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Report on
Ballot Measure 7
OREGON SCENIC WATERWAY SYSTEM

To the Board of Governors,
City Club of Portland:

Ballot Measure 7 would add almost 500 miles to the state's existing Scenic Waterways System by the inclusion of segments of eleven rivers.

The measure reached the ballot by initiative petition, as did the original Scenic Waterways proposal in 1970. It should not be confused with proposed legislation in Congress which would add a much greater number of segments to the federal Wild and Scenic Rivers system in Oregon.

The language to appear on the ballot is:

Question: Shall Oregon law designate more river sections as scenic waterways?

Explanation: Adds more river sections to the "scenic waterways" system established by existing state law. Effect is to designate as scenic waterways new sections of four previously designated waterways (Clackamas, Deschutes, John Day, Rogue) and seven new river sections (parts of Elk, Klamath, McKenzie, Metolius, Nestucca, Umpqua, Wallowa-Grande Ronde). Designation as scenic waterways protects scenic, fishery, wildlife and recreation values along river. Prohibits dams and placer mining. Sets standards for development within one quarter mile of waterway. Does not affect Indian trust lands and tribal rights.
I. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

Additions to the State Scenic Waterway System as proposed by Measure 7 are listed in Table 1 below:

Table 1
Proposed 1988 Additions
State Scenic Waterways System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenic Waterways</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
<th>County(ies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas*</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Clackamas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deschutes*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Deschutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Curry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Day*</td>
<td>167.6</td>
<td>Grant, Wheeler &amp; Umatilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klamath</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Klamath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Lane &amp; Linn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metolius</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestucca</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>Yamhill &amp; Tillamook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogue*</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>Douglas &amp; Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umpqua</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallowa-Grande Ronde</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Union &amp; Wallowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MILES</td>
<td>496.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* expansion of existing State Scenic Waterways unit

The original Oregon Scenic Waterways System was proposed by initiative petition and approved by the voters in 1970. The City Club reviewed the original measure and recommended its approval. (Existing Oregon Scenic Waterways and the manner in which they were designated as well as a map of existing and proposed waterways are provided in Appendix A.)

A. Program Description

The goals of the Scenic Waterways Program are:

* To protect the free-flowing character of the designated water ways for fish, wildlife and recreation. No dams, reservoirs, impoundments or placer mining are allowed on scenic waterways;¹

* To protect and enhance scenic, aesthetic, natural, recreation, scientific and fish and wildlife qualities along the scenic waterways;

¹ The federal government preempts state regulation of hydroelectric dams.
* To protect private property rights. The Program discourages unsightly structures or inappropriate development that could be a nuisance to neighboring landowners or depreciate property values; and

* To encourage other state agencies to act consistently with the goals of scenic waterways management. The State Parks and Recreation Division consistently reviews plans and decisions made by other state agencies.

The program restricts future development of private property but respects existing land use and water rights. Public use of private property without the owner's consent is not permitted.

The Parks and Recreation Division of the Oregon Department of Transportation administers the Scenic Waterways Act. In addition, the Division of State Lands, Oregon State Marine Board and Oregon Water Resources Department have special responsibilities under the Act's regulations.

Specific rules for the management of each river in the system are based on the river's unique character and conditions along it. Each river plan is developed with the help of the property-owners, local governments, interested citizens, as well as other state and federal agencies.

Because there is great diversity in the character of the lands within the Program, river management plans utilize six classifications for protected areas. These range from "Natural River Areas" which are managed to retain their pristine state to "River Community Areas" which allow a wide variety of uses with proper screening.

Proposed activities and land uses along the designated waterways are reviewed by the state. This review is in addition to local permits. Within the context of the river management plan and the specific classification of the segment in question, a proposed development activity is reviewed to determine how well it fits with adjacent development and how well it is concealed from river view.

If the proposed activity is found to be compatible with the river management plan, it is approved. If it is found not compatible, the state will negotiate with the property owner to try to reach some compromise. If none can be reached, the State has the authority to acquire the property through negotiated purchase or by condemnation. Should the State not act within one year, the landowner may then proceed with the activity without a state permit.

