



**CLATSOP COUNTY**  
**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CLATSOP PLAINS CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #10**  
**OCTOBER 8, 2020**  
**2:00 PM**  
**ELECTRONIC MEETING**

**The Clatsop Plains Citizens Advisory Committee will host virtual meetings on GoToMeeting**  
 During the COVID-19 pandemic, the County remains committed to broad community engagement and transparency of government. To provide an opportunity for public input while physical distancing guidelines are in effect, the County will host virtual meetings on the GoToMeeting platform.

**To join the meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone.**

<https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/789458365>

**You can also dial in using your phone.**

United States (Toll Free): [1 866 899 4679](tel:18668994679)

United States: [+1 \(669\) 224-3319](tel:+16692243319)

**Access Code:** 789-458-365

The full agenda package can be found [here](#). Those wishing to provide input will need to be recognized to speak by the Chairperson. The public may also submit comments via email to be read to the Citizen Advisory Committee at the designated time. Please send submissions to [comdev@co.clatsop.or.us](mailto:comdev@co.clatsop.or.us).

| TIME    | TOPIC   | LEAD   |
|---------|---|--|
| 2:00 PM | Call to Order   | CPCAC Chair  |
| 2:05 PM | Introductions   | All  |
| 2:10 PM | Review of Meeting Summary<br>-September 10, 2020  | CPCAC Members  |
| 2:15 PM | Public Comment and Input<br>County-owned properties map   | Public<br>CPCAC Members                                  |
| 2:30 PM | Review of Goal 5 Topics: Groundwater Resources<br>-Overview of groundwater resources<br>-Review of existing policies and inventories<br>-Identify new policies and additions to inventories | CPCAC Members<br>Staff<br>CPCAC Members<br>CPCAC Members |
| 3:45 PM | Public Comment and Input  | Public   |
| 3:55 PM | Closing comments and adjournment  | CPCAC Members  |

*All Comprehensive Plan Citizen Advisory Committee meetings are open to the public. Community members are welcome to observe and provide written comment at any time to [comdev.co.clatsop.or.us](mailto:comdev.co.clatsop.or.us). As time allows, verbal comment is welcome during the time specified on the agenda.*

**NOTE TO CAC MEMBERS:** Please contact the Community Development Department (503-325-8611) if you are unable to attend this meeting.

**ACCESSIBILITY:** This meeting is accessible to persons with disabilities or wish to attend but do not have computer access or cell phone access. Please call 503-325-8611 if you require special accommodations at least 48 hours prior to the meeting in order to participate.

1 **SUMMARY OF SEPTEMBER 10, 2020**  
2 **CLATSOP PLAINS CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #9**  
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 |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Diane Heintz          | Phillip Johnson            | Julia Decker  |                |
| Mary Kemhus           | Maria Pincetich            |               |                |
| Devon Abing           |                            |               |                |
| Don Abing             |                            |               |                |
| Robert Stricklin      |                            |               |                |

8  
9 Mr. Stricklin began the meeting by discussing a piece of county-owned property on the west side of Ridge  
10 Road. He stated that this would be prime piece of natural habitat for frogs. Ms. Kemhus stated that she  
11 would like more time to review the map of county-owned properties rather than trying to discuss each  
12 property one-by-one. Mr. Stricklin asked if he could have two minutes to talk about this issue. Ms. Decker  
13 shared a map with the members and identified the various county-owned properties along the U.S. 101  
14 corridor.

15  
16 Mr. Stricklin provided history and detail about a piece of property on the west side of Highway 101 at the  
17 intersection with Sunset Beach Lane. He recommended that the County maintain ownership of this parcel.  
18 Mr. Stricklin also discussed a property on the east side of Highway 101 adjacent to Cullaby Lake Park. Mr.  
19 Stricklin continued to discuss various county-owned properties that he believed the County should continue  
20 to retain in its ownership. Ms. Kemhus suggested continuing this discussion at the next meeting.

21  
22 Ms. Heintz asked whether the committee was responsible for reviewing the use of these properties and  
23 making recommendations to the County about how to use them. Ms. Kemhus stated that she recalled that  
24 the committee had agreed to look at these parcels and discussed the property adjacent to Cullaby Lake.  
25 Mr. Stricklin stated that the committee should be reviewing whether these parcels are Goal 5 resources  
26 worthy of additional protections.

27  
28 Mr. Abing stated that that approach was not acceptable. He discussed the archaeological sites identified in  
29 Clatsop County and how they have increased in number from 53 in 1980 to 90 sites currently. He stated  
30 that these individual county-owned parcels may have significant impact on the Chinook people, including  
31 graves, cairns, and village sites. He added that he didn't want to dismiss those sites as having already been  
32 catalogued by the state and the county and that he didn't want to miss any places. He stated that the  
33 Chinook Council was concerned about this location of these archaeological sites that are not publicly  
34 identified and wanted to verify the location of those state-identified sites with the sites known by the  
35 Chinook Indian Nation. Mr. Abing expressed concern that some of those archaeological sites may have  
36 already been bull-dozed or otherwise destroyed and that the Chinook Indian Nation wanted to preserve as  
37 many of those sites as possible. Mr. Abing continued to discuss the need to conduct archaeological surveys  
38 on the county-owned parcels and, if needed, invoke the Native American Graves Protection and  
39 Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) to repatriate and relocate remains.

40  
41 Ms. Kemhus discussed a notice that had been sent to the committee members regarding the sale of  
42 property by the Wauna Mill. She asked if any of the committee members had comments on that. Mr.

1 Abing discussed the need to protect the white-tail deer. Mr. Stricklin stated that it is waste property for  
2 ODOT and that there not likely to be white-tail deer in that particular location as it had been paved over.  
3

4 **Review of Goal 5 Topics – Historic and Cultural Resources:**

5 Ms. Kemhus reviewed the three action items that the committee was to complete at the meeting. She read  
6 Historic Resources Policy #1. She mentioned that the committee had previously reviewed this policy and  
7 provided recommended revisions. She added that she had some additional suggested changes for the  
8 committee to consider. She recommended that the policy should be revised to read “The County  
9 encourages the State Parks Division, when developing a Master Plan for Clatsop County natural resources,  
10 scenic and historic areas, and open spaces to give proper recognition to the historical activities that  
11 occurred there.” She emphasized that the policy should apply to more than just Ecola State Park.  
12

13 The committee discussed whether the policies should be site specific or whether the policies should be  
14 more general and be applicable to all state park sites. Ms. Heintz asked what the term “protect” means.  
15 She requested that staff revise the policies to reflect that.  
16

17 Mr. Abing stated that the Chinook Indian Nation would want to be more specific in the language that was  
18 used. He stated that instead of the term “Indian” the correct language would be “Clatsop Chinook”. He  
19 discussed the history associated with the Clatsop Chinook. He stated that the language should not be 15<sup>th</sup>  
20 century, but time immemorial. He stated that clean-up was needed in the document.  
21

22 Ms. Heintz asked Mr. Abing whether he was referring to specific locations when he talked about specificity.  
23 She discussed the difference between strategies, policies and goals and stated that some of the overly  
24 specific policies in the comprehensive plan were more strategies than goals. She agreed that all of the  
25 policies should address the cultural appropriateness of the Clatsop Chinook. However, she expressed  
26 concern that if policies were going to be written for each specific location that has its own culture that the  
27 committee might end up with an unclear document.  
28

29 Mr. Abing stated that the correct name of the tribe is Clatsop Chinook. Ms. Decker asked if there was any  
30 punctuation between the two words. Mr. Abing stated that there was not. Mr. Stricklin discussed  
31 historical references to the Clatsop Plains in the journals of Lewis and Clark. He stated that there are many  
32 locations of historic importance within the Clatsop Plains planning area.  
33

