

**SUMMARY OF AUGUST 20, 2020  
COUNTYWIDE CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #9  
ELECTRONIC MEETING**

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

<u>CCAC Members Present</u>	<u>CCAC Commissioners Absent</u>	<u>Staff Present</u>	<u>Public Present</u>
Jim Alegria	Harold Gable	Gail Henrikson	Comm. Lianne Thompson
Andrew Davis	Jan Mitchell		James Coughlin
Patrick Corcoran	Andrea Mazzarella		Jed Arnold
Cheryl Johnson			Ashley Lertora
Robert Stricklin			Nancy Ferber
Tod Lundy			Carla Cole

**Welcome and Introductions**

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

**Review of Meeting Summaries:**

Ms. Henrikson stated that the July meeting summary had not been completed and that this item should be removed from the agenda.

**CAC Liaison Reports:**

Mr. Davis asked Ms. Henrikson if she would provide summaries for the CAC representatives that were not in attendance at today's meeting.

**Clatsop Plains (CPCAC):** Mr. Stricklin stated that he had been tasked with sharing a project that the CPCAC had undertaken. Mr. Stricklin explained that the group would be reviewing county-owned properties, in conjunction with wetlands and soils, to determine if there were remnant pieces that the County should retain for wildlife habitat. Ms. Henrikson stated that she was working with county GIS staff to produce an electronic map that contained the requested data. [Follow-up: A [link to the map](#) was emailed to the CAC members on August 31, 2020.]

**Elsie-Jewell / Seaside Rural (EJSRCAC):** Ms. Henrikson stated that the EJSRCAC had met on Tuesday. She discussed issues the CAC was having with member retention. She said that the committee was down to three members and two of them were absent on Tuesday. Ms. Henrikson stated that the one member and a member of the public did discuss wetlands and riparian areas.

**Lewis & Clark Olney Wallooskee (LCOWCAC):** Ms. Henrikson stated that the last LCOWCAC meeting had been held in June and the next meeting was scheduled for July 27. She stated that at the June meeting, the committee had gone through all of the Goal 5 policies, but that staff would be bringing back information to them in order to have a more detailed discussion about aggregate and mining resources.

**Northeast (NECAC):** Ms. Johnson stated that four of the five NECAC committee members attended the last meeting. She stated that the committee members had reviewed the three wetland policies. She commented that as was similar to other resources in Goal 5, there policies but no over arching goal. She stated that the NECAC had crafted a draft goal for the wetlands policies. She stated that the NECAC did not have time at its last meeting to review the four recommendations from the County's Ad Hoc Wetlands Advisory Committee meeting.

**Southwest Coastal (SWCCAC):** Tod Lundy stated that the SWCCAC had met on August 12 and that the members had discussed wetlands and riparian corridors. He stated that the group is working off a set of proposals that were made by Charles Dice and a second set of proposals that had been drafted by Linda Eyeran. He added that he hoped this information could be placed on the County's website as they each contain too much

1 information to share with the Countywide CAC at this time. Mr. Davis asked Mr. Lundy if he had a good  
2 command of the Arch Cape Local Wetland Inventory that had been completed, in case the committee needed to  
3 use him as a source of information. Mr. Lundy stated that he was aware of the inventory, but not the specifics of  
4 it.

5  
6 The committee discussed types of wetlands and the process for inventorying wetlands under OAR 660-16 and  
7 OAR 660-23. Mr. Davis stated that what he is understanding from the discussion is that there is a need to have  
8 goals for the various resources identified in Goal 5. Mr. Stricklin discussed the importance of the aquifer on the  
9 Clatsop Plains. He discussed recent events related to water provision in the Clatsop Plains.

10  
11 **Public Comment and Input:**

12 Susanna Gladwin stated that she could not find any wetlands delineation for the drainage basin of the Nehalem  
13 River. She stated that the wetlands seemed to be quite large areas, but she views this drainage as feeding in close  
14 to the river and the associated feeder streams. She asked if that made any difference and whether those areas  
15 could be delineated in that area of the county.

