



Rithy KHUT <rithy.khut@multco.us>

Fwd: Update to Multnomah County Comprehensive Plan

Rich FAITH <rich.faith@multco.us>
To: Rithy Khut <rithy.khut@multco.us>

Tue, Aug 23, 2016 at 8:39 AM

From: Marcy Houle <newmoonfarms@gmail.com>
Date: August 22, 2016 at 8:08:32 PM PDT
To: Commissioner Jules Bailey <jules.bailey@multco.us>, Kafoury Deborah <deborah.kafoury@co.multnomah.or.us>, district2@multco.us, district3@multco.us, district4@multco.us, district1@multco.us
Subject: Update to Multnomah County Comprehensive Plan

Dear Chair Kafoury and Commissioners:

I write to you as a member of the Citizen Advisory Committee who worked for over 15 months carefully studying, reviewing, and drafting updates to the rural Multnomah County Comprehensive Plan.

From this position, I would like to voice a deep concern over a requested modification to Policy 8.8, proposed by Metro, that would weaken protections for natural resources across all of the West Hills.

This policy, 8.8, was discussed in depth at our CAC meeting on February 14, 2016. All 14 members present were aware of what could be the ramifications to 8.8, if different wording was used.

After diligent and thorough discussion, we chose, in *unanimous* agreement, to closely align our words with the Sauvie Island/ Multnomah Channel Rural Plan, which offered stronger language that we all felt was essential if the intent of Goal 5 was to be observed.

Being a resident of Sauvie's Island, I was also involved, as a citizen, with the 2015 SIMC plan, which was another long and thoughtful CAC process. Its outcome was exemplary, and I wish to thank Commissioner Bailey in particular for making it clear that the county will honor its commitment not to change the policies that were recently adopted. Natural resource protection was an important goal in this plan, and had been in the past.

I am especially cognizant of this because I was a member of the 1997 CAC for Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel. During this process, precise wording for natural resource protection was also discussed. It was in this plan, in fact, that we first included policy language about recreation activities that were "complementary to" natural and environmental resources.

After all of this careful work, with historic precedence, opposition is today arising from METRO. METRO is requesting to change the clear intent that Multnomah County and Sauvie Island CAC's have carefully worded. This is worrisome indeed to all members of the Multnomah County CAC, as we know precisely the reason for METRO's advocacy to weaken the policy.

METRO, as we discussed in depth at our meeting on Feb. 14, 2016, seeks to lower standards for natural resource protection to make it easier to get their plan for recreational facilities approved by Multnomah County. They wish to change the word "complimentary" to a weaker version, "consistent"; further, they seek to limit any legal challenges.

This directly contradicts the full and *robust* agreement that the stronger word, complimentary, should be part of policy 8.8.

Understanding where METRO was coming from, the entire CAC voted to strengthen the language, and thus offer more protection for the resource, keeping our intent consistent with Goal 5.

While I, personally, would have liked to make the language entirely concordant with SIMC, and offer stronger protection, we reached a compromise that all felt was a good resolution: "8.8: *Support only those recreational activities within the West Hills area that are complementary to, and do not cause undue negative impacts on natural and environmental resources that are identified in Goal 5.*"

Speaking as a CAC member who was extremely involved in, not only this plan, but also the previous two Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel plans, I adjure you to retain the language that our committee strove so hard to delineate. When we said "complementary" rather than "consistent", and wrote "do not cause undue negative impacts on natural and environmental resources" we meant this precisely and accurately.

That's right. *All of us.* A unanimous CAC.

Additionally, I know I speak for my other CAC members saying that we request that all subarea policies govern should there be any conflict with county wide policies.

Lastly, I wish to go on record to say I strongly agree with the comments and corrections to the Comprehensive Plan requested by Carol Chesarek and Mark Greenfield.

Thank you very much for your attention to this matter. It is my true hope that you will give due consideration to the hours and months of time all 16 members gave as we poured over these policies.

Why? It's because we all really care about the place we live, and our responsibility to leave it in good measure, full function, and retained beauty for future generations.