34 Julia Decker asked for clarification that the consensus of the committee was to remove the term “Ecola  
35 State Park” and replace it with more general language. She read to the committee what she understood to  
36 be the correct revised language. Ms. Kemhus clarified that revised policy 1 should apply not just to parks,  
37 but also natural resources, scenic and historic areas and open spaces.  
38

39 Ms. Kemhus moved on to Historic Resources Policy 2. She stated that the cannon had been moved and that  
40 staff was recommending that the policy be removed. Mr. Abing stated that the Clatsop Chinook had no  
41 interest in this policy. **Ms. Kemhus asked all those in favor of removing the policy to raise their hands. All  
42 present committee members voted to remove this policy.**  
43

44 The committee members began discussion of policy 3. She asked whether any of the committee members  
45 had concerns with that policy. No members of the committee indicated concerns.  
46

47 Ms. Kemhus read Historic Resources Policy 4. She asked Ms. Decker whether staff had any updates on this  
48 policy. The committee members continued to discuss where the plaques might be located. Mr. Abing  
49 stated that the Clatsop Chinook had concerns with this policy as the Falls Pulp Mill was built over Clatsop

1 Chinook fishing site. He stated that this was a prime fish/food gathering source for the people who lived  
2 between Walluski/Wallooskee and Youngs River Falls. Ms. Kemhus asked whether Mr. Abing was  
3 advocating for language to that effect to be included on any commemorative plaque. Mr. Abing stated that  
4 that was correct. Ms. Kemhus asked whether Mr. Abing could approve language for the plaque. Mr. Abing  
5 stated that it would need to be approved by the Chinook Indian Nation Council. Ms. Kemhus asked that  
6 staff note that language regarding the importance of the Falls site to the Clatsop Chinook be included in the  
7 revised recommendation.

8  
9 Ms. Kemhus read Historic Resources Policy 5. She asked if the committee members were in agreement to  
10 remove this policy as it has already been completed. The committee agree to recommend that the policy  
11 be deleted.

12  
13 Ms. Kemhus read Historic Resources Policy 6. She stated that staff was recommending that the policy be  
14 revised to state that the County “will continue to protect...” She asked the committee if there were any  
15 other revisions to the policy. Ms. Heintz stated that it was still unclear as to what the county was obligated  
16 to do if it states that it will protect a historical site. Ms. Decker cited an example of a cell tower that was  
17 proposed on the Clatsop Plains on the ridge. She stated that staff used the policies in Goal 5 to guarantee  
18 that the tower was designed to be a stealth/concealed tower.

19  
20 Ms. Heintz asked whether there was a definition of “protect” other than providing examples. Ms. Decker  
21 stated that there are so many different ways that could be used to protect a site or structure that it would  
22 probably be impossible to work all those into a definition.

23  
24 Ms. Kemhus read Historic Resources Policy 7. She stated that the committee had previously recommended  
25 added the Clatsop Chinook Nation as one of the entities with whom the County should coordinate. Mr.  
26 Abing explained that there are five tribes that make up the Nation. Ms. Heintz asked why there was a two-  
27 year time limit. Ms. Decker explained that the language was likely originally put in to ensure that action  
28 was taken in a timely manner. The committee continued to discuss whether the two-year time frame  
29 should be removed from the policy. **The committee agreed to remove the two-year time limit and instead**  
30 **state that the County would “continue to work with...”**

31  
32 The committee began discussion of Cultural Resource Policy 1. The committee noted that the previous  
33 recommended revision should be again revised to change “Chinook Indian Nation” to “Clatsop Chinook  
34 Nation”. There were no further revisions to this policy.

35  
36 The committee reviewed Cultural Resource Policy 2. This policy had been previously reviewed. The committee  
37 agreed to change “Chinook Indian Nation” to “Clatsop Chinook Nation”.

38  
39 The committee began to discuss the draft issues and policies worksheet. Ms. Decker explained the principles  
40 behind this workshop and provided instruction to the committee members. Ms. Kemhus asked where the  
41 identified issues on the worksheet came from. Ms. Decker explained the rationale behind the worksheet. Ms.  
42 Heintz stated that Bradwood and Clifton were outside the Clatsop Plains planning area. She asked if the County  
43 considered these two sites historically significant. Ms. Decker stated that they were not considered so at this  
44 time.

45  
46 Mr. Abing stated that the area towards Clifton, which was originally Cliff Town, was an extensive fishing village  
47 for the Chinook people between Bradwood and Clifton. Ms. Kemhus asked whether the County should consider  
48 this area as historic. Mr. Abing discussed the possibility of one day having a canoe landing and a plank house  
49 built on the shores of the channel in this area. He discussed the historic use of the properties by the five tribes.  
50 He discussed a map of the Lower Columbia Estuary that identified the site that was previously occupied and how

1 the people living there were evicted by the construction of the railroad and the sawmills and the destruction  
2 caused by disease. He stated that this area is a very important site.

3  
4 Ms. Heintz asked who owned the property. Mr. Abing stated that most of it was privately owned, except for the  
5 beach area, which he believed was owned by the Oregon Department of State Lands. Ms. Kemhus stated that  
6 the consensus of the committee was to include Bradwood and Clifton as historic sites.

7  
8 The committee discussed a proposed policy addressing whether Clatsop County should become a Certified Local  
9 Government. Ms. Kemhus and Ms. Decker were unsure what that term meant. Ms. Kemhus stated that the  
10 committee members did not seem to have an opinion on this proposed recommendation. Ms. Heintz “asked  
11 the Google” and identified the basic principles of the Certified Local Government program. She stated that it  
12 appeared that there would be more access to grants and public funds. Ms. Decker said she would obtain  
13 additional information and bring that back to the committee **[FOLLOW-UP: Information on the Certified Local  
14 Government program, is attached]**.

15  
16 The committee began discussing the proposed issues and policies related to cultural resources. Ms. Decker  
17 explained the purpose of the proposed draft language. Ms. Kemhus stated she supported the language. Mr.  
18 Abing cited NAGPRA and recommended language that would encourage finders of artifacts to contact the  
19 Chinook Council. He stated that they would be the only interested party in anything found on Clatsop land, even  
20 if it came from a coast Salish tribe. He discussed the history of trade between tribes. He stated that there is no  
21 distinction between what is Chinook and what is somebody else’s artifact between it was all incorporated into  
22 the process of fair trade and peaceful negotiation between different Aboriginal cultures. He added that if an  
23 artifact was dug up from a grave, it would immediately need to be properly reburied with a sanctifying prayer  
24 and song and could not be raised again. He stated that he could think of several sites where that sort of  
25 desecration had occurred. He stated that the Chinook must be the first to address these types of situations.

26  
27 Ms. Kemhus stated that including this proposed policy to develop a public education and outreach program  
28 would assist people who might not be aware of the proper steps to take. She added that any program to assist  
29 owners should include the Clatsop Chinook. She asked all members who were in favor of the proposed policy to  
30 raise their hands. All committee members voted in favor of the proposed policy.

31  
32 The committee discussed the second proposed cultural policy. Ms. Kemhus asked the committee members if  
33 they had any additional input on this proposed policy. No further input was provided. She asked the committee  
34 members to raise their hands if they were in support of the proposed policy. All committee members voted in  
35 favor of the proposed policy.

36  
37 Ms. Kemhus asked the committee members to review the inventory list. She asked if any of the known historic  
38 sites had stood out to anyone or if there were sites that were not covered by the inventory. Mr. Abing  
39 commented on the text in the comprehensive plan that discussed cultural resources. He stated that the Clatsop  
40 Chinook were distinct from other coastal tribes.