16  
17 Mr. Coughlin discussed a waterway that passes through property he owns. He commented about possible sources  
18 of pollution that might be entering the ground water, as the levels are so close to the surface. He stated that  
19 offending property owners should be held accountable for clean-up.

20  
21 **Review of Goal 5 Worksheets:**

22 Mr. Davis reviewed the six work items for the meeting. He asked Ms. Henrikson to discuss the revised timeframe  
23 for discussing Goal 5. Ms. Henrikson stated that the individual resources would be broken in to smaller  
24 discussion topics and that an additional 3-6 months would be incorporated into the schedule. She stated that  
25 because Goal 5 was so complex additional time is required to allow for adequate discussion and processing. She  
26 stated that staff was also working with CREST to prepare a contract to provide additional assistance to update  
27 wetland inventories; to establish a definition of “riparian area”; and to identify possible riparian areas for  
28 inclusion in the comprehensive plan. She said the committees would circle back to wetlands and riparian areas in  
29 February to March 2021, once CREST completes its work.

30  
31 Mr. Davis asked whether the extended timeframe would run up against any regulatory requirements or  
32 timeframes. Ms. Henrikson stated that because the update is not being done under periodic review there are no  
33 mandated deadlines. The committee members continued to discuss the extended timeframe. Mr. Alegria asked  
34 whether the Board of Commissioners would have to approve the revised schedule. Ms. Henrikson stated that the  
35 Board receives regular updates on the process and that the Board would not need to approve the revision.

36  
37 Ms. Henrikson stated that staff had been trying to keep all the committees on the same cycle, but if some groups  
38 felt the process was too slow or that they could complete their work more quickly, staff could accommodate  
39 separate schedules for each group. She added that each CAC has their own level of sophistication and familiarity  
40 with the process and subject matter, so staff was trying to accommodate those different informational needs as  
41 well. The consensus was to have all of the CACs remain on the same schedule.

42  
43 Ms. Gladwin stated that for someone who had never been involved in a planning process that it could be very  
44 overwhelming. She stated that she had applied for a position on a CAC, but that her name had been removed from  
45 the list.

46  
47 Mr. Corcoran discussed ways that the committee could more efficiently complete its work. Those suggestions  
48 include not only identifying emerging issues and concerns, but also working with staff to draft those thoughts into  
49 goals and policies. He suggested that staff could provide additional recommendations to help guide decision  
50 making, without leading the committee members. Ms. Gladwin suggested that people with expertise in different  
51 subject areas be brought in to help draft policy language. The committee members continued to discuss methods  
52 that could assist in making the process more accessible and less overwhelming.

1 Mr. Davis and Ms. Henrikson discussed the inventory process and the 1982 report prepared by Duncan Thomas.  
2 Mr. Stricklin discussed the history behind McCormack Gardens Road.

3  
4 Ms. Johnson noted that almost all of the inventoried wetlands are in the Clatsop Plains planning area, but there is  
5 one in the Northeast planning area. She formally requested that staff arrange a field trip to that wetland. She cited  
6 the specificity in Wetlands Policy 3 as a reason for wanting to walk the site. Ms. Henrikson stated that if the  
7 CCAC wanted a field trip, it should be offered to all the CACs. She stated that she could contact the property  
8 owners, and advertise the trip as it would be considered a public meeting. She also stated that minutes of the field  
9 trip would also be required. She also reminded the committee members that due to the governor's order related to  
10 mass gatherings due to the pandemic, the trip may have to be staggered in order to maintain social distance and  
11 not violate any limits on gathering sizes. Ms. Johnson withdrew her formal request.

12  
13 Mr. Davis asked if any of the committee members had any reasons to strike any of the current inventoried  
14 wetlands. Mr. Alegria stated that he would prefer to defer that discussion until after CREST had prepared its  
15 review. **Motion by Jim Alegria, seconded by Tod Lundy, to postpone discussion on inventorying wetlands  
16 until after CREST had completed its review. Motion passed 4-1, with Mr. Stricklin dissenting.**

17  
18 The committee members continued to discuss the three Wetlands Policies. Ms. Johnson explained the work the  
19 Northeast CAC had done to draft a goal for the wetlands policies. The committee discussed the use of the phrase  
20 "for which no conflicting uses have been identified." Ms. Henrikson explained that the language was specifically  
21 stated in OAR and that it should remain in the policy. The committee members continued to discuss conflicting  
22 uses and wetlands.

