

Doc# 2016100030

Clatsop County Board of Commissioners
Regular Meeting
September 28, 2016

Chair Scott Lee called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm., in the Judge Guy Boyington Building, 857 Commercial Street, Astoria, Oregon. Also present were Commissioners Sarah Nebeker, Lisa Clement, and Lianne Thompson and Dirk Rohne.

Staff Present:

- Cameron Moore County Manager
- Chris Crean County Counsel
- Heather Hansen Community Development Director

AGENDA APPROVAL

Nebeker requested item 5e be removed from the consent calendar and tabled. Lee looked for a motion to approve the amended consent calendar. Motion carried unanimously.

BUSINESS FROM THE PUBLIC

No business from the public.

CONSENT CALENDAR

- a. Youngs River Loop Road Federal Bridge Grant Award Acceptance..... {Page 1}
- b. Dedication of certain land in Seaside as Recreational Land..... {Page 7}
- c. Approval of purchase of Ford F350 pickup {Page 11}
- d. Appointment of Public Health Director {Page 13}
- e. Right-of-way Extension Easement..... {Page 15}
- f. ***Modification of IGA agreement with Bonneville Power Administration separate materials*

PUBLIC HEARING

a. Ordinance 16-03 Legislative Text Amendments to the Comprehensive..... {Page 23}

Heather Hansen, Community Development Director addressed the Board. Hansen advised the Board there is a corrected agenda summary. The Planning Commission approved minutes from July 26th, the draft minutes from September 13th, the approved minutes from the Southwest Coastal Citizens Advisory Committee (SCCAC) from January 21st, and the draft minutes from the SCCAC from July 12th are included in the new packet. Hansen gave the Board some background. There are six community planning areas identified in the Clatsop Comprehensive Plan – Northeast, Clatsop Plains, Lewis & Clark-Olney-Walluski, Elsie-Jewell, Seaside Rural and Southwest Coastal. Citizen Advisory Committees (CAC) were formed in each of the six Community Planning Areas for the sole purpose of advising on development of the Community Plans, which are part of the Comp Plan. After the Comp Plan was acknowledged in 1980, the Clatsop Plains, and Elsie-Jewell CACs continued for a short duration, and only a modified version of the SCCAC remains active. However, the Committee’s current role is greatly expanded from the intended role of the CACs and they only address land use issues within the Arch Cape rural community, this does not include Falcon Cove, Cove Beach, Arcadia, or anywhere else in the southwest community area, just the roughly 300 acres of the Arch Cape Rural Community within

1 the 3,000 acres of Southwest Coastal area. The Committee has clearly added value by advising on
2 the development of the Southwest Coastal Community Plan and the zoning regulations in the
3 Development Code that implemented that plan. Their recommendations have certainly affected the
4 look, feel, and sense of place in the Southwest Coastal Community Area because the zoning
5 regulations in the Development Code must be met in order to develop land within that area. The
6 zoning regulations are the reason there aren't strip malls along Highway 101 or tall houses
7 allowed along the oceanfront. Hansen said the issue before the Board tonight is not about whether
8 citizen involvement is important to the Clatsop County Board of Commissioners or whether the
9 Committee's input has added value to development in a particular geographic area of the county;
10 it's about the appropriate role for a county-appointed committee that advises on land use
11 decisions, and it's about the county's land use regulations being applied fairly and consistently
12 throughout the county.

13
14 Hansen said under their design review role, the Committee reviews all new structures and
15 expansions of existing footprints, including accessory structures so small they don't require
16 building permits. These types of development are not considered land use decisions anywhere else
17 in the county and are generally processed over the counter. For example, if you want to build a
18 house anywhere outside of the Arch Cape Rural Community, a person submits the plans and they
19 are reviewed by Planning staff to ensure they meet all the development standards in the zone they
20 are in, such as setbacks, building height, lot coverage, parking, access, etc. The development
21 standards for building a house should be clear and objective so they are applied fairly and
22 consistently regardless of who the applicant is or where they are from. If the house meets all the
23 standards, the applicant can then apply for building permits and begin construction soon after. The
24 fee for this type of review is \$75.