41  
42 Mr. Abing stated that there are five tribes that make up the Chinook Indian Nation – the Clatsop, the Lower  
43 Columbia, the Willapa, the Wahkiakum, and the Cathlamet. He reiterated that the Clatsop Chinook should be  
44 notified before the State Historic Preservation Office.

45  
46 Ms. Kemhus directed staff to text on page 25 of the agenda. She specifically mentioned language in the second  
47 paragraph under “Cultural Areas” that needed to be revised. Mr. Abing stated that the language should reflect  
48 that the Clatsop Chinook have lived in the area since time immemorial. Mr. Abing also discussed the language  
49 that stated the “Indians typically avoided settling the forested areas because of the difficulty of travel.” HE  
50 stated that the forested areas in the past were not as dense as they are today because the Chinook did not  
51 practice clear-cutting.

1 Mr. Abing discussed that the Creator allow the Chinook to just harvest what was benefited to them from the  
2 storm along the riverbanks of the Columbian tributary stream. He said they used what was cast upon the shore  
3 for making canoes, but harvested materials for planks. **Ms. Kemhus asked if Mr. Abing would prepare new**  
4 **language and forward it to staff. Mr. Abing agreed to do so after consulting with the Cultural Committee and**  
5 **the Council members.**

6  
7 Mr. Abing discussed the 53 known archaeological sites that were mentioned in the following paragraph in the  
8 comprehensive plan. He stated that the Council was very concerned about those sites and questioned the new  
9 list of 90 sites and how they were determined. He stated that it would be very beneficial for the Clatsop  
10 Chinook to review that list against their known sites to make sure that they were all protected. Ms. Decker  
11 stated that the list was kept confidential by the state in order to prevent looting or destruction of sites. She  
12 added that she was not aware of a site list that was maintained by the Community Development Department,  
13 but that staff would likely need to contact SHPO.

14  
15 Ms. Kemhus asked if it was possible to draft a new policy regarding working with the Clatsop Chinook to develop  
16 procedures for working with known archaeological sites. Mr. Abing asked if it might require a Memorandum of  
17 Understanding (MOU) between the County and the Clatsop Chinook. Ms. Kemhus stated that maybe a timeline  
18 could be added to the policy to ensure timely enactment. Mr. Devon Abing suggested an on-going MOU  
19 between the Clatsop Chinook, County and State. Mr. Devon Abing cited the example of a plank house in  
20 Washington. He stated that in that case Fish and Wildlife is required to notify the tribe prior to any events or  
21 activities being conducted at the plank house. He said the agreement is updated every year. He added that this  
22 creates extended communication between the tribal, county and state governments.

23  
24 Ms. Decker asked if Mr. Devon Abing was requesting a policy that would support that type of collaboration. She  
25 stated that the comprehensive plan can't require an MOU. Mr. Devon Abing stated that as long as the policy is  
26 structured in such a way that it would allow the tribe to have input on decisions the county decides to make that  
27 would be acceptable. He emphasized the need to create a working relationship between the various  
28 governmental entities.

29  
30 Ms. Kemhus asked if the committee would be able to review the proposed language at the next meeting. Ms.  
31 Decker agreed to include the draft policy in the meeting summary. **[FOLLOW-UP: Proposed draft policy: Clatsop**  
32 **County will establish ongoing clear and open lines of communication with the Clatsop Chinook and state**  
33 **agencies to create a collaborative process where information is openly and freely shared in order to obtain full**  
34 **input from all parties when considering land use decisions.]**

35  
36 Mr. Stricklin commented on the topography and hydrology of the spruce swamps. He stated that it is very  
37 difficult to cross these areas and would have been more so in previous centuries. He cited accounts from the  
38 journals of Lewis and Clark documenting the difficulty they encountered trying to cross these areas. He said that  
39 it was a rich historic area that he didn't want the committee to gloss over.

40  
41 Mr. Abing stated that the Clatsop Chinook are people of the water and they would have traveled in various-sized  
42 canoes and would have portaged canoes through certain areas. He stated that the Chinook were the master of  
43 their place. He stated that some of those portages were still intact.

44  
45 **Public Comment and Input:**

46 None.

47  
48 **Closing Comments and Adjournment:**

49 Mr. Abing again discussed the discrepancy between the 53 sites mentioned in the comprehensive plan and  
50 the 90 sites currently inventoried by the state. He reiterated that the Clatsop Chinook would like that list in  
51 order to compare the state sites to the Nation's known sites.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

Ms. Heintz thanked Mr. Don Abing and Mr. Devon Abing for the history lesson. Mr. Don Abing asked if the committee would be discussing the remaining historical sites in Clatsop County. Ms. Kemhus asked staff to reserve time on the October agenda for this discussion. **[{FOLLOW-UP: A list of historic resource and cultural resource policies specific to the Clatsop Plains Community Plan is attached to this meeting summary.}]**

**There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 3:29pm.**

## *Certified Local Government Certification*

### ***Requirements***

The basic certification requirements for local governments are as follows:

- Establish a historic preservation commission and appoint interested and qualified residents to serve. To the extent they are available, at least some of the commission members should meet "professional" qualifications in the disciplines of history, architecture, architectural history, archaeology, or related fields.
- Pass a preservation ordinance that outlines how the local government will address historic preservation issues.
- Agree to participate in updating and expanding the state's historic building inventory program. SHPO takes the lead in this effort by maintaining the master database and the files for the statewide inventory, and by providing grants to survey additional properties.
- Agree to review and comment on any National Register of Historic Places nominations of properties within the local government boundaries. Nominations are usually submitted by the property owners themselves or other members of the public. SHPO administers the National Register program in Oregon.
- Affirm that it will fulfill its obligation to enforce existing state preservation laws. This includes a designation process for historic properties.



### ***Benefits***

- **Grants:** CLGs may apply for annual grants from SHPO. The grants, which require a 50/50 match, have typically been in the \$5,000--\$20,000 range in recent years. Grants can be used for a broad range of preservation activities, though some of the most common grant-funded projects include the following:
  - Surveys of historic properties and accompanying context studies
  - National Register nominations of either individual buildings or historic districts
  - Public education activities: plaques, walking tour booklets, websites, etc.
  - Preservation planning: updating ordinances, preparing design guidelines, administering local preservation programs, etc.
  - Architectural and engineering studies and plans for rehabilitating historic properties
  - "Brick-and-mortar" rehabilitation work on National Register buildings
- **Training:** workshops and conferences for staff and commission members
- **SHPO and National Park Service assistance:** CLGs enjoy a partnership relationship with the state and federal agencies that have the primary responsibility for promoting historic preservation in the U.S. As such, CLGs are able to tap into the expertise and resources of these agencies in order to help address their local preservation issues. **Networking:** Through CLG workshops, conferences, listservs, and websites, CLGs are able to participate in the discussion of preservation issues with other local governments throughout the state and country.
- **Increased Effectiveness:** By participating in the CLG program, local governments become more skilled and effective at promoting the economic, social, and educational benefits of historic preservation in their community. They are also able to avoid much of the controversy that comes from mishandled local historic preservation issues.



