private lands.
- ♦ Flood control.
- ♦ Wakes along Multnomah Channel. Traffic on Sauvie Island. Establish zoning for M.C. waterfront which reflects marine use rather than MUA.

4. What types of future public involvement opportunities would be best?

Newsletters 8
 Open houses 9
 Public hearings 9
 Other (please specify): 3

- ♦ Newsletters: not involvement -- good for information -- giving to public, not getting information from public. Open houses: the techniques need to be varied enough to make it comfortable for a variety of people to participate. More important, this community will participate when given opportunities. Try to involve them in setting goals, developing evaluation criteria, and preparing the plan itself. Provide plenty of feedback loops between advisory committee and citizens as a whole. Public hearings: no! Please, not useful. Workshops, opportunities to review and comment on written materials, hot lines during comment periods, advisory groups, lots of feedback loops to interested persons.
- ♦ No newsletter -- everyone has too much to read these days.
- ♦ Registered mail making sure information has been received.

5. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being very good and 5 being very poor, please rate the effectiveness of this open house in the following.

	Very Good 1	2	3	4	Very Poor 5
a. Providing information on planning issues		2	5	3	
b. Providing opportunities to give personal input	6	2	2	1	

6. **Other comments?**

- ◆ No trails -- no prohibitions on forestry.
- ◆ Most representatives I talked to didn't know much.
- ◆ Could have used more information on the process -- how will citizens be involved in subsequent phases.
- ◆ Worthwhile.
- ◆ I'm not sure the open house provided information on planning.
- ◆ Take care to prevent the appearance of "Bureaucracy comes to the rednecks and tells them what they will do" -- which unfortunately characterizes these efforts and reinforces the feeling among many that this is all just window dressing to fulfill requirements.

JO:rm sauv9502