Since 1972, approximately 700 applications for development have been reviewed. Of these, 50 have been denied, resulting in 18 properties being purchased by negotiation and two properties being acquired by condemnation.
B. Program Expansion

One of the goals of the system as stated in its statutory authorization is to promote expansion of the system. There are three methods by which a river or river segment can be designated as a scenic waterway:

- Adoption by the Governor. After study by State Parks and Recreation and with a favorable recommendations by the Transportation Commission and the Water Resources Commission, the Governor may designate a scenic waterway. The new designation becomes effective if the legislature does not object. (If designation occurs during the interim, such designation becomes effective after the next legislative session).

- Direct legislative action.

- Public initiative.

Study by the Parks and Recreation Department focuses on how a candidate river meets three scenic waterways criteria. The river or river segment must:

1) be relatively free-flowing (no dams or impoundments) and have a scene from the river which is "pleas-ant," or capable of being restored to a pleasant view;

2) possess outstanding recreational and natural values; and

3) be large enough to accommodate existing uses and increased recreational uses without causing major damage to the natural landscape or lessening the recreational experience.

Of the 11 waterways currently designated, six resulted from the original initiative, four from direct legislative action and one by proclamation by the Governor.

Since the system was adopted, numerous attempts have been made to add river segments to the system, but most have failed. Ballot Measure 7 represents an effort to designate new river segments by use of the initiative process. This measure would add 496.7 river miles for a new total of 1,279 designated river miles. The new total, if the initiative is approved, would constitute approximately 4% of the 35,000 miles of named waterways within the state of Oregon.

C. Concurrent Federal Legislative Proposals

Scenic waterway protection is also the subject of the federal Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The relationship between the state system and the federal system, and the
concurrent efforts to expand the federal system are issues which have been raised by both proponents and opponents to the measure. Table 2 is a brief comparison of the federal and state systems.

**Table 2**

Comparison of State and Federal River Protection Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Federal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dams</strong></td>
<td>Prohibits all except hydro-electric</td>
<td>Prohibits all dams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mining</strong></td>
<td>Prohibits placer (in-stream) mining. Regulates other mining activities. Applies to private lands.</td>
<td>Withdraws only federal lands from mining only in &quot;wild&quot; locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulated area</strong></td>
<td>Within 1/4 mile of stream banks.</td>
<td>Average of 320 acres per river mile. Exact border determined by agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control of federal agency actions</strong></td>
<td>State law &quot;considered&quot; but does not control federal actions.</td>
<td>Controls federal agency actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Condemnation</strong></td>
<td>Authorized over all private lands.</td>
<td>Authorized only if less than 50 percent of river corridor is in public ownership. Allows purchase of scenic easements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Senators Hatfield and Packwood have introduced S.2148 to add 40 Oregon river segments to the federal Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. (As of this writing, the bill has been amended to add three rivers to the total proposed for designation, study ten rivers for possible future designation, and call for the development of "citizen management plans" for an additional six rivers. Representatives AuCoin and DeFazio have also proposed federal legislation which would designate rivers in addition to the Hatfield bill, notably the Klamath.
Except for the South Fork of the McKenzie River, the Middle Fork of the John Day River, the North Umpqua River, Walker Creek, the Wallowa River, and portions of the Deschutes and Clackamas Rivers, all of the river segments proposed in State Measure 7 are included in proposed federal legislation. In terms of river miles, 320 of the 497 river miles in the state measure are included in federal proposals.

III. ARGUMENTS ADVANCED IN FAVOR OF THE MEASURE

The following arguments were advanced by proponents of this measure:

1. All of the segments proposed have high natural and scenic values and are worthy of designation as scenic waterways.

2. The segments were chosen as a result of a comprehensive study of possible rivers and the choice reflected consultation with state and federal agencies and local officials.

3. Because administrative and legislative efforts have largely failed and a statewide environmental protection mandate must be reasserted, the initiative process is an appropriate method of designating additional segments.