Kuri Gill, CLG Coordinator Phone: (503) 986-0685

Email: [Kuri.Gill@oregon.gov](mailto:Kuri.Gill@oregon.gov)

## Oregon Certified Local Governments

|    | JURISDICTION     | CERTIFICATION DATE |
|----|------------------|--------------------|
| 1  | Albany           | March 8, 1989      |
| 2  | Ashland          | February 23, 2000  |
| 3  | Amity            | March 22, 2016     |
| 4  | Astoria          | July 3, 1996       |
| 5  | Aurora           | December 16, 2013  |
| 6  | Baker City       | October 2, 2006    |
| 7  | Bend             | December 3, 2014   |
| 8  | Benton County    | June 20, 1991      |
| 9  | Canby            | March 3, 2003      |
| 10 | Clackamas County | July 30, 1987      |
| 11 | Coburg           | May 24, 2013       |
| 12 | Coos Bay         | March 14, 2016     |
| 13 | Corvallis        | January 17, 1992   |
| 14 | Cottage Grove    | January 21, 2009   |
| 15 | Dayton           | January 24, 2011   |
| 16 | Deschutes County | October 16, 1986   |
| 17 | Douglas County   | July 3, 1986       |
| 18 | Enterprise       | May 5, 2010        |
| 19 | Eugene           | August 9, 1988     |
| 20 | Falls City       | July 24, 2001      |
| 21 | Forest Grove     | March 1, 1996      |
| 22 | Fossil           | May 24, 2013       |
| 23 | Gresham          | January 24, 2011   |
| 24 | Hillsboro        | January 21, 2009   |
| 25 | Hood River       | May 20, 1996       |
| 26 | Independence     | February 18, 2008  |
| 27 | Jacksonville     | September 11, 1986 |
| 28 | Jefferson        | July 27, 2010      |
| 29 | La Grande        | January 2, 2002    |
| 30 | Lake Oswego      | May 3, 2009        |
| 31 | Linn County      | October 6, 1999    |
| 32 | McMinnville      | October 23, 2007   |
| 33 | Medford          | May 5, 2010        |
| 34 | Monmouth         | February 18, 2008  |
| 35 | Newberg          | August 28, 2014    |
| 36 | North Bend       | March 23, 2006     |
| 37 | Oakland          | September 23, 2008 |
| 38 | Oregon City      | February 21, 1986  |
| 39 | Pendleton        | January 6, 2014    |
| 40 | Port Orford      | December 18, 2012  |
| 41 | Portland         | May 20, 1996       |

|    |             |                   |
|----|-------------|-------------------|
| 42 | Redmond     | May 24, 2012      |
| 43 | Roseburg    | January 28, 1987  |
| 44 | Salem       | February 21, 1986 |
| 45 | Silverton   | June 4, 2007      |
| 46 | Springfield | June 20, 1989     |
| 47 | St. Helens  | January 21, 2009  |
| 48 | The Dalles  | December 2, 1992  |
| 49 | Union       | March 2, 2015     |
| 50 | West Linn   | January 10, 2007  |
| 51 | Weston      | January 24, 2011  |

**Oregon State Historic Preservation Office**  
**Certified Local Government (CLG) Program**  
Certification Agreement

Pursuant to the provisions of the 1980 amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act (P. L. 89-655), to applicable federal regulations (36 CFR 61), and to the State of Oregon procedures, the City/County of \_\_\_\_\_ hereby requests participation in the Certified Local Government program and agrees to:

- (1) Enforce appropriate state or local legislation for the designation and protection of historic properties.
- (2) Maintain an adequate and qualified historic preservation review commission composed of professional and lay members.
- (3) Maintain a system for the survey and inventory of historic properties.
- (4) Provide for adequate public participation in the historic preservation program, including the process of recommending properties to the National Register.
- (5) Maintain adequate financial management systems.
- (6) Adhere to all requirements of the *Historic Preservation Fund Grants Manual*.
- (7) Adhere to any requirements mandated by Congress regarding use of federal historic preservation funds.
- (8) Adhere to requirements outlined in the *State of Oregon Local Government Participation Procedures* issued by the State Historic Preservation Office.
- (9) Satisfactorily perform the responsibilities delegated to it under the Act.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chief Elected Official

\_\_\_\_\_  
Christine Curran  
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Print Name & Title

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



# CLATSOP PLAINS COMMUNITY PLAN POLICIES

| POLICY REVIEW  |                |                   |  |
|--|----------------|-------------------|--|
| CLATSOP PLAINS COMMUNITY PLAN POLICIES AND GOALS   | GOAL MET (Y/N) | RETAIN GOAL (Y/N) | STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDED CHANGES |
| <p><b>OVERALL GOAL</b><br/>           The Clatsop Plains Community Plan shall provide for planned and orderly growth of the Clatsop Plains planning area which is in keeping with a majority of its citizens and without unduly depriving landowners and/or residents of the reasonable use of their land. The Plan shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Protect and maintain the natural resources, natural environment and ecosystems,</li> <li>2. Respect the natural processes,</li> <li>3. Strive for well designed and well place development, and</li> <li>4. Preserve the semi-rural, agricultural, open space and marine characteristics of the area.</li> </ol> <p>In order to meet the Goal, the County shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use the physical characteristics described in the section on landscape units as the major determinants of the location and intensity of the use of the land.</li> <li>2. Retain as much of the land as possible in its natural state.</li> <li>3. Review, update and amend the Plan on a regular basis as needs, additional data and/or economics demand.</li> </ol> |                |                   |  |
| <p><b>CLATSOP PLAINS HISTORIC AREAS PLANNING GOAL</b><br/>           To preserve Historic Resources of our past that might otherwise be lost due to unnecessary and unwise development.</p>  |                |                   |  |
| <b>HISTORIC AREA POLICIES</b>  |                |                   |  |
| <p><b>POLICY 1</b><br/>           The County shall work with the Clatsop County Historical Advisory Committee and other organizations to identify and protect important local historical and archaeological sites. Compatible uses and designs of uses should be encouraged for property nearby important historical or archeological sites.</p>   |                |                   |  |
| <p><b>POLICY 2</b><br/>           Clatsop County shall protect significant historical resources by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Encouraging those programs that make preservation economically possible;</li> <li>b. Implementing measures for preservation when possible;</li> <li>c. Recognizing such areas in public and private land use determinations subject to County review.</li> </ol>   |                |                   |  |



**Clatsop County**  
Community Development – Planning

800 Exchange St., Suite 100  
Astoria, OR 97103  
(503) 325-8611 phone  
(503) 338-3606 fax  
www.co.clatsop.or.us

**TO:** Clatsop Plains Citizen Advisory Committee Members  
**FROM:** Gail Henrikson, Community Development Director  
**DATE:** October 8, 2020  
**RE:** **GOAL 5 RESOURCE TOPIC – GROUNDWATER RESOURCES**

**ACTION ITEMS FOR OCTOBER 8, 2020, MEETING:**

- (1) Review the existing policies in the comprehensive plan addressing groundwater resources (**Table 1**) to verify whether those policies should be removed, retained, or amended.
- (2) Review the specific policies for the Clatsop Plains planning area related to groundwater resources (**Table 2**) to verify whether those policies should be removed, retained or amended.
- (3) Identify any new issues regarding groundwater resources that should be addressed in the comprehensive plan and/or community plan and develop proposed policies designed to address those issues (**Table 3**).

**OVERVIEW**

Statewide Planning Goal 5 – Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces – has identified the following inventories that either are required or encouraged to be provided and reviewed in each jurisdictions’ Comprehensive Plan:

| REQUIRED INVENTORIES  | ENCOURAGED INVENTORIES |
|---|------------------------|
| Riparian corridors, including water and riparian areas and fish habitat | Historic Resources     |
| Wetlands  | Open Space             |
| Wildlife Habitat  | Scenic Views and Sites |
| Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers  |                        |
| State Scenic Waterways  |                        |
| Groundwater Resources   |                        |
| Approved Oregon Recreation Trails                                       |                        |
| Natural Areas   |                        |
| Wilderness Areas  |                        |
| Mineral and Aggregate Resources   |                        |
| Energy Sources  |                        |
| Cultural Resources  |                        |

**OAR 660-023-0140 defines “Groundwater” as “any water, except capillary moisture, beneath the land surface or beneath the bed of any stream, lake, reservoir, or other body of surface water.”**

While Statewide Planning Goal 5 specifically calls out groundwater resources as a required inventory, policies related to or affecting groundwater resources are found in several goals throughout the comprehensive plan, as well as in the individual community plans for each planning area. These applicable policies have been extracted and collated into two tables:

- Table 1: Existing County-wide Comprehensive Plan groundwater resource policies

- Table 2: Clatsop Plains Community Plan groundwater resource policies

Table 3 is to be used to identify new issues or concerns that are not addressed in the current comprehensive plan and to prepare draft policies to address those concerns or issues.