23  
24 Mr. Lundy asked whether the committees would be discussing brackish and saltwater marshes and wetlands as  
25 part of Goal 5. Ms. Henrikson explained that Goals 16 and 17 would address estuarine wetlands and coastal  
26 wetlands and that Goal 5 dealt specifically with freshwater wetlands. The committee members continue to  
27 discuss whether the Goal 16 and 17 wetlands should be also be addressed in Goal 5 as well. Mr. Davis stated that  
28 under OAR, Goal 16 wetlands superseded Goal 5 wetlands under the state classification system.

29  
30 **Motion by Tod Lundy, seconded by Jim Alegria, to use the goal drafted by the Northeast CAC as a  
31 replacement for existing wetlands policy 1. The new policy would read "The county will protect significant  
32 freshwater wetlands, as identified in the Statewide Wetland Inventory, for which no conflicting uses have  
33 been identified form incompatible uses. Oregon's wetlands and their ecosystems are a highly diverse  
34 resource that reflects the physical and biological variability of the state. Streamside wetlands in the coast  
35 range, provide food and shelter to threatened juvenile salmon and trout."**

36  
37 **Motion by Patrick Corcoran, seconded by Robert Stricklin, to revise the first sentence to read "The county  
38 will protect significant freshwater wetlands, as identified in the Statewide Wetland Inventory."**

39  
40 The committee members asked staff whether the deleted clause needed to be retained. Ms. Henrikson reiterated  
41 that under OAR it appeared that this was required language. **The amended motion passed unanimously.**

42  
43 The committee began discussion of Wetland Policy 2. Ms. Henrikson confirmed that a portion of the property  
44 had been transferred to the ownership of the North Coast Land Conservancy. She added that she had been unable  
45 to verify where the 10-acre gravel extraction site was located and whether it was still in operation. **Motion by  
46 Cheryl Johnson, seconded by Patrick Corcoran, to consider Policy 2 at a later date when additional  
47 information was available.**

48  
49 Mr. Alegria stated that he would prefer to have a broader discussion. The committee discussed conflicting uses,  
50 specifically when one Goal 5 resource conflicted with another Goal 5 resource. The committee discussed whether  
51 they would need to identify conflicting uses for each of the inventoried wetlands.

52  
53 **The motion to delay discussion on Policy 2 was denied 2-3, with Mr. Stricklin abstaining, and Mr. Davis,  
54 Mr. Corcoran and Mr. Alegria dissenting.**

1  
2 The committee continued to discuss Policy 2. Mr. Alegria stated that he was in favor of deleting this policy. **Mr. Alegria made a motion to delete Policy 2, seconded by Mr. Stricklin. The committee voted unanimously to delete Policy 2.**

3  
4  
5  
6 The committee began discussion of Policy 3. Mr. Davis noted that while the map identified the site as Wetland 7, it was actually noted as Wetland 9 in the text of the comprehensive plan. Mr. Corcoran asked whether CREST would be providing additional information about this wetland. Ms. Henrikson stated that no specific sites had been discussed with CREST at this time. She stated that this policy was likely included with such detail as it was the location of the Wauna Mill. Ms. Johnson discussed the policy and stated that she had no additional information regarding the policy at this time. **Motion by Ms. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Alegria, to retain Policy 3.** Mr. Alegria stated that as the committee did not have enough information to decide whether to keep or delete the policy, he suggested that the committee discuss Policy 3 in two parts and that the committee reexamine the policy after additional information was provided by CREST. **Motion by Mr. Alegria, seconded by Mr. Corcoran, to amend the original motion to include language stating that the committee would reexamine Policy 3 after additional information had been received from CREST.** Mr. Stricklin discussed the concerns of the Chinook Indian Nation regarding white-tailed deer habitat. Ms. Henrikson asked for more specificity regarding the additional information that the committee was requesting. The consensus was that the committee was simply looking for additional information regarding the site. **Motion passed unanimously.**