25
26 In Arch Cape, to build that same house, the applicant would pay an additional \$711 for a special
27 design review, staff would send a notice out to property owners within 250 feet, the applicant or
28 their representative would present their plans at a hearing at the next regularly scheduled
29 Committee meeting, the Committee would make a recommendation to the Director based on the
30 development standards in the Development Code, then the Director would make the decision and
31 issue a Notice, and the applicant could then apply for building permits once the appeal period is
32 over. This additional step adds at least 4-6 weeks to the process of building a house in Arch Cape.

33
34 The vast majority of applications the Committee reviews are for design review of new single
35 family houses, additions, decks, and accessory structures. But the Committee also reviews all
36 other types of land use applications, again only within the Arch Cape Rural Community, including
37 Conditional Uses, Variances, Rezones, Subdivisions, etc. and makes a recommendation to either
38 the Director or to the Planning Commission, depending on the type of application. All their
39 reviews must rely upon existing land use regulations – the same ones used by the Director or
40 Planning Commission in making their final decision.

41
42 The Board needs to decide whether the Committee's current role is appropriate and are the land
43 use regulations being applied fairly and consistently throughout the county. In response to a
44 complaint by an applicant in November 2015, Interim County Manager Rich Mays requested
45 information from staff about the Committee such as the types of applications they review, what
46 process they use, how long it takes, how much it costs, and what authority they have. Mr. Mays

1 also conferred with County Counsel regarding the need for the committee and the appropriate role
2 for a Board appointed advisory committee in land use decisions. Mr. Mays attended the January
3 2016 meeting of the Committee. County Counsel didn't feel the Committee's role was appropriate
4 or that the county's land use regulations were being fairly administered countywide, nor did
5 Interim County Manager Rich Mays. On February 10th 2016, Mr. Mays recommended that the
6 Board of Commissioners pass a Resolution that had two parts: (1) Immediate discontinuance of
7 the Committee; and (2) Direction to the Community Development Director to initiate amendments
8 to the Comp Plan and Development Code, which the Board passed unanimously.

9
10 The Interim County Manager recommended the discontinuation of this committee for the
11 following reasons:

- 12 1. It is inappropriate for a subordinate body to the Board of Commissioners to be delegated a
13 broad role in quasi-judicial decision making while being limited to a specific geographic
14 area.
- 15 2. It is inappropriate for a subordinate body to the Board of Commissioners, representing a
16 specific geographic area, to be permitted to make land use decisions not authorized
17 elsewhere in Clatsop County.
- 18 3. Regarding the above two points, if in the future there is a land use issue specific to the
19 Southwest Coastal area, the Board of Commissioners can appoint an ad-hoc committee to
20 address it.
- 21 4. All of the activities associated with this committee and its monthly meetings add additional
22 financial cost to the public and the applicant without providing a corresponding public
23 benefit.
- 24 5. Committee review adds about 4 to 6 weeks to the county's review process - a process that
25 is typically completed "over the counter" for other Clatsop County residents and
26 developers. This prolonged time frame increases the risk of the county violating the state
27 requirement that the development permit process not exceed 150 days.
- 28 6. When a committee with quasi-judicial authority is made up of citizens from such a small
29 geographic area, it is unavoidable that those members will be considering land use issues
30 involving their friends and neighbors. This increases the possibility of bias, subjective
31 decision making and questions of committee members properly recusing themselves.

32
33 The Board's action by Resolution to dissolve the Committee was appealed to the State's Land Use
34 Board of Appeals (LUBA). LUBA held that the discontinuance of the Committee constitutes a
35 land use decision and thus the county must first amend its Comp Plan and Development Code to
36 complete the dissolution of the Committee. The appeal was voluntarily remanded. Meanwhile
37 staff has continued to work on the Comp Plan and Development Code amendments to discontinue
38 the Committee, while simultaneously enhancing citizen involvement countywide through the
39 proposed amendments.

40
41 Hansen gave a summary of the proposed text amendments to the Comp Plan.

42 1. Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement

- 43 (a) Remove language referencing the SCCAC as the only active Citizens Advisory
44 Committee.
- 45 (b) Remove policy regarding active citizen advisory committees.