### **REQUIRED ACTION**

- (1) Review the existing policies in the comprehensive plan addressing groundwater resources (**Table 1**) to verify whether those policies should be removed, retained, or amended.
- (2) Review the specific policies for the Clatsop Plains planning area related to groundwater resources (**Table 2**) to verify whether those policies should be removed, retained or amended.
- (3) Identify any new issues regarding groundwater resources that should be addressed in the comprehensive plan and/or community plan and develop proposed policies designed to address those issues (**Table 3**).

### **ATTACHED MATERIALS**

#### **Groundwater Resources Background Materials**

- Watershed Inventory Memo
- Relevant excerpts from Goals 5 and 6 related to water quality
- Table 1: Groundwater resources policies in the current county-wide comprehensive plan
- Table 2: Groundwater resources policies in the Clatsop Plains Community Plan
- Table 3: Worksheet to identify new issues and groundwater resources policies that should be addressed in the comprehensive plan

### **SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS**

#### **Additional reference materials for those interested in further research and technical information:**

- [OAR 660-016-0000 Inventory Goal 5 Resources](#)
- [OAR 660-016-0005 Identify Conflicting Uses](#)
- [OAR 660-016-0010 Develop Program to Achieve the Goal](#)
- [OAR 660-023-0030 Inventory Process](#)
- [OAR 660-023-0040 ESEE Decision Process](#)
- [OAR 660-023-0050 Programs to Achieve Goal 5](#)
- [OAR 660-023-0140 Groundwater Resources](#)
- [Goal 6 Water Quality Background Report](#)
- [Statewide Groundwater Monitoring Program: North Coast 2015-2016 Report](#)
- [Oregon Public Water Systems Groundwater Resource Guide for Drinking Water Source Protection](#)
- [Groundwater Information System Mapping Tool \(Oregon Water Resources Department\)](#)
- [Understanding Groundwater \(OSU\)](#)



# TABLE 1: GROUNDWATER RESOURCES EXISTING POLICIES – COUNTYWIDE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

| POLICY REVIEW   |                |                   |  |
|---|----------------|-------------------|--|
| CLATSOP COUNTY GOALS AND POLICIES   | GOAL MET (Y/N) | RETAIN GOAL (Y/N) | STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDED CHANGES   |
| <b>WATER RESOURCES POLICIES (GOAL 5)</b>  |                |                   |  |
| <p><b>POLICY 1</b><br/>The County will cooperate and coordinate with State and Federal Agencies in assuring the maximum beneficial use of all water areas in the County.</p>  |                |                   | <p><b>STAFF RECOMMENDATION:</b> Continue to retain this policy. Oregon DEQ identifies “beneficial uses” as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• domestic water supply</li> <li>• fishing</li> <li>• industrial water supply</li> <li>• boating</li> <li>• irrigation</li> <li>• water contact recreation</li> <li>• livestock watering</li> <li>• aesthetic quality</li> <li>• fish and aquatic life</li> <li>• hydropower</li> <li>• wildlife and hunting</li> <li>• commercial navigation and transportation</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>POLICY 2</b><br/>The County will coordinate its actions with water quality planning and implementation activities carried out by such state agencies as the Department of Environmental Quality, the Soil and Water Conservation Commission, the Department of Forestry, and the Department of Water Resources.</p>           |                |                   | <p><b>STAFF RECOMMENDATION:</b> Change policy to read “The County will continue to coordinate...”</p>  |
| <p><b>POLICY 3</b><br/>Where municipalities or water districts have identified possible conflicts between forest management practices and the maintenance of the integrity of their watershed, the County encourages these to work with the Northwest Region Forest Practices Committee in the development of amendments to the</p> |                |                   | <p><b>STAFF RECOMMENDATION:</b> Retain this policy. <b>NOTE:</b> This committee still exists. Regional Forest Practice Committees are advisory committees established to assist the Board of Forestry in developing</p>  |



# TABLE 1: GROUNDWATER RESOURCES EXISTING POLICIES – COUNTYWIDE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

| POLICY REVIEW   |                |                   |   |
|---|----------------|-------------------|---|
| CLATSOP COUNTY GOALS AND POLICIES   | GOAL MET (Y/N) | RETAIN GOAL (Y/N) | STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDED CHANGES  |
| Oregon Forest Practices Act that will provide needed modification and protection of state licensed water supply systems.  |                |                   | appropriate forest practice rules. The committees are comprised of citizens qualified by education or experience in natural resource management. The committees may review proposed forest practice rules, identify the need to amend forest practice rules or propose amended forest practice rules. |
| <b>POLICY 4</b><br>The County encourages the development of community dock facilities rather than individual piers or docks.  |                |                   | <b>STAFF RECOMMENDATION:</b> This policy is more related to surface water than ground water. Recommend moving to Goals 16/17 and to include in the Clatsop Plains Community Plan.   |
| <b>WATERSHED POLICIES (GOAL 5)</b>  |                |                   |   |
| <b>POLICY 1</b><br>As information becomes available, Clatsop County shall apply Goal 5 Administrative Rules to the 14 identified watersheds and the small or minor watersheds identified in this element.   |                |                   | <b>STAFF RECOMMENDATION/COMMENT:</b> It appears that the intent was to conduct and ESEE analysis for the identified watersheds. To the best of staff’s knowledge this was never completed. Recommend revising policy to remove “As information becomes available”.                                    |
| <b>WATER RESOURCES POLICIES (GOAL 6)</b>  |                |                   |   |
| <b>POLICY 1</b><br>The County shall encourage the maintenance of a high quality of air, water and land through the following actions:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Encouraging concentration of urban development inside Urban Growth Boundaries,</li> <li>(b) Encouraging maintenance and improvement of pollution control facilities,</li> </ul> |                |                   | <b>STAFF COMMENT:</b> Sub-policies “c” and “e” are not applicable to groundwater resources.   |