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 The committee discussed the schedule for the remaining items on the agenda. The committee discussed whether there were any additional wetland areas in the Clatsop Plains that should be included in the resource inventory. Mr. Davis asked whether there are any significant wetlands in the National or Statewide Wetlands Inventories that are located in the Clatsop Plains. Ms. Henrikson stated that the Statewide Wetlands Inventory is not an officially adopted map. Ms. Johnson asked whether the Duncan Thomas report contains the same information as the Statewide Wetland Inventory. Ms. Henrikson discussed the differences between the two inventories.

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 The committee continued to discuss the Statewide Wetlands Inventory and how to use it to identify significant wetlands in the Clatsop Plains. Ms. Henrikson clarified that due to an error on the cover memo, the committee should consider wetlands throughout the unincorporated county areas and not just specifically in the Clatsop Plains. Mr. Lundy discussed the Arch Cape Local Wetlands Inventory that had been approved by the Department of State Lands. He stated that the County had never adopted the local inventory. He stated that because it had not been locally adopted it was irrelevant. Ms. Henrikson stated that adoption of the inventory could be considered again in the future.

29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36 The committee continued to discuss the various inventories and identification of significant wetlands. Mr. Corcoran asked whether any counties had adopted the Statewide Wetland Inventory as its official wetlands map. Ms. Henrikson discussed concerns that might be associated with such a decision. Mr. Stricklin stated that the Clatsop Plains was chosen because it was so obvious and so important. Mr. Davis asked for a copy of the Arch Cape and other local wetlands inventories. **[Follow-up: A link to the local wetland inventories that have been approved by the Department of State Lands can be found [here](#).]**

37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 The committee discussed encouraging the county to adopt the Statewide Wetlands Inventory but then requiring individual development proposals to ground-truth the wetland boundaries by completing a delineation. Ms. Henrikson discussed the possible increased costs for small individual property owners if a delineation were to be required.

44  
45  
46  
47  
48 The committee continued to discuss whether additional wetlands should be included in the resource inventory. Mr. Corcoran suggested that a new policy be added to Goal 5 addressing emergent wetland areas. The committee agreed to keep the local wetlands inventories and to review the statewide and any additional information provided by CREST. Mr. Davis also mentioned the need to protect wetlands that were created as mitigation for the destruction of other wetland areas. The committee also agreed that future discussions about wetlands should include the recommendations made by the Ad Hoc Wetlands Advisory Committee.

1 Mr. Corcoran clarified that his discussion about newly emergent wetlands was directed as small areas that willing  
2 landowners could use to create new wetlands. Mr. Alegria asked whether that would include areas that are  
3 currently diked, but which were previously wetlands. He stated that as an aspirational document those areas  
4 should be identified and that willing landowners could work with various environmental organizations to restore  
5 those areas. Mr. Corcoran stated that he was hesitant to include diked areas as that also brought up issues related  
6 to flooding and policies in Goal 7. Mr. Corcoran added that he generally supported creating and maintaining  
7 wetlands whenever possible. Mr. Corcoran and Mr. Alegria continued to discuss issues related to disclosure of  
8 wetlands to property buyers and how this issue overlapped with different goals in the comprehensive plan.  
9

10 The committee discussed whether they wanted to revisit the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Wetlands Advisory  
11 Committee at a future meeting. The consensus of the committee was to have future discussion on the first three  
12 recommendations of the ad hoc committee, but because there was not sufficient detail to clarify the fourth  
13 recommendation regarding low impact development, the committee agreed to delay discussion of that item.  
14

15 **Public Comment and Input:**

16 There was no additional public comment or input.  
17

18 **Closing Comments and Adjournment:**

19 There were no closing comments by either staff or the committee members.  
20

21 *There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:56pm.*