- (c) Add policy that advisory committees may be appointed by the Board of Commissioners to address specific land use issues as needed (a common practice of the Board).
- (d) Add community organizations to policy about public notices.
- (e) Add recommended action about requirement for Applicant-Neighborhood meetings for certain land use applications.

2. Southwest Coastal Community Plan

- (a) Add policy reiterating Goal 1 policy that the Planning Commission is the County's Committee for Citizen Involvement.
- (b) Repeat Goal 1 policy that ad hoc advisory committees may be appointed by the Board of Commissioners to address specific land use issues as needed.
- (c) Repeat Goal 1 policy that public notices will also be sent to community organizations.
- (d) Remove references to SCCAC role in design review and other recommendations.
- (e) Revise language regarding hardship variances clarifying that they will be considered by the Planning Commission or Hearings officer as is done in the rest of the county.

The following is a summary of proposed text amendments to the Development Code.

1. Section 1.030 Definitions: Add definition of a neighborhood/community organization.
2. NEW Section 2.046 Applicant-Neighborhood Meeting: Adds requirement for applicant to hold a neighborhood meeting for certain types of land use applications prior to submitting an application.
3. Section 2.110 & 2.115 Mailed Notice: Revises language regarding neighborhood or community organizations.
4. NEW Section 2.111 Posting Notice of Public Hearing: Adds requirement for posting a sign on properties that are the subject of a land use hearing. County provides the sign, which can be reused.
5. Section 3.068 Arch Cape Rural Community Residential Zone-Development and Use Standards:
 - (a) Add restriction on height of accessory buildings in setbacks to address protection of ocean views.
 - (b) Relocate some design standards from the Arch Cape Overlay District.
 - (c) Remove redundant regulations, i.e., they are already required elsewhere in the Development Code.
6. Section 3.262 Rural Community Commercial Zone-Development and Use Standards:
 - (a) Relocate some design standards from the Arch Cape Overlay District to the Rural Community Commercial Zone.
 - (b) Remove redundant regulations, i.e., they are already required elsewhere in the Development Code.
7. Section 4.100 Arch Cape Rural Community Overlay:
 - (a) Relocate some design standards to the Arch Cape Rural Residential Zone and Rural Community Commercial Zone and delete the Design Review sections.
 - (b) Keep the Short-Term Rental Program section pending further discussions county wide.
 - (c) Delete the Variance section since it is already covered verbatim in Section 5.130.
 - (d) Relocate subsection (2) from the Nonconforming Uses and Structures to Section 5.600 Non-conforming Uses and Structures. The remainder is already covered verbatim in 5.600.
8. Section 5.608 Non-Conforming Uses and Structures-Alteration

- 1 (a) Relocate subsection (2) from Section 4.124 Arch Cape Non-Conforming Uses and
2 Structures-Alteration, which puts limits on alterations to non-conforming structures over a
3 three-year period.
4

5 There were three hearings held.
6

7 July 12, 2016: SCCAC held a public hearing and voted to recommend denying the application
8 and keeping the SCCAC intact based on their findings that the amendments are not consistent
9 with Goal 1 of the Comprehensive Plan and the Southwest Coastal Community Plan. Their
10 findings are incorporated into the staff analysis found in Exhibit PC.
11

12 July 26, 2016: Planning Commission held a public hearing and continued the hearing to
13 September 13, 2016. The Planning Commission requested that staff return with options for
14 enhancing citizen involvement – both countywide and in Arch Cape. County Manager Cameron
15 Moore instructed staff to focus only on countywide citizen involvement options.
16

17 September 13, 2016: Planning Commission held a public hearing, deliberated, and voted to
18 recommend approval of the proposed amendments with a minor modification regarding staff
19 attendance at applicant-neighborhood meetings.
20

21 Hansen said the majority of public testimony has been from residents and property owners in the
22 Arch Cape area against dissolution of the county-appointed Committee. Of those, some think they
23 should continue their advisory role in design review as well as other quasi-judicial land use
24 decisions, and others feel that role is not appropriate and want their role limited to legislative
25 matters. The minority of testimony was in favor of dissolving the committee, pointing out that
26 their review is redundant and unnecessary. One person testified that the new requirements for
27 posting property that is subject to a land use hearing and for applicant-neighborhood meetings
28 should both be the county's responsibility; and the meeting requirement should be voluntary not
29 mandatory.
30

31 Some general themes and arguments against the dissolution of the committee:
32

- 33 • The Board doesn't have the authority to discontinue the Committee per the Comp Plan and
34 bylaws.

