

1 **SUMMARY OF AUGUST 13, 2020**
2 **CLATSOP PLAINS CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #8**
3 **ELECTRONIC MEETING**

4
5 **Call to Order**

6 **The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by Mary Kemhus, CPCAC Chair.**
7

CPCAC Members Present	CPCAC Commissioners Absent	Staff Present	Public Present
Maria Pincetich	Phillip Johnson	Gail Henrikson	Chris Farrar
Mary Kemhus		Julia Decker	Jon Burpee
Devon Abing			
Don Abing			
Robert Stricklin			
Diane Heintz			

8
9 **Introductions**

10 The CPCAC members, public, and staff introduced themselves.
11

12 **Review of Meeting Summaries:**

13 There were no corrections, additions, or deletions to the July 9, 2020, meeting summary.
14

15 **Public Comment and Input:**

16 None.
17

18 **Review of Goal 5 Topics – Wetlands and Riparian Corridors:**

19 Ms. Kemhus opened the floor for discussion of the Goal 5 worksheet containing policies related to wetlands
20 and riparian corridors. She asked if any committee members had any comments about the policies listed
21 on the worksheet.

22 s
23 Ms. Henrikson provided an overview of the cover memo that had been provided in the agenda. She called
24 the committee’s attention to the six action items that were listed at the beginning of the memo.
25

26 Ms. Kemhus read Policy #1 on the worksheet and asked the committee members whether they thought this
27 goal had been met.
28

29 Ms. Pincetich asked what was meant by the term “identified”. She asked how the County protects wetlands
30 that are not identified in the comprehensive plan. Ms. Henrikson discussed the setback requirements that
31 the County has for certain types of wetlands and riparian areas and explained the role of the Department of
32 State Lands in managing wetlands. Ms. Henrikson discussed the Duncan Thomas report that had been
33 completed in 1982, which identified the wetland areas that are now included in Goal 5.
34

35 Ms. Pincetich asked whether other wetlands listed in the Duncan Thomas report could be added to Goal 5.
36 Ms. Henrikson stated that identifying new or additional wetlands is also part of the update process.
37

38 Mr. Stricklin different types of wetland areas. He stated that it is overly simplified in language if you
39 haven’t ever walked it. Ms. Heintz stated that she had been told the reason Smith Lake had not been
40 designated a wetland was because the surrounding property owners owned the lake and that because it
41 was private property it could be filled. She asked what it meant to “protect” a wetland under Goal 5. The
42 committee continued to discuss how lands were divided around the various lakes on the Clatsop Plains.

1
2 Ms. Henrikson explained how wetlands are broken into three distinct categories in the comprehensive plan.
3 She explained that Goal 16 addressed estuarine wetlands, Goal 17 addressed coastal wetlands, and Goal 5
4 addressed freshwater wetlands.

5
6 Mr. Stricklin explained the geography and topography of the Clatsop Plains. He continued to discuss the
7 history of the development of the Clatsop Plains. He stated that there is real puzzlement about who is in
8 charge.

9
10 Ms. Kemhus asked the committee members again whether they had determined that Policy 1 had been
11 completed. Ms. Heintz stated that the committee was stuck because they did not know what “protect”
12 means. She stated that Policy 1 is too imprecise to determine whether it had been met. She stated that in
13 her opinion, the policy had not been accomplished and that it should be retained and clarified.

14
15 Ms. Kemhus asked about Policy 9, which states “The county shall recognize existing surface mining
16 operations as significant resources pursuant to Goal 5, and shall allow existing operations to continue for
17 two (2) years without conforming to the performance standards in the zoning ordinance. Expansion beyond
18 the limits of an existing site shall be in accordance with county zoning regulations.” She specifically asked
19 why the two-year window had been established.

20
21 The committee continued to discuss how to identify wetlands.

22
23 Ms. Kemhus read Policy 2 aloud. Ms. Pincetich stated that this was a very tactical component in a policy
24 document. She stated that the level of detail was not appropriate. The committee members agreed that
25 the specificity of the policy seemed out of place.

26
27 Ms. Kemhus stated that Policy 3 is almost trying to define things. She said it might be better in Policy 1 to
28 help clarify that policy. Mr. Stricklin added that it was not a broad strategy.

29
30 Mr. Stricklin stated that the Chinook Indian Nation is concerned about the white-tailed deer habitat. Mr.
31 Abing stated that white-tailed deer are the canary in the coal mine. The Columbia species is found
32 nowhere else in the country. He discussed the historical connection with the deer and that anything to
33 diminish that population would diminish the culture of the Chinook Nation.