# TABLE 1: GROUNDWATER RESOURCES EXISTING POLICIES – COUNTYWIDE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

| POLICY REVIEW  |                |                   |   |
|--|----------------|-------------------|---|
| CLATSOP COUNTY GOALS AND POLICIES  | GOAL MET (Y/N) | RETAIN GOAL (Y/N) | STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDED CHANGES  |
| (d) Encouraging indigenous, clean industries such as fishing, boat building, tourism, and forest products utilization  |                |                   |   |
| <p><b>POLICY 2</b><br/>The County Planning Department shall work with the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) to monitor and keep its environmental data base current including information on air quality, surface and groundwater quality, and land quality including waste disposal and erosion problems.</p>   |                |                   | <p><b>STAFF COMMENT:</b> To the best of staff’s knowledge, this data base was not created or maintained. <b>STAFF RECOMMENDATION:</b> Delete policy as this data is collected and maintained by state agencies and is readily available via the internet.</p> |
| <p><b>POLICY 3</b><br/>The cumulative effect of development on the County’s environment should be monitored and, where appropriate, regulated. When evaluating proposals that would affect the quality of the air, water or land in the County, consideration should be given to the impact on other resources important to the County’s economy such as marine resource habitat and recreational and aesthetic resources important to the tourist industry.</p> |                |                   | <p><b>STAFF COMMENT:</b> Proposed development is reviewed for consistency with comprehensive plan goals and policies. This includes Goal 9 (Economic Development) policies.</p>   |
| <p><b>POLICY 6</b><br/>Upon completion of the Clatsop Plains Groundwater Study, the County shall reevaluate the Clatsop Plains Community Plan to determine whether existing policies and standards are adequate to protect water quality in the aquifer, lakes and streams. Consideration shall be given to protection of the lakes from further degradation (eutrophication), and possible remedial actions to improve water quality.</p>                       |                |                   | <p><b>STAFF COMMENT:</b> See specific Groundwater Study recommendations on Table 2. <b>STAFF RECOMMENDATION:</b> Eliminate first sentence. Move second sentence to the Clatsop Plains Community Plan.</p>   |
| <p><b>POLICY 8</b><br/>The County shall cooperate with DEQ, State Forestry Department, State Transportation Department and other agencies in implementing best management practices to reduce non-point pollution.</p>   |                |                   | <p><b>STAFF RECOMMENDATION:</b> Retain policy. Update department names.</p>   |
| <p><b>POLICY 9</b><br/>The County shall recommend that state agencies regulate the issuance of water rights so as to insure that the total water rights of a stream bed do not exceed the minimum stream flow.</p>   |                |                   | <p><b>STAFF COMMENT:</b> The County can only “encourage” or “recommend”. There is no way to enforce this policy as this is not</p>  |



# TABLE 1: GROUNDWATER RESOURCES EXISTING POLICIES – COUNTYWIDE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

| POLICY REVIEW   |                |                   |  |
|---|----------------|-------------------|--|
| CLATSOP COUNTY GOALS AND POLICIES   | GOAL MET (Y/N) | RETAIN GOAL (Y/N) | STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDED CHANGES   |
|   |                |                   | within the County’s jurisdiction. <b>STAFF RECOMMENDATION:</b> Remove policy.  |
| <b>HIGH GROUNDWATER AND/OR COMPRESSIBLE SOILS POLICIES (GOAL 7)</b>   |                |                   |  |
| <p><b><u>POLICY 1</u></b><br/>The County shall recognize the development limitations of lands with high groundwater and compressible soils during its planning process.</p>                   |                |                   | <b>STAFF COMMENT:</b> Regulations regarding compressible soils are currently included in the code. <b>STAFF RECOMMENDATION:</b> Retain policy.   |
| <p><b><u>POLICY 2</u></b><br/>It is recommended that in all areas identified as having a high groundwater level, DEQ conduct a winter water check before issuing any septic tank permits.</p> |                |                   | <b>STAFF COMMENT:</b> The Environmental Health Division of the County’s Public Health Department administers the on-site wastewater program. Per information from Public Health, this policy predates the use of soils to determine water table levels (redox). PH only does this on a case-by-case basis and it is usually resolved by installing a curtain or by just denying the site. <b>STAFF RECOMMENDATION:</b> Remove policy.                    |
| <p><b><u>POLICY 5</u></b><br/>The County shall update its compressible soils and high water table maps as detailed soils information becomes available.</p>                                   |                |                   | <b>STAFF COMMENT:</b> Maps are not regularly updated in-house, but information is available on the internet from the National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and other sources. DLCDC requires County to adopt a date-specific map. <b>STAFF RECOMMENDATION:</b> Revise policy to read “The County shall review its compressible soils and high water table maps every two years and adopt updated maps if new information has become available.” |
| <b>POPULATION POLICIES (GOAL 10)</b>  |                |                   |  |



# TABLE 1: GROUNDWATER RESOURCES EXISTING POLICIES – COUNTYWIDE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

| <b>POLICY REVIEW</b>   |                       |                          |  |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <b>CLATSOP COUNTY GOALS AND POLICIES</b>   | <b>GOAL MET (Y/N)</b> | <b>RETAIN GOAL (Y/N)</b> | <b>STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDED CHANGES</b>  |
| <p><b><u>POLICY 3</u></b><br/>           Promote the accommodation of growth within areas where it will have minimal negative impacts on the County’s environment and natural resources.</p>   |                       |                          | <b>STAFF RECOMMENDATION:</b> Retain policy.  |
| <b>GENERAL PUBLIC FACILITIES POLICIES (GOAL 11)</b>  |                       |                          |  |
| <p><b><u>POLICY 6</u></b><br/>           Clatsop County should work with State agencies to conduct a study of the Gnat Creek aquifer to determine the potential to provide a water source for residents of the area.</p>   |                       |                          | <b>STAFF COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION:</b><br>Staff was unable to determine why this policy was needed and included in the countywide comp plan. Recommend moving to the Northeast Community Plan. |
| <b>POLICIES AND DISTRICT AGREEMENTS (GOAL 14)</b>  |                       |                          |  |
| <p><b><u>POLICY</u></b><br/>           Plans providing for the transition from rural to urban land use should take into consideration as to a major determination the carrying capacity of the air, land and water resources of the planning area. The land conservation and development actions provided for by such plans should not exceed the carrying capacity of such resources.</p>   |                       |                          | <b>STAFF RECOMMENDATION:</b> Retain policy.  |
| <b>BEACHES AND DUNES POLICIES (GOAL 18)</b>  |                       |                          |  |
| <p><b><u>POLICY 6</u></b><br/>           Land use actions (i.e., Comprehensive Plan changes, zone changes, subdivisions and partitions, planned developments, conditional use permits) shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission or the Department of Planning and Development so that the proposed activity(ies) will not result in the drawdown of the groundwater supply which could lead to any or all of the following:<br/>           (a) The loss of stabilizing vegetation,<br/>           (b) The loss of water quality,<br/>           (c) Salt water intrusion into the water supply,<br/>           (d) Result in the permanent drawdown of the dune lakes.</p> |                       |                          | <b>STAFF RECOMMENDATION:</b> Retain policy.  |



# TABLE 1: GROUNDWATER RESOURCES EXISTING POLICIES – COUNTYWIDE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

| POLICY REVIEW   |                |                   |  |
|---|----------------|-------------------|--|
| CLATSOP COUNTY GOALS AND POLICIES   | GOAL MET (Y/N) | RETAIN GOAL (Y/N) | STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDED CHANGES   |
| <p><b><u>RECOMMENDED ACTION 1</u></b><br/>To avoid desiccation of the groundwater lakes and encroachment of sea water, a water management program which is consistent with the water budget equation for the Clatsop Plains should be developed. The County should request technical and financial assistance from state and federal agencies in evaluating water development potentials.</p> |                |                   | <p><b>STAFF COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION:</b> It is not clear whether the 208 Water Study referenced here and in the Clatsop Plain Community Plan sufficed to satisfy this policy. Recommend moving policy to the Clatsop Plains Community Plan.</p> |
| <p><b><u>RECOMMENDED ACTION 2</u></b><br/>The County, in cooperation with other local jurisdictions, should consider a cost/benefit comparison of developing the Clatsop Plains aquifer as a water source with other sources of water supply.</p>   |                |                   | <p><b>STAFF COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION:</b> Staff was unable to verify whether a cost/benefit analysis was completed. Recommending moving this policy to the Clatsop Plains Community Plan.</p>  |