35 Staff response: The proposed amendments remove the advisory role of the Committee in
36 the Comp Plan and Development Code. The Comp Plan and Development Code are living
37 documents that can be amended as needed. The Board is the County's policy making body
38 and they have the right to create and amend their policies and implementing measures as
39 long as they comply with State and Federal laws. The Planning Commission is the
40 county's designated Committee for Citizen Involvement and the proposed amendments
41 enhance Goal 1-Citizen Involvement countywide. The Committee Bylaws do not
42 supersede the County Code of Regulations, which authorizes the Board to dissolve an
43 advisory committee that it appoints.
44

- 45 • Committee involvement results in better outcomes/we are most familiar with the area.

1 Staff response: The benefit of adding a public hearing to applications that would otherwise
2 be a staff decision (Type I) or a Director decision (Type II) elsewhere in the County does
3 not outweigh the additional time and cost to the applicant and to the county. Local review
4 of sheds, houses, and additions is more appropriate for neighborhood associations with
5 adopted CC&Rs. The development standards should be clear enough that staff can review
6 and apply them. Staff review of these types of developments already includes compliance
7 with relevant development standards, such as setbacks, height limits, vegetation, etc. Other
8 types of discretionary land use decisions are already heard by the Planning Commission or
9 Hearings Officer and additional opportunities for citizen involvement are proposed.

- 10
11 • Retain Committee for legislative review.

12 Staff response: If there were any Comp Plan or Development Code amendments proposed
13 that are specific to the Southwest Coastal Community Area, an ad hoc advisory committee
14 would be appointed by the Board. It would have broader representation from the area than
15 the current Committee (which are just property owners in the Arch Cape Rural Community
16 area), such as residents, property owners, and business owners from the entire Southwest
17 Coastal area, ODOT, State Forestry, US Forest Service, State Parks, etc. Appointing a
18 standing committee from Arch Cape for legislative review of unknown future land use
19 actions is not practical or necessary.

- 20
21 • It's too far to come to Astoria to testify/our voices won't be heard.

22 Staff response: There are many opportunities for citizens to be made aware of pending land
23 use actions and to have their voices heard, including new ones proposed in this ordinance –
24 properties subject to land use hearings will be posted, applicant-neighborhood meetings
25 will be required for certain land use applications, notices will be sent to adjacent property
26 owners and community organizations, and testimony can always be provided in writing,
27 The Planning Division will also be posting a map with links to active land use applications
28 so it will be easier to be aware of development when it is proposed throughout the county.
29 The public can always review and comment on any active land use applications.

30
31 Hansen said citizen involvement is really what this is about and they need to comply with the
32 Statewide Planning Goal 1 and any Comp Plan or Code amendments that are made. The Planning
33 Commission is the county's designated Committee for citizen involvement. The existing
34 countywide methods of citizen involvement comply with the Statewide Planning Goal and the
35 proposed methods will enhance citizen involvement countywide.

36
37 Hansen said if this ordinance passes, development and citizen participation would be handled
38 consistently countywide. Hansen shared some examples of how applications that currently require
39 a special design review and public hearing in Arch Cape would be processed:

- 40
41 • Structures under 200 square feet: No Building or Planning permits required (they must still
42 comply with setbacks and any natural hazard overlay requirements, if applicable)
43 • Remodels requiring a structural permit: No Planning permit required.
44 • Type I Applications-Structures 200 square feet or greater/expansions: Staff decision;
45 planning permit required; clear and objective development standards apply.