34
35 Ms. Kemhus and Mr. Abing discussed possible language to include in the comprehensive plan policies that
36 would address Mr. Abing’s comments and observations and which would identify the white-tailed deer as
37 an indicator or marker species. The board continued discuss revisions to the wording to put more of an
38 emphasis on wildlife behavior rather than artificial and arbitrary human boundaries. Ms. Heintz added that
39 the cultural relationship of the white-tailed deer and the Chinook Indian Nation also needed to be noted.

40
41 With regard to sub-policy “c”, Ms. Kemhus stated that this policy could be revised to indicate where
42 industrial development should occur. She asked the committee what their thoughts were. Mr. Stricklin
43 stated that industrial development should be eliminated.

44
45 Ms. Pincetich stated that it needed to be revised to allow development only after the county’s
46 requirements for protection had been met and that what that protection consisted of had yet to be
47 defined.

1 Ms. Henrikson again discussed the setback requirements from Goal 5 wetlands. She discussed the balance
2 that would be required to compensate property owners if industrial development were prohibited. Ms.
3 Heintz stated that she would pay more property taxes to support that goal. She added that if the county's
4 overarching goal is to diminish the destruction of those riparian waterways, that should be the goal.
5
6 Mr. Stricklin discussed county-owned parcels that are critical to protecting certain environmentally-
7 sensitive areas.
8
9 Ms. Kemhus stated that if she understood the consensus of the committee members, they wanted these
10 specific types of sub-policies in Policy 3 to apply to all wetlands.
11
12 Ms. Heintz asked if staff knew why this particular policy had been included. Ms. Henrikson answered that
13 she did not know the reason. Ms. Heintz stated that it was confusing to her why such a specific policy had
14 been included.
15
16 Ms. Heintz asked if there were other policies that dealt with specific sites which such detail. The committee
17 members and staff continued to discuss why very specific policies might be included for some sites and
18 areas and other policies are very broad and general.
19
20 Mr. Farrar stated that Policy 3 and its associated sub-policies might have been a political compromise. The
21 committee agreed that all of the sub-policies in Policy 3 should be applied to all wetland sites throughout
22 the county. Mr. Farrar stated that it would be helpful to have a map showing where these sites were. Ms.
23 Kemhus noted that there was a map that was included in the agenda materials.
24
25 Ms. Kemhus opened the meeting to public comment and input. There was no public comment.
26
27 Ms. Kemhus asked if the committee members had any closing comments. No committee members had
28 comments.
29
30 Ms. Kemhus asked for a motion to adjourn. Ms. Pincetich seconded that.
31
32 Mr. Abing asked about the concerns the Chinook Indian Nation had raised at the last meeting and
33 mentioned some changes that he would recommend regarding historic resources. Ms. Kemhus stated that
34 today's meeting was focused on wetlands and riparian corridors.
35
36 Ms. Kemhus stated that she had a motion and second to adjourn.
37
38 Mr. Stricklin proceeded to talk about different types of wetlands, wet areas, and vegetation and the history
39 behind some of the proper names of these wetland areas.
40
41 The committee continued to discuss how wetlands were identified and what actually constituted a wetland.
42 Ms. Kemhus read the definition of "wetland" from Statewide Planning Goal 5.
43
44 The committee and public discussed wetlands on privately-owned lands and mitigation for filling in
45 wetlands. Mr. Stricklin discussed the numerous county-owned remnant properties that could be used for
46 mitigation and wildlife habitat instead of being sold.
47
48 Ms. Kemhus raised the subject of the county's ad hoc wetlands advisory committee and the
49 recommendations they had provided to the Board of Commissioners in 2017. She asked whether the

1 committee could get a copy of those recommendations. Ms. Henrikson stated that they had been included
2 in the agenda package.

3
4 Ms. Henrikson showed the committee the WebMaps site on the county's webpage and brought up the
5 county-owned parcels and the wetlands map layer. Ms. Henrikson stated that the committee could begin
6 reviewing each of the parcels that afternoon. Mr. Stricklin discussed how there used to be a county policy
7 that required all county-owned property to be sold, unless it had been designated as a park. He stated that
8 the county viewed those parcels as worthless.

9
10 The committee agreed that staff should provide a map that showed all of the county-owned properties
11 along with the soils for each property. The committee agreed to break the county into quadrants and to
12 begin reviewing each of the county-owned parcels over the next four months to determine parcels that
13 should be retained for wetland preservation and wildlife habitat. The committee requested that Mr.
14 Stricklin bring this project to the next County Citizen Advisory Committee meeting to determine whether
15 any of the other committees would also be interested in reviewing the parcels.

16
17 Mr. Stricklin reminded the committee of the Resiliency Project meeting late that evening. Ms. Henrikson
18 provided additional information about the meeting.

19
20 **Public Comment and Input:**

21 None.

22
23 **Closing Comments and Adjournment:**

24 None.

25
26 **There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 2:55pm.**
27