

**SUMMARY OF JULY 16, 2020  
COUNTYWIDE CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #8  
ELECTRONIC MEETING**

**The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by Andy Davis, CCAC Chair.**

**CCAC Members Present**

Jim Alegria  
Andrew Davis  
Harold Gable  
Jan Mitchell  
Cheryl Johnson  
Robert Stricklin  
Tod Lundy  
Andrea Mazzarella

**CCAC Commissioners Absent**

Patrick Corcoran, Excused

**Staff Present**

Gail Henrikson

**Public Present**

Comm. Kathleen Sullivan  
Comm. Pamela Wev  
Susanna Gladwin  
Nancy Ferber

**Welcome and Introductions**

The CCAC members, staff and members of the public introduced themselves.

**Review of Meeting Summaries:**

There were no corrections or changes to the November 21 and December 5, 2019, meeting summaries or to the June 18, 2020, meeting summary.

**Public Comment and Input:**

Susanna Gladwin addressed the committee. Ms. Gladwin discussed the need for low water septic systems as the county encourages the development of affordable housing stock. She stressed the need to ensure that adequate drinking water was available. Ms. Gladwin continued to discuss her concerns surrounding minimum parcel sizes and issues related to assessment and taxation of farmlands.

Ms. Gladwin stated that the Forest Practices Act does not do enough to protect fish and individuals from activities such as spraying pesticides. She stated it did do more to protect fish than it did individuals. She stated that the Act affects land use because it is legislated.

**Review of Goal 5 Worksheets:**

Ms. Henrikson shared the Goal 5 policy worksheet with the committee. Mr. Davis asked Ms. Henrikson whether she wanted to lead this portion of the discussion. Ms. Henrikson stated that she believed it was better for the committee members to lead the discussion on the policies, but did provide an overview of the structure and function of the two worksheets that had been included in the agenda package.

Mr. Davis recommended the committee members review the policies one-by-one to determine if there were any recommended changes. Mr. Davis read Goal 1 in the Goal 5 worksheet. He asked Ms. Henrikson to explain the recommended changes that were listed in the online worksheet. Ms. Henrikson stated that staff had been incorporating comments from the different citizen advisory committees during their meetings.

Mr. Alegria asked whether the goal and policies related to mineral and aggregate resources in the comprehensive plan were stipulated by DOGAMI and asked whether the committees had any latitude to make any changes. Ms. Henrikson stated that all of the committees had asked a similar question. She stated that the Northeast CAC had put discussion on this section aside until staff could provide additional information.

Ms. Mitchell stated that there is an incredible amount of detail related to aggregate resources and she questioned why it was included in the comprehensive plan. She asked whether it was a major issue in the state, or a measure

1 of strong input from the industry. Ms. Henrikson stated that she did not have the background information to  
2 verify why that much detail had been included.

3  
4 Ms. Gladwin stated that because aggregate is used in road and foundation construction and is therefore a big  
5 industry in the county. She stated that in this area, it is rock formations that are blasted as opposed to river rock,  
6 which is more prevalent in other counties. She stated there is an issue with runoff entering streams.

7  
8 Ms. Johnson agreed with Ms. Mitchell that Goal 5 is very oddly laid out. She stated that the County only had one  
9 goal in Goal 5 and that was related to aggregate and mineral resources. She stated that at a minimum each of the  
10 resources should have its own goal. She stated that there are 32 policies related to aggregate and mineral  
11 resources. She identified resources that didn't even have any policies identified in the comprehensive plan.

12  
13 Mr. Davis asked whether the Northeast CAC had developed any new goals at its meeting. Ms. Johnson stated that  
14 the Northeast committee is still at the very beginning of its review.

15  
16 Mr. Stricklin stated that there are over 1,500 miles of forest land roads in the county, so there is a strong interest  
17 in rock. He stated that that total was just for industrialized forest lands and did not include county roads.

18  
19 Mr. Davis discussed different orders of approach to review the policies. Ms. Mitchell asked if staff would be  
20 willing to go through all the aggregate resource policies to see if some of them could be combined. She added that  
21 doing so might free up time and energy for the committee members to review and revise some of the other  
22 resource areas that did not have policies or goals.

23  
24 Mr. Stricklin discussed the recommendations that had been made at the Clatsop Plains meeting. Mr. Davis  
25 confirmed with staff that they would work on combining the aggregate policies where possible. Ms. Henrikson  
26 agreed that it could be done and that it would benefit all of the citizen advisory committees.