- 1 • Type II Applications (e.g., partitions, minor subdivisions, limited conditional uses): Director
2 decision; Notice is mailed; Development standards and review criteria apply.
- 3 • Type IIa/III Applications (e.g., variances, major conditional uses, and major subdivisions):
4 Planning Commission hearing & decision; Notice is mailed, published and posted on the
5 property; Development standards and review criteria apply.
- 6 • Type IV Applications (e.g., rezones, legislative amendments): Planning Commission
7 hearing; Board hearing and decision; Notice is published, and also mailed and posted on the
8 property (if quasi-judicial); Development standards and review criteria apply.
- 9 • Major Legislative Amendments: Prior to public hearings before the Planning Commission
10 and Board, an ad hoc advisory committee would be appointed by the Board with broad
11 representation from the affected areas; Open Houses, workshops, community meetings
12 would be held as directed by the Board. Recent examples include North Clatsop Plains,
13 Tsunami Hazard Overlay, Transportation System Plan, Farm & Forest Code Update, and
14 Wetlands Advisory Committee.

15
16 Lee asked for the first reading by short title only. Hansen read Ordinance 16-03: “In the matter of
17 an Ordinance adopting legislative text amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Land and
18 Water Development and Use Ordinance #80-14 regarding the Southwest Coastal Citizens
19 Advisory Committee, Arch Cape Rural Community, and additional requirements for Citizen
20 Involvement countywide; and declaring an emergency.”

21
22 Lee opened the public hearing.

23
24 Charles Dice, 31911 Clatsop Lane, Arch Cape. Dice thanked the commissioners for their service.
25 Dice requests the Board not approve Ordinance 16-03. Dice said this ordinance was crafted as a
26 way to eliminate the SCCAC which has been operating in Arch Cape for over 40 years. The
27 committee has done a fine job resolving local land use issues. This committee does not make
28 decisions but makes recommendations to the Planning Commission. Dice wants to know what has
29 changed so drastically to do away with the committee and to do it under an emergency process.
30 Dice said there has been no published examples of any errors from the work that was done by the
31 committee. Dice is asking the Board to represent the best interests of the people. Dice said it does
32 not seem fair that the people of Arch Cape are not being heard.

33
34 Linda Eyerman, 80296 Pacific Road, Arch Cape. Eyerman has been a member of SCCAC since
35 2012. Eyerman has testified at four hearings regarding the dissolution of the committee and has
36 submitted written testimony four times. Eyerman wanted the Board to know that no one
37 understands why this is happening. The committee has been doing the work that the county has
38 assigned to it without much conflict. When there has been a conflict it is generally because
39 applicants and county staff are more development minded then the people of Arch Cape are.
40 Eyerman said the first time the committee was dissolved was an illegal act. The county has
41 basically wiped out everything that was done in February. Eyerman said the staff has been
42 wandering on their own and questions why the commissioners are on an illegal path again to try to
43 disband and dissolve a committee that is active. Eyerman said if the design review function is a
44 problem then take away the design review function but leave the committee in place so there will
45 at least be a voice for the southwestern region.

1 Jim Jensvold, 80030 Pacific Road, Arch Cape. Jensvold said he has had a relationship with the
2 community and county for years. Jensvold asked the Board to look at the testimony, draft minutes
3 from the SCCAC meeting and the comments from the petition of the southwest coastal community
4 that was put up a few days ago. Jensvold said the people of the southwest coastal community are
5 reasonable people, willing to compromise, cooperate, obey the laws and respect their neighbors.
6 Jensvold does not see how this constitutes an emergency and asked the Board to see a way to
7 retain the beneficial functions of the committee.

8
9 Debra Birkby 79829 Gelinsky Road, Arch Cape. Birkby brought a 2007 award from the county for
10 the committee's participation. Birkby said Oregon land use began as an ideal for Oregonians
11 vision not a permit process driven by staff and personnel. Birkby said citizens formed a land use
12 plan to fit in each area and this is how there is exclusive farm use, single family residential, the
13 rural service area and many other zones. Birkby asked the Board to read a newspaper article she
14 gave them as they continue to prepare to dissolve the last of Clatsop's rural plans. In 2003 the
15 planner introduced the licensing for short term rental in Arch Cape which became the beginning of
16 the end to Arch Cape as Birkby's neighbors knew it for the previous 75 years. Three members of
17 the Board after years of public hearings, self-funded billable lands inventory, wetland survey by
18 Arch Cape residents, Sanitary Districts and Watershed Councils voted to adopt the plan to protect
19 the residences. Birkby said three years later the plan has not been adopted. Birkby asked the Board
20 why they would want to dissolve the SCCAC.