4. The existing system of land use planning and regulation of specific activities such as mining, logging and agriculture does not adequately protect the scenic and natural values of Oregon's waterways.

5. This initiative is compatible with the federal legislative proposals and the dual protection offered by both programs will once again establish Oregon as an exemplary state in resource protection.

6. The costs of administration of the existing system are reasonable and the addition of new river segments will not result in excessive administrative burdens.

7. The program promotes cooperative protection and wise use of these rivers by all: government, property owners and other users.

8. The negative economic impacts on logging, agriculture and development will be slight.

9. The positive economic impact of retaining a high quality of life in Oregon will be significant.
IV. ARGUMENTS ADVANCED IN OPPOSITION TO THE MEASURE

The following arguments were advanced by opponents to this measure:

1. Not all of the segments included in the initiative are deserving of designation.

2. Little thought or analysis was given as to which rivers are threatened or which are worthy of special protection.

3. Designating scenic waterways by initiative petition is an attempt at "micro-management" at the state level and doesn't allow for adequate public involvement or for the expression of the concerns of landowners affected by the proposal.

4. Existing regulation is adequate to address the concerns expressed about threats to the proposed segments.

5. Proposed federal legislation will deal with many of the same segments as well as others not proposed in the measure, therefore the initiative is redundant.

6. The measure will require additional resources to administer the new segments but it provides for no additional funding to the Parks and Recreation Division.

7. On the Klamath and John Day rivers, existing cooperative efforts to balance the needs for water, timber, wildlife and recreation will be hindered by passage of the measure, and future similar efforts may be affected.

8. New designations potentially lock up large quantities of water resources otherwise available for both agriculture and hydroelectric energy generation.

9. The measure will stimulate additional recreational use of the rivers without providing for facilities (e.g., campgrounds, sanitary facilities) that would protect the rivers from overuse.

V. DISCUSSION

The question posed by State Measure 7 is whether to add by initiative specified rivers and river segments to the State Scenic Waterways System. Your Committee was immediately forced to acknowledge its inability to make independent and scientifically informed judgments about the suitability of each river included in the initiative.
Your Committee did not attempt to determine whether the rivers proposed are the most qualified or whether the initiative process is the best way of designating additional rivers. The discussion and conclusions presented herein are submitted within this framework.

Your Committee focused on four major questions regarding the expansion of the program which your Committee believes summarize the arguments presented in favor of and in opposition to the measure. These questions are discussed below.

A. Is the Existing System Workable?

The question of designating additional waterways was evaluated in the context of the operation and impact of the existing Scenic Waterway System. Had your Committee found the existing system was controversial, burdensome, expensive to administer and adversely affecting river and water uses, these findings would have justified the desire for an extremely conservative and cautious approach to expansion of the system. In actuality, your Committee found that the existing system appears to enjoy support from both proponents and opponents of State Measure 7. No witness provided any testimony critical of the existing program.

Administration of the program appears to be flexible. The state administrator of the system testified that in the vast majority of cases (650 of 700 applications since the system was established), private landowners wishing to develop river-front property on Scenic Waterways were allowed to do so within the process of review by the state. In the remainder of the cases, negotiated purchases of the property predominated. Condemnation has been used only twice.

No evidence was given that the Scenic Waterway program has adversely affected resource development. A witness representing timber industry groups noted that such groups generally support the program, and another witness presented data showing the minimal effects the broader federal designation would have on timber harvests. No credible evidence was presented on existing or potential impacts on water supplies for agriculture.2

2 In Diack vs. City of Portland, 306 Or 287, ___ p2nd ___, SC534223 (1988), the Oregon Supreme Court expanded the scope of the Oregon Scenic Waterways Act by ruling that the State Water Resources Commission had the authority to regulate water diversions, under the criteria established in the Scenic Waterways Act on a portion of a river that flows into a scenic waterway. Such regulation would not necessarily result in prohibition of the diversion.
Finally, the costs of administration of the system are reasonable.