27  
28 The committee began its discussion of the energy policies in Goal 5. Mr. Davis stated that this resource does not  
29 have a goal, just a few policies that are associated with it. He suggested that the committee begin thinking about  
30 draft language for a goal for this particular resource. Mr. Davis read Energy Sources Policy 1. He also read the  
31 questions regarding that policy. He asked whether staff had any answers for those questions. Ms. Henrikson  
32 stated that staff had not yet had time to research those questions and therefore had not obtained answers.

33  
34 Ms. Gladwin asked whether offshore wind facilities would be controlled by county regulations or state regulations.  
35 Ms. Henrikson stated that territorial waters were addressed in Statewide Goal 19 and that air and water quality  
36 issues would also be addressed in Goal 6. Mr. Stricklin stated that people might look to Goal 5 first for energy  
37 policies. Mr. Davis stated that it concerned him that this policy might be overly restrictive. He stated that he  
38 supported wind generation, but added that as written the policy could be used to strike down any development that  
39 might possibly conflict with a wind generation facility.

40  
41 The committee continued to discuss wind generation. Ms. Mitchell had asked if anyone had mapped appropriate  
42 wind generation sites in the county. The committee continued to discuss [wind generation maps](#) and possible  
43 scenarios where it could be applied. Ms. Johnson agreed that the policy language was very strongly worded. She  
44 added that the Northeast CAC wanted to encourage all forms of renewable energy resources. Mr. Stricklin  
45 discussed a windmill he had constructed in the early 1990s. He stated that it was so powerful that it self-  
46 destructed in the Clatsop Plains winds.

47  
48 Ms. Mitchell asked whether there were any experts or quasi-experts that could review the energy policies and  
49 provide feedback to the committee. Ms. Henrikson suggested Chris Farrar who serves on the Planning  
50 Commission. **[FOLLOW-UP: An email was sent to Mr. Farrar on September 9, 2020, regarding this issue.]**

51  
52 Mr. Davis stated that he believed it was the intent of the group to support all forms of renewable energy, but  
53 suggested that that language be added to an Energy Sources Policy Goal.

1 The committee began to discuss Energy Sources Policy 2, which references “low-head hydro projects”. Mr. Davis  
2 also read the comment from the Clatsop Plains CAC regarding that policy. Mr. Stricklin explained the intent  
3 behind the comment. Mr. Davis and Mr. Stricklin continued to discuss the policy and the comments from the  
4 Clatsop Plains CAC. The committee and public continued to discuss what a low-head hydro project is and what  
5 it’s impacts might be on waterways.  
6

7 Ms. Johnson stated that she liked the wording suggested by the Clatsop Plains CAC, but expressed concerns about  
8 the language regarding county reliance on state and federal permitting to resolve conflicts. She stated that the  
9 language proposed by the Clatsop Plains CAC might better serve the policy. Mr. Alegria asked if the Chinook  
10 Indian Nation would agree to language that addressed non-fish-bearing streams where dams are placed above  
11 natural obstructions. Mr. Stricklin discussed concerns about that proposed language, especially the phrase “non-  
12 fish-bearing streams” as any stream, with a little bit of help, could become a spawning place for Coho. Mr.  
13 Alegria stated that it would be a lost opportunity to prevent some type of hydro in areas that will never be  
14 accessed by fish. Mr. Stricklin continued to discuss the concerns raised by the Chinook Indian Nation at the  
15 Clatsop Plains CAC. Mr. Davis asked if Mr. Stricklin would take the issue back to the Clatsop Plains CAC for  
16 further development of recommended wording.  
17

18 Ms. Mazzarella stated she agreed with Ms. Johnson regarding the language about reliance on state and federal  
19 permitting. She stated that she did not trust the federal government with issues regarding natural resources. Ms.  
20 Mazzarella discussed recent developments surrounding a purported fish-safe turbine.  
21

22 Ms. Mitchell stated that she would contact City of Astoria staff to verify the status of the Youngs River hydro  
23 facility. **[FOLLOW-UP: Per Nathan Crater, City Engineer for the City of Astoria, the Bear Creek  
24 Watershed is expected to handle the needs of Astoria for the foreseeable future. Using Youngs River Falls  
25 is not an option at this point in time. There may possibly be a reason in the future to release those water  
26 rights, but that would likely only happen if a regional group was formed to resolve a regional problem.]**