21
22 Virginia Birkby, 79829 Gelinsky Road, Ach Cape. Birkby asked the Board to consider adopting
23 the plan over two meetings and to allow time to digest all the testimony. Birkby cannot think of
24 any instance that warrants an emergency in one meeting. Birkby asks that at least one
25 commissioner disagree with making the final decision because the entire Board must support the
26 decision to have it be considered an emergency. Birkby truly believes that she has been publically
27 humiliated by the Interim County Manager Rich Mays and County Counsel Chris Crean. She
28 believes they reported to the press and the Commissioners that Birkby created a hostile work
29 environment and was unprofessional. Birkby said the first time she heard that was in reading
30 minutes from a meeting that she was not involved in. Birkby said that county staff and legal
31 counsel have neglected to provide her with any process skills working on a county committee or
32 any training to address perceived performance. Birkby has asked what conditions have to be met
33 in order to have the meeting in the Arch Cape community. Birkby feels let down by staff
34 members.

35
36 Theodore Lundy, 2553 Grand Ave., Astoria. Lundy has been a member of the committee. Lundy
37 wanted to reiterate the importance of the committee to the citizens of the southwest county. Lundy
38 said the committee is a community thing like a family meeting. The committee sees it as a way for
39 local people to voice their opinions in developments. Lundy shared an example of one
40 development where local people would come in as opposing the development but the committee
41 worked with the developer to adjust the plan, facilitate and keep trees from being cut down and
42 they left as friends.

43
44 Gordon Church, 79878 Hwy 101, Arch Cape. Church has many of the same concerns. Church said
45 that potential conflicts and ramifications do not appear anywhere in the actual documentation of
46 disbanding the committee. Church said no system of potential ad hoc committees or instituting

1 neighborhood organizations could possibly replace 40 years of continuity. The local people have a
2 local venue to work out potential differences to apply the zoning regulations or building design
3 conflicts. The committee has fulfilled that role.

4
5 Nebeker asked staff or county counsel to address what citizen involvement they can still
6 participate in and why the county has chosen to disband the committee. Crean said the group can
7 participate in the land use proceedings. They are not acting on behalf of the county as a committee
8 to conduct the first public hearing on land use applications. That is where the problems arose.
9 Crean said they have improved the public notice provisions in the County Code. There will be
10 more public notice and outreach. The people in Arch Cape and the rest of the county can be
11 engaged and participate as much as they want. Thompson appreciates her neighbors for their
12 passion and concerns for protecting their places. Thompson shares their concerns on how to
13 protect neighborhood livability. Thompson said land use is state law in Oregon and county staff is
14 obliged to follow state law. Thompson said she is pained to hear that Birkby felt disrespected and
15 apologized to her. Thompson said the Arch Cape Design Review Committee was given quasi-
16 judicial authority and there are very stringent controls on what needs to be done and how it has to
17 be done or there is legal exposure to risk. Thompson said not every person in the community
18 agrees with the dissolution and sometimes those people do not want to appear on record because
19 they are concerned about their neighbors making opinions. Crean said one of the initial problems
20 was the legal requirements; there were procedural errors which puts the county at risk. Crean said
21 he is also concerned about the compliance with public meetings law such as a matter pending
22 within the Arch Cape Committee and if it was discussed through email. If so, it is a public uniform
23 violation which could turn each one of the committee member's devices into a public record.
24 There are ADA issues that Interim County Manager Mays mentioned. Crean said these issues have
25 exposed the county and the tax payers to risk. Thompson's concerns are how to encourage the
26 support and how to maintain the continuity and quality of neighborhood livability. Thompson said
27 staff has come forward with proposals which may not be acceptable for some. A Neighborhood
28 Association is one option. Thompson said what is clear to her is the committee having quasi-
29 judicial authority is not a good idea. Rohne said he believes everyone should be treated fairly and
30 encourages public involvement and said the Board is not trying to jeopardize the public
31 involvement process. Rohne said no public process is being short changed and that a small bit of
32 authority in the small area of Arch Cape has been backed because all tax payers in Clatsop County
33 are paying for the unique authority that only a small group and a small area of a section have.
34 Rohne believes it is entirely appropriate to dissolve the SCCAC. Lee said he read every page and
35 every comment at least twice and has taken this issue lightly. Lee believes the dissolution is best
36 for the county.