Because the existing system is workable, additions to the system of qualified rivers or segments appear to be desirable and also in keeping with stated goals of the program.

B. Is there adequate evidence to show that the river segments proposed in the initiative are appropriate for designation as scenic waterways?

Opponents of the ballot measure argue that the list of rivers is ad hoc, arbitrary, and political. They argue further that studies have not been done to demonstrate the appropriateness of the various proposed river segments and that local landowners already have management and protection well in hand. Opponents made a specific argument about the inappropriate nature of only one river segment (Walker Creek).

According to witnesses, proponents considered natural and scenic values, geographic distribution of major physiographic areas of the state, name recognition, and the immediacy of threats such as dam building in selecting rivers for inclusion in the measure. Included in the selection process was consultation with federal and state agencies, elected and appointed officials and timber industry and agricultural representatives.

Your Committee believes that the sponsors of the measure have made a plausible case for the appropriateness of each river included in the measure. Some rivers, such as the North Umpqua and the Wallowa-Grande Ronde, have already been studied by the state and found to qualify for the program. According to the measure's sponsors, others were studied and recommended for protected status by the U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management or the Northwest Power Planning Council. Many other segments are well-known to large numbers of Oregonians (the Metolius, for example). Most of the rivers or segments proposed in the measure are included in the proposed federal legislation, which drew lists of rivers from studies by federal agencies. Rivers in S. 2148 were further studied and recommended for designation in a comprehensive study by a group of state agencies under the leadership of the State Parks and Recreation Division.

The question before voters is not whether they are being offered the best possible list of rivers. Rather, the question is whether Oregon would be better off for the designation of these eleven river segments as Scenic Waterways.

C. Are the channels for administrative and legislative waterway designation provided in the original
act fair and effective, or is there a need at this
time to return to the electorate to bring addi-
tional waterways under the program?

The Scenic Waterways Act sets up both an administra-
tive and a legislative procedure for adding rivers to
the Oregon system. Several witnesses argued that these
procedures are sufficient for adding rivers. They
stress that the mandated studies and public hearings
assure that any rivers added through these processes
will be clearly meritorious and appropriate. They also
argue that initiatives are appropriate for setting basic
policy but that the use of the initiative to
second-guess a management process is inappropriate.

Members of your Committee expressed varying levels
of concern about the issue of process, in particular the
use of the initiative for "micro-management" rather than
policy-making. The consensus of your Committee is that
the initiative process is not the ideal means of adding
waterways, and that a process allowing more formal
public involvement and an evaluation of the comparative
merits of different waterways would be preferable.

However, your Committee is convinced that the ad-
ministrative and legislative processes have failed to
work as effectively as anticipated by the voters in
1970, and that the initiative is an appropriate response
to this failure.

The table below displays the various unsuccessful
legislative and administrative attempts to add rivers or
river segments to the Scenic Waterways Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful Legislative &amp; Administrative Attempts at Scenic Waterways Designation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>River Segment</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snake</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Legislative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Santiam</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Legislative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little North Fork Santiam</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Legislative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Legislative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Umpqua</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Legislative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmonberry</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Legislative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molalla</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Legislative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klamath</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Legislative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owyhee</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Legislative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallowa-Grande Ronde</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Legislative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallowa-Grande Ronde</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallowa-Grande Ronde</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Legislative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breitenbush</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Legislative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opal Creek</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Legislative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the administrative side, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) decides whether a river study is to be undertaken and whether a recommendation to designate is sent to the Governor. ODOT has relatively little incentive to pursue the expansion of the Scenic Waterways System. First, money spent on river studies, management plans, and property acquisition is money unavailable for other departmental programs. The department has not been given the mandate or the resources to implement the program vigorously. Second, ODOT's hearings occur in local areas where opponents are more likely to be heard than proponents. Third, ODOT has relatively little to gain in terms of political support through an active designation program. In fact, the agency has failed to make periodic reviews and reports on additional rivers for inclusion in the system. ODOT produces reports only on specific request from the Legislature.