27 Mr. Davis stated that Policy 2 sounded as though the county was punting responsibility to another organization  
28 and that he would support a wholesale change to it. The committee continued to discuss concepts that they  
29 wanted to see addressed by these policies.  
30

31 Ms. Gladwin discussed how water temperature increases downstream from a dam. She cited the example of the  
32 main stem of the Nehalem. She stated that she also agreed with not wanting to put trust in federal regulators and  
33 that she would also add state regulators to that list.  
34

35 The committee moved on to discussion of Energy Sources Policy 3. Mr. Davis asked for clarification about the  
36 Goal 5 Administrative Rule. Ms. Henrikson stated that this was a section on Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR)  
37 that detailed how a jurisdiction implemented the regulations associated with Statewide Planning Goal 5.  
38

39 Mr. Alegria and Mr. Davis questioned whether this policy was even required if the county already obligated to  
40 follow state rules. The committee agreed to recommend that policy be eliminated.  
41

42 Mr. Davis recommended adding additional policy rows to the worksheet so the committee could address different  
43 renewable energy sources. Ms. Johnson stated that there was already a second worksheet in the agenda package  
44 that was to be used for new policies and goals.  
45

46 Ms. Gladwin stated that there are huge conflicts between statewide planning goals and implementing rules. She  
47 cited the Forest Practices Act as an example. She stated the county should stand up for its original stated goals of  
48 fish, clean water and clean air.  
49

50 The committee discussed Energy Sources Policy 4. Ms. Mitchell stated that it seemed to be a repetitious by  
51 stating that the county would follow a policy that we’re already required to follow. Mr. Davis asked if there would  
52 be a conflict between the City of Astoria and the County in the application of the Goal 5 Administrative Rule.  
53 Ms. Henrikson stated that she was not aware of a conflict, at least at this present time. She added that she did not  
54 know if there may have been conflict between the two jurisdictions 40 years ago.

1  
2 The committee continued to discuss whether Policy 4 should be eliminated. Commissioner Wev stated that the  
3 City of Astoria owns the water rights to Youngs River. She discussed the impact that has on the Youngs River  
4 Lewis and Clark Water District. Commissioner Wev stated that water quantity and quality are important for the  
5 future of development in unincorporated Clatsop County. Ms. Mitchell discussed the costs associated with low  
6 density development, as residents still required services such as water and septic and fire stations.  
7

8 Ms. Mazarella asked if there was any harm in retaining the policy in the plan. Mr. Stricklin discussed the  
9 relationship of the Clatsop Plains aquifer and how protection of it was perceived to be an impediment to  
10 development. Mr. Davis encouraged Mr. Stricklin to bring this topic up again when the committee began its  
11 discussions on watersheds and water provision.  
12

13 Commissioner Wev stressed the need for every citizen advisory committee to discuss water supply and quality.  
14 She stated that water is an issue everywhere. Jan Mitchell asked if there was someone available who could  
15 provide the committee an overview of water conditions in the county. **[Follow-up: Staff is working to schedule  
16 an October 1 workshop on watersheds, wetlands, and scenic areas.]** Commissioner Wev discussed the  
17 Governor's 100-Year Watershed Plan and stated that Chris Farrar had attended a two-day technical session. She  
18 suggested that Mr. Farrar be invited to discuss this issue with the CAC.  
19

20 Ms. Johnson noted the water resources policies that were included later in Goal 5. She stated that she had made a  
21 note to see if someone from the North Coast Watershed Association would be able to make a presentation to the  
22 committees. Commissioner Wev stated that it might not be that helpful as the groups are trying to consolidate  
23 within the county, but they have very little scientific expertise on their staffs.  
24

25 Mr. Gable stated that basic resources such as water and sewage disposal will be imperative over the next twenty  
26 years. He stated that the job of the committee should be to preserve as much of our natural resources in the  
27 condition they are presently in, rather than trying to make decision based on what modern science will do for us in  
28 the future. The committee continued to discuss possible speakers that could address water quality issues. Ms.  
29 Henrikson stated that staff could contact the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) and the Oregon  
30 Water Resources Department to see if their staff members could provide additional information. **[Follow-up:  
31 Emails sent on September 9, 2020, to Katie Duzik (OWEB) and Nikki Hendricks (WRD).]**  
32