Sincerely,

Marcy Cottrell Houle



Rithy KHUT <rithy.khut@multco.us>

Fwd: Update to Multnomah County Comprehensive Plan

Rich FAITH <rich.faith@multco.us>
To: Rithy Khut <rithy.khut@multco.us>

Tue, Aug 23, 2016 at 8:39 AM

From: Marcy Houle <newmoonfarms@gmail.com>
Date: August 22, 2016 at 8:08:32 PM PDT
To: Commissioner Jules Bailey <jules.bailey@multco.us>, Kafoury Deborah
<deborah.kafoury@co.multnomah.or.us>, district2@multco.us, district3@multco.us, district4@multco.us,
district1@multco.us
Subject: Update to Multnomah County Comprehensive Plan

Dear Chair Kafoury and Commissioners:

I write to you as a member of the Citizen Advisory Committee who worked for over 15 months carefully studying, reviewing, and drafting updates to the rural Multnomah County Comprehensive Plan.

From this position, I would like to voice a deep concern over a requested modification to Policy 8.8, proposed by Metro, that would weaken protections for natural resources across all of the West Hills.

This policy, 8.8, was discussed in depth at our CAC meeting on February 14, 2016. All 14 members present were aware of what could be the ramifications to 8.8, if different wording was used.

After diligent and thorough discussion, we chose, in *unanimous* agreement, to closely align our words with the Sauvie Island/ Multnomah Channel Rural Plan, which offered stronger language that we all felt was essential if the intent of Goal 5 was to be observed.

Being a resident of Sauvie's Island, I was also involved, as a citizen, with the 2015 SIMC plan, which was another long and thoughtful CAC process. Its outcome was exemplary, and I wish to thank Commissioner Bailey in particular for making it clear that the county will honor its commitment not to change the policies that were recently adopted. Natural resource protection was an important goal in this plan, and had been in the past.

I am especially cognizant of this because I was a member of the 1997 CAC for Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel. During this process, precise wording for natural resource protection was also discussed. It was in this plan, in fact, that we first included policy language about recreation activities that were "complementary to" natural and environmental resources.

After all of this careful work, with historic precedence, opposition is today arising from METRO. METRO is requesting to change the clear intent that Multnomah County and Sauvie Island CAC's have carefully worded. This is worrisome indeed to all members of the Multnomah County CAC, as we know precisely the reason for METRO's advocacy to weaken the policy.

METRO, as we discussed in depth at our meeting on Feb. 14, 2016, seeks to lower standards for natural resource protection to make it easier to get their plan for recreational facilities approved by Multnomah County. They wish to change the word "complimentary" to a weaker version, "consistent" □further, they seek to limit any legal challenges.

This directly contradicts the full and *robust* agreement that the stronger word, complimentary, should be part of policy 8.8.

Understanding where METRO was coming from, the entire CAC voted to strengthen the language, and thus offer more protection for the resource, keeping our intent consistent with Goal 5.

While I, personally, would have liked to make the language entirely concordant with SIMC, and offer stronger protection, we reached a compromise that all felt was a good resolution: "8.8: *Support only those recreational activities within the West Hills area that are complementary to, and do not cause undue negative impacts on natural and environmental resources that are identified in Goal 5.*"

Speaking as a CAC member who was extremely involved in, not only this plan, but also the previous two Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel plans, I adjure you to retain the language that our committee strove so hard to delineate. When we said "complementary" rather than "consistent", and wrote "do not cause undue negative impacts on natural and environmental resources" we meant this precisely and accurately.

That's right. All of us. A unanimous CAC.

Additionally, I know I speak for my other CAC members saying that we request that all subarea policies govern should there be any conflict with county wide policies.

Lastly, I wish to go on record to say I strongly agree with the comments and corrections to the Comprehensive Plan requested by Carol Chesarek and Mark Greenfield.

Thank you very much for your attention to this matter. It is my true hope that you will give due consideration to the hours and months of time all 16 members gave as we poured over these policies.

Why? It's because we all really care about the place we live, and our responsibility to leave it in good measure, full function, and retained beauty for future generations.

Sincerely,

Marcy Cottrell Houle