The fact that only one river has been added through the administrative process (a 13-mile stretch of the Sandy River by Gov. Tom McCall in 1972) and that two other administrative attempts have failed is seen by your Committee as evidence of an inability of the administrative system to respond to the stated intent of the Scenic Waterways Act to expand the system.

There also appear to be problems with the addition of river segments by the legislature. One lake and segments of four rivers totaling approximately 150 miles have been added by the legislature (Waldo Lake and segments of the Deschutes, Clackamas, Willamette, and Little North Fork Santiam rivers).

Opponents of the present measure point out that segments have been added by each of the last three legislatures. However, at least thirteen attempts at legislative designation have failed since 1973. Proponents of the present measure argue that local opposition in the legislature can always block action. A witness who has participated as a legislator in attempts to designate additional rivers explained that state legislators representing districts containing potential scenic waterways tend to be more responsive to development, timber and agriculture interests in their districts. The legislature as a whole tends to defer to the position of the legislator representing the district in which the proposed scenic river is located. Many potential river additions have been killed at the committee level without ever being considered by the Senate or House.

Although your Committee is sympathetic to the argument that the initiative is an inappropriate way to decide questions of detail, we also believe that the paucity of additions since 1970 shows a failure of the current procedures. The failure to add more waterway
segments cannot be explained in terms of lack of qualified rivers or of opposition to or problems with the administration of the system.

The issue of river additions is a classic issue of focused versus diffuse interests. The administrative hearing process and the legislative process both give special clout to local interests, which have often resisted river designation. The initiative process, in contrast, allows more scattered and statewide interests to be effectively heard.

D. Is it appropriate to consider expanding state protection of scenic waterways while the U. S. Congress is considering bills to expand the federal Wild and Scenic Rivers program in Oregon?

Witnesses knowledgeable about both the state and federal systems view them as complementary and mutually supportive. The federal program bans all dams, and restrains the managing agency where federal lands are involved. It also provides access to federal management funds, but condemnation is usually unavailable as a management tool. The state program provides stronger protection in relation to mining activities, including a ban on in-stream placer mining.

Currently, segments of the Rogue, Illinois, and Owyhee rivers are covered by both programs, with no significant reported negative consequences.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Your Committee concludes that:

1. The Scenic Waterways Program enjoys general support, is flexibly administered, does not unduly inhibit resource development and does not present excessive administrative costs. Qualified rivers should be added to the system.

2. The ballot measure proposes a reasonable list of river segments for addition to the Scenic Waterways program.

3. The established administrative and legislative processes for adding mileage to the Oregon Scenic Waterways program have not worked effectively to protect many of the state's key waterways because the position of local representatives has been allowed to override state-wide concerns.

4. Any additional designations of federal Wild and Scenic Rivers will complement the protection offered by
the Oregon Scenic Waterways Program. There is no reason to delay additions to the state system because of possible federal action.

VII. RECOMMENDATION

Your Committee recommends a "Yes" vote on Ballot Measure No. 7.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl Abbott
Allan A. Abravanel
John Andersen
Jonathan B. Brown
Nancy L. Glerum
Denise Kleim
Ellen Lanier-Phelps
Ruth A. Robinson
Jeffrey Tashman, Chair

Approved by the Research Board on October 6, 1988 for transmittal to the Board of Governors. Received by the Board of Governors on October 10, 1988 and ordered published and distributed to the membership for consideration and action on October 28, 1988.
# APPENDIX A

## Existing Oregon Scenic Waterways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>River</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Method of Establishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rogue (lower)</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Original Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Original Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deschutes (lwr)</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Original Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minam</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Original Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owyhee (2 segments)</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Original Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Day</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Original Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Proclamation by Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Legislative Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Fork</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Legislative Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldo Lake</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Legislative Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little North Fork Santiam</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Legislative Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 656 miles

## Existing and Proposed Additions to State Scenic Waterway System
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Senator Jane Cease
Richard Glick, Attorney representing Oregon Water Resources Congress
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Jack Nicholls, McMinnville Power and Light Department
Michael Salsgiver, Office of Senator Mark O. Hatfield
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