33 Mr. Stricklin again addressed previous conflicts between attempts to protect the aquifer and development rights.  
34 Mr. Gable reminded the committee members that navigable waters have a completely different set of regulations  
35 than those that are not. Mr. Alegria asked staff to provide the committee members with a water rights map.  
36 **[Follow-up: Water rights maps and data can be located on the Oregon Water Resources Department**  
37 **[webpage.](#)**] Ms. Gladwin agreed that water resources should be mapped. She also suggested contacting the Upper  
38 Nehalem Watershed Council.  
39

40 The committee members continued to discuss data sources. Mr. Davis stated that there is not much data around  
41 the county and he would like to see more. He added that that is probably outside the scope of the comprehensive  
42 plan update. The committee discussed the Soil and Water Conservation District and how lack of funding affected  
43 the projects that they could undertake.  
44

45 Mr. Davis asked the committee if they wanted to move on to discussion of the wetlands policies or if the  
46 committee wanted to take public comment. The consensus of the committee members was to take public  
47 comment at this time and then to continue working on the policy discussion.  
48

#### 49 **Public Comment and Input:**

50 Ms. Gladwin discussed homesites in California that have graywater system and use minimal amounts of water.  
51 She asked how this could be adapted to Clatsop County, which now requires a minimum water flow for new  
52 residential dwellings.  
53

1 Commissioner Sullivan commented on the level of detail with which the CCAC had approached the policy  
2 review. She asked staff how the other advisory committees were approaching these discussions. Ms. Henrikson  
3 provided the committee and public with an update on the various approaches each CAC had taken to date.  
4

5 **Review of Goal 5 Worksheets:**

6 Mr. Davis read Wetlands Policy 1. Ms. Henrikson explained that the wetlands identified in these policies were  
7 based upon a 1982 study completed by Duncan Thomas. Mr. Stricklin stated that there were many wetlands  
8 throughout the county that were not deemed significant and not included in the count.  
9

10 Ms. Johnson asked for an update on the Statewide Wetlands Inventory. She also asked if the committee could  
11 receive a copy of the four recommendations the County's Ad Hoc Wetlands Advisory Committee had presented  
12 to the Board of Commissioners in 2017. Ms. Henrikson stated that those recommendations had been included in  
13 an email sent to the citizen advisory committee members in late April 2020.  
14

15 Ms. Johnson discussed her concerns about the phrase "for which no conflicting uses have been identified, from  
16 incompatible uses." The committee members discussed conflicting uses and the significance of wetlands. Mr.  
17 Davis suggested that language be added as a policy to encourage the county to retain lands that have significant  
18 natural resources and to resist annexation by incorporated areas.  
19

20 Mr. Gable and Mr. Stricklin discussed navigable waterways and water rights. Commissioner Wev raised recent  
21 federal changes that redefine how navigable waters are defined and the regulations that would control them. She  
22 suggested that given this controversy, use of the word "navigable" might be best avoided.  
23

24 Mr. Davis read Wetlands Policy 2. He asked whether Wetland Site 6 was under the control of the North Coast  
25 Land Conservancy. Ms. Henrikson stated that staff had not yet verified that information. Mr. Davis suggested  
26 holding off on discussion until more information was available. **[Follow-up: Portions of the site have been  
27 transferred to the ownership of the NCLC. Based upon information provided by committee members at  
28 the Lewis and Clark Olney Wallooskee CAC meeting, the 10-acre gravel site is no longer in use.]**  
29

30 The committee Wetlands Policy 3. Mr. Stricklin stated that these sub-policies were a hot topic for the Chinook  
31 Indian Nation due to the presence of the white-tailed deer. He stated that the Chinook Indian Nation would be  
32 opposed to any policies that allowed destruction of habitat.  
33

34 Ms. Johnson stated that these policies are very specific to the Westport area. She asked Commissioner Sullivan if  
35 the new development currently proposed for Westport is tied to these policies. Commissioner Sullivan stated that  
36 the new development was related to the park primarily, but she did not have more information to add at this time.  
37

38 The committee and the public continued to discuss previous studies and projects related to the Westport area.  
39

40 **Closing Comments and Adjournment:**

41 Ms. Henrikson asked the committee if they wanted to continue to hold their meetings at 2PM or if they wanted to  
42 go back to the 4PM meeting time. The committee agreed to keep the meeting time at 2PM.  
43

44 Mr. Alegria stated that the Columbia white-tailed deer is a federally-listed species. He suggested that critical  
45 habitat be considered and identified and worked into the policies. Mr. Alegria volunteered to investigate the  
46 matter and bring information back to the committee.  
47

48 *There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:46pm.*