## TABLE 2: GROUNDWATER RESOURCES EXISTING POLICIES - CLATSOP PLAINS COMMUNITY PLAN

| POLICY REVIEW  |                |                   |   |
|--|----------------|-------------------|---|
| CLATSOP PLAINS COMMUNITY PLAN POLICIES AND GOALS   | GOAL MET (Y/N) | RETAIN GOAL (Y/N) | STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDED CHANGES  |
| <p><b>OVERALL GOAL</b><br/>           The Clatsop Plains Community Plan shall provide for planned and orderly growth of the Clatsop Plains planning area which is in keeping with a majority of its citizens and without unduly depriving landowners and/or residents of the reasonable use of their land. The Plan shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Protect and maintain the natural resources, natural environment and ecosystems,</li> <li>2. Respect the natural processes,</li> <li>3. Strive for well designed and well place development, and</li> <li>4. Preserve the semi-rural, agricultural, open space and marine characteristics of the area.</li> </ol> <p>In order to meet the Goal, the County shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use the physical characteristics described in the section on landscape units as the major determinants of the location and intensity of the use of the land.</li> <li>2. Retain as much of the land as possible in its natural state.</li> <li>3. Review, update and amend the Plan on a regular basis as needs, additional data and/or economics demand.</li> </ol> |                |                   |   |
| <b>NATURAL RESOURCES – POST 208 WATER QUALITY STUDY POLICIES</b>   |                |                   |   |
| <p><b>POLICY A</b><br/>           The groundwater protection strategy of this study should promote the maximum present and future beneficial uses of the Clatsop Plains aquifer. On-site wastewater disposal has been shown to be a significant beneficial use of the aquifer, and thus, the moratorium should be lifted in all areas of the Clatsop Plains study area.</p>  |                |                   | <p><b>STAFF COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION:</b><br/>           There is no moratorium in place within the Clatsop Plains planning area. Recommend deleting policy.</p>  |
| <p><b>POLICY B</b><br/>           The Camp Rilea wastewater spray irrigation field should be rehabilitated with a cover material that is conducive to plant growth. A suitable crop management plan should be developed so that the selected crop can be periodically harvested to remove the nutrients. The crop should be planted during March-April 1982, so that the spray irrigation field will be operable during the heavy summer use period.</p>   |                |                   | <p><b>STAFF COMMENT:</b> Staff has requested additional information from Camp Rilea staff to determine whether this policy was completed. <b>STAFF RECOMMENDATION:</b> If completed, delete policy. If not completed, retain and work with Camp Rilea on necessary revisions to the policy.</p> |



## TABLE 2: GROUNDWATER RESOURCES EXISTING POLICIES - CLATSOP PLAINS COMMUNITY PLAN

| POLICY REVIEW  |                |                   |  |
|--|----------------|-------------------|--|
| CLATSOP PLAINS COMMUNITY PLAN POLICIES AND GOALS   | GOAL MET (Y/N) | RETAIN GOAL (Y/N) | STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDED CHANGES   |
| <p><b><u>POLICY C</u></b><br/>The Warrenton landfill should be closed through an approved closure plan as directed by DEQ. The closure plan should provide for prohibition of further leachate contamination of the aquifer and the necessary gas removal facilities.</p>  |                |                   | <p><b>STAFF COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION:</b><br/>Landfill has been closed and converted to a soccer field. Recommend deleting policy.</p>   |
| <p><b><u>POLICY D</u></b><br/>The wastewater disposal recommendations for the unincorporated Clatsop Plains are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Continue with current zoning requiring a minimum of 1 acre lot size and permit the use of a standard septic tank and disposal field.</li> <li>2. For lots of record between ½ acre and 1 acre, a septic tank with a low pressure disposal field or sand filter should be used.</li> <li>3. For lots of record between 10,000 square feet and 1/2 acre, septic tank systems should use a sand filter with a low pressure disposal field, if DEQ’s regulations on house size, setbacks and system redundancy can be accommodated.</li> <li>4. Allow no septic systems on lot sizes smaller than 10,000 square feet.</li> </ol> |                |                   | <p><b>STAFF COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION:</b><br/>Staff received the following information from Public Health:<br/><b>Sub-policy 1:</b> Still applicable and is contained in the onsite program rules. Retain policy.<br/><b>Sub-policy 2:</b> Change “sand filter” to “bottomless sand filter”.<br/><b>Sub-policy 3:</b> Change to “Appropriate technology and treatment standards must be met for lot sizes ranging from 10,000 square feet to ½ acre.”<br/><b>Sub-policy 4:</b> Revise policy to state that the County will identify all lots smaller than 10,000 square feet to determine the number of properties. If properties will be used to address the housing problem, these lots could be made “buildable” if there is a non-well potable water source and appropriate septic technology is used for the soil types on these lots.”</p> |
| <p><b><u>POLICY E</u></b><br/>All future development in Gearhart, in accordance with the current Comprehensive Plan, should be required to use low pressure disposal fields and/or sand filters to maximize nitrogen removal in the system prior to</p>  |                |                   | <p><b>STAFF COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION:</b><br/>The Public Health Director recommends the policy be revised to read as follows: “All future development in <u>the city limits</u> of Gearhart, in accordance with the current</p>  |



## TABLE 2: GROUNDWATER RESOURCES EXISTING POLICIES - CLATSOP PLAINS COMMUNITY PLAN

| POLICY REVIEW   |                |                   |  |
|---|----------------|-------------------|--|
| CLATSOP PLAINS COMMUNITY PLAN POLICIES AND GOALS  | GOAL MET (Y/N) | RETAIN GOAL (Y/N) | STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDED CHANGES   |
| <p>disposal in the soil. DEQ should be requested to adopt a special geographic rule exempting the DEQ house size regulations in Gearhart.</p>   |                |                   | <p>Comprehensive Plan, should be required to use <u>bottomless</u> sand filters to maximize nitrogen removal in the system prior to disposal in the soil.”</p> <p>DEQ has already adopted the special geographic rule referenced in this policy. Bottomless sand filters can be increased in size to accommodate larger homes. Delete last sentence.</p>   |
| <p><b>POLICY F</b><br/> Wastewater disposal recommendations for the seven sensitive areas are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Install low pressure distribution and/or sand filter systems for all new wastewater sources (including the aggregate of one development) under 5,000 gallons per day.</li> <li>2. For all new wastewater sources exceeding 5,000 gallons per day, construction of sewers and wastewater treatment facilities using land disposal or other disposal techniques acceptable to DEQ should be required.</li> <li>3. Present uses of the aquifer for wastewater disposal should not be prohibited.</li> </ol> |                |                   | <p><b>STAFF COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION:</b><br/> The Public Health Director is not aware of what the “seven sensitive areas” area. He states that the “Clatsop Plains is designated by the DEQ as a special geographic area that only allows higher treatment for any lot under 1 acre.” He recommends the following revisions to this policy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Add the word “bottomless” before “sand filter” and delete “low pressure distribution and/or”</li> <li>2. No changes</li> <li>3. Comment from Public Health Director: “This is strangely worded. If the goal is to preserve and maintain the aquifer, then why not prevent more wastewater from being dumped above it?”</li> </ol> |