37
38 *Rohne moved to adopt Ordinance 16-03, adopting legislative text amendments to the*
39 *Comprehensive Plan and Land and Water Development and Use Ordinance 80-14; to declare an*
40 *emergency; and to conduct the second reading by title only and Clement seconded. Motion carried*
41 *unanimously.* Moore read Ordinance 16-03 by short title only.

42 43 **COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS**

44 Nebeker attended the Arts Council meeting where they are continuing on with the surveys which
45 represent a lot of hours. There are 400 surveys left to complete by the first of January. The Astor
46 Street Opry will present Barefoot in the Park in October. The Coaster Theater will be presenting

1 “Don’ Dress for Dinner” and “It’s a Wonderful Life.” The Stormy Weather Festival will be in
2 November. The last Tuesday of every month Ft. George does a benefit for a non-profit. Storm
3 Large will perform at the Liberty Theater on October 8th. The Arts Council wanted Nebeker to
4 express her appreciation to Theresa Dursse and to the county for assisting with the surveys and the
5 other support that they have received. There is a vacancy on the Arts Council if anyone is
6 interested.

7
8 Clement attended the Three Course Challenge at Camp Rile which is a locally organized race from
9 Seaside High School. The race attracts middle and high school runners. There were 2500 runners
10 that ran the true cross country course. The Great Columbia Crossing is coming up on October 16th
11 which benefits Columbia Memorial Hospital.

12
13 Thompson said she is enthused about Clatsop County building modular housing. Thompson would
14 like a round table discussion to bring all parties together. Thompson went to a meeting of the
15 governor’s work group on wood products and presented the housing idea to them and they were
16 quite responsive. The idea is to make better use of the trees that are cut. The Community Action
17 Team will be celebrating their 50th anniversary party.

18
19 Rohne attended the Northwest Seniors & Disabilities Services meeting. The meeting was very
20 positive. The state is reducing services so they will be looking at people who are at risk. The
21 facility is in Warrenton. Rohne is working on a Farm and Forest Committee to review land use
22 under Heather Hansen and Will Caplinger. Caplinger has good relations with a broader
23 community and the involvement has increased so it is moving in a positive direction. Rohne
24 attended the CEDR meeting and on October 5th there is the Forestry Leaders Tour. Affordable
25 housing was discussed at the CEDR meeting. CEDR was in support of the Bella Ridge project
26 which fell through so there is a little bit of disappointment and frustration on the committee.
27 It was suggested that the county take on this issue and Rohne feels it would be impossible for the
28 county to organize this wide spread effort without devoting an incredible amount of resources.
29 Nebeker suggested another county wide meeting with all the elected officials and managers to
30 discuss this issue. Moore said they will be organizing this meeting sometime next year and hope to
31 meet semi-annually.

32
33 Lee said he would like to see another countywide meeting. Lee and Thompson attended the
34 Association of Oregon Counties (AOC) district meeting. Betsy Johnson was in attendance.
35 Clatsop County has been dealing with issues on fisheries and forestry. Lee told Johnson that the
36 county needs some leadership from the Governor’s office on these issues and Johnson agreed. Lee
37 attended the executive meeting of the Oregon Coastal Zone Management Association (OCZMA)
38 and they will be moving their annual meeting to the AOC conference. The Wetlands Advisory
39 Committee met on Monday and they talked about the new maps. Lee asked Hansen when the
40 target date was for the maps to be out. Hansen said she can have them posted online the next day.
41 The Wetlands Advisory Committee will deliver a recommendation to the Planning Commission.

42 43 **COUNTY MANAGER’S REPORT**

44 Moore reminded the Board that 2017 will be time to convene a Charter Review Committee.
45 Moore would like to bring a presentation to the Board in October about past practice. It will be a
46 complicated process. Lee asked what the expectations of the Charter Review Committee would be.

1 Moore said they will set the scope of review, membership of the committee, frequency of
2 meetings, and more to discuss.

3

4 **ADJOURNMENT 7:35PM**

5

6

Approved by,

7

8

9

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'S. Lee', is written above a horizontal line.

10

Scott Lee, Chairperson