## TABLE 2: GROUNDWATER RESOURCES EXISTING POLICIES - CLATSOP PLAINS COMMUNITY PLAN

| POLICY REVIEW   |                |                   |  |
|---|----------------|-------------------|--|
| CLATSOP PLAINS COMMUNITY PLAN POLICIES AND GOALS  | GOAL MET (Y/N) | RETAIN GOAL (Y/N) | STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDED CHANGES   |
| <p><b>POLICY G</b><br/>No action should be taken on surface water conditions at this time.</p>  |                |                   | <p><b>STAFF COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION:</b><br/>Remove policy.</p>   |
| <p><b>POLICY H</b><br/>Aquifer reserve areas should be maintained to protect the aquifer as a possible future drinking water source through the following measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A minimum of 2.5 square miles of aquifer should be set aside for water supply development, including an area set aside by the City of Warrenton, the area within the boundaries of Camp Rilea, and the 40 acres of County-owned land at Del Ray Beach.</li> <li>2. The County should preserve the necessary recharge area within Camp Rilea by developing an agreement with the Oregon Department of Military within 6 months.</li> <li>3. Additional areas for aquifer protection should be sought through land use planning, and open space requirements.</li> <li>4. Land use in the reserve areas should be controlled so that the potential for groundwater contamination from nitrogen and other possible pollutants is kept to a minimum.</li> </ol> |                |                   | <p><b>STAFF COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION:</b> An aquifer reserve overlay has been created. Recommend removing sub-policies “a” and “b” and retaining sub-policies “c” and “d”</p>    |
| <p><b>POLICY I</b><br/>The groundwater monitoring program should be continued as a part of the DEQ statewide monitoring program for the wells identified in Section VII of the report with samples taken on a semi-annual basis.</p>  |                |                   | <p><b>STAFF COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION:</b><br/>Staff has not been able to locate a copy of the 208 Water Quality Report that appears to have been prepared sometime in the early 1980s. Neither does staff know the locations of the wells identified in Section VII of the report. The Oregon DEQ conducts</p> |



**TABLE 2: GROUNDWATER RESOURCES EXISTING POLICIES - CLATSOP PLAINS COMMUNITY PLAN**

| <b>POLICY REVIEW</b>   |                       |                          |   |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <b>CLATSOP PLAINS COMMUNITY PLAN POLICIES AND GOALS</b>  | <b>GOAL MET (Y/N)</b> | <b>RETAIN GOAL (Y/N)</b> | <b>STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDED CHANGES</b>   |
|  |                       |                          | testing within the Clatsop Plains area as part of its <a href="#">statewide groundwater monitoring program</a> . Recommend deleting this policy as it is not under the county’s jurisdiction and is not enforceable by county staff.  |
| <b><u>NATURAL RESOURCES – CLATSOP PLAINS AQUIFER POLICY</u></b>  |                       |                          |   |
| <b><u>POLICY 1</u></b><br>Land use actions (i.e. Comprehensive Plan changes, zone changes, subdivisions and partitions, planned developments, conditional use permits, etc.) shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission and the Department of Planning and Development to insure that the proposed activity(ies) will not: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Adversely affect the water quality;</li> <li>B. Result in the drawdown of the groundwater supply;</li> <li>C. Result in the loss of stabilizing vegetation, or</li> <li>D. Salt water intrusion into the water supply.</li> </ul> |                       |                          | <b>STAFF COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION:</b><br>This should be an ongoing policy. Recommend retaining policy and changing “Department of Planning and Development” to “Community Development Department”.   |
| <b><u>RECOMMENDED ACTION 1</u></b><br>To avoid desiccation of the groundwater lakes and encroachment of sea water, a water management program which is consistent with the water-budget equation for the Clatsop Plains should be developed. The County should request technical and financial assistance from state and federal agencies in evaluating water development potentials.  |                       |                          | <b>STAFF COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION:</b> It is not clear whether the 208 Water Study referenced here and in the countywide comprehensive plan sufficed to satisfy this policy. Recommend retaining policy.  |
| <b><u>RECOMMENDED ACTION 2</u></b><br>The County, in cooperation with other local jurisdictions, should consider a cost/benefit comparison of developing the Clatsop Plains aquifer as a water source with other sources of water supply.  |                       |                          | <b>STAFF COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION:</b><br>Staff was unable to verify whether a cost/benefit analysis was completed. Recommending removing this policy from the countywide comprehensive plan and to retain in the Clatsop Plains Community Plan until the County and local jurisdictions are able to discuss and determine if this is feasible. |



## TABLE 2: GROUNDWATER RESOURCES EXISTING POLICIES - CLATSOP PLAINS COMMUNITY PLAN

| POLICY REVIEW  |                |                   |  |
|--|----------------|-------------------|--|
| CLATSOP PLAINS COMMUNITY PLAN POLICIES AND GOALS   | GOAL MET (Y/N) | RETAIN GOAL (Y/N) | STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDED CHANGES   |
| <b><u>RURAL SERVICE AREAS POLICIES</u></b>   |                |                   |  |
| <p><b><u>POLICY 1</u></b><br/>           The minimum building site in Rural Service Area shall be 7,500 square feet in sewerred areas and 15,000 square feet in unsewerred areas.</p>  |                |                   | <p><b>STAFF COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION:</b><br/>           Rural service areas are identified by zoning designations containing "RSA-" The area around Cullaby Lake is a Rural Service Area. This also coincides with the boundaries for the Shoreline Sanitary District. Retain policy.</p> |
| <p><b><u>POLICY 2</u></b><br/>           The area know as Shoreline Estates shall be designed a RURAL SERVICE AREA, due to the existing facilities available. The land area for this designation shall not be larger than the existing treatment plant's capacity. The expansion of the RURAL SERVICE AREA designation should NOT be allowed. It is the intent of the Community Plan to encourage urban densities to occur within the cities and the Urban Growth Boundaries where more facilities and services are available.</p> |                |                   | <p><b>STAFF RECOMMENDATION:</b> Retain policy.</p>   |



# TABLE 3: GROUNDWATER RESOURCES NEW POLICIES WORKSHEET

| PROPOSED GROUNDWATER RESOURCES POLICIES                      |  |
|--|--|
| ISSUE TO BE ADDRESSED  | PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE  |
| Impacts of wildfire, climate change on groundwater resources | In partnership with private landowners and state and federal agencies, Clatsop County will continue to monitor impacts to groundwater resources caused by climate change, and will develop strategies to mitigate those impacts. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |



# Clatsop County

## Community Development – Planning

800 Exchange St., Suite 100  
Astoria, OR 97103  
(503) 325-8611 phone  
(503) 338-3606 fax  
[www.co.clatsop.or.us](http://www.co.clatsop.or.us)

---

**TO:** Clatsop County Citizen Advisory Committee Members  
**FROM:** Victoria Sage, Planner  
**DATE:** September 23, 2020  
**RE:** **GOAL 5 RESOURCE TOPIC – WATERSHEDS**

---

**Watersheds:** Clatsop County’s Goal 5 makes mention of watersheds as a resource only in passing (page 49), and classifies them as more relevant to Goal 6, Air, Water, and Land Resources Quality. It is too simple to define water and its quality as the only resource in a watershed; all of the land uses, terrain, soils, plants, and animals within the watershed can reasonably be considered a part of the resource as well.

The USGS (US Geological Survey) defines a watershed as, “an area of land that drains all the streams and rainfall to a common outlet such as the outflow of a reservoir, mouth of a bay, or any point along a stream channel. Watersheds can be as small as a footprint or large enough to encompass all the land that drains water into rivers that [enter the ocean].

The word "watershed" is sometimes used interchangeably with drainage basin or catchment. Ridges and hills that separate two watersheds are called the drainage divide. The watershed consists of surface water--lakes, streams, reservoirs, and wetlands--and all the underlying groundwater. Larger watersheds contain many smaller watersheds. It all depends on the outflow point; all of the land that drains water to the outflow point is the watershed for that outflow location. *Watersheds are important because the streamflow and the water quality of a river are affected by things, human-induced or not, happening in the land area "above" the river-outflow point.*

Watersheds can consist of many streams, creeks, and rivers; for example Moosmoos Creek is in the Youngs River watershed, while Moosmoos Creek itself has its own watershed made up of unnamed rivulets and streams. Each district has water rights to access either all or a portion of these watersheds. Some jurisdictions even have exclusive rights to an entire watershed; for instance the City of Astoria has exclusive rights to the Bear Creek Watershed, which is a part of the larger Columbia River Watershed. In order to manage and protect the Bear Creek Watershed, the access to the land and creek is regulated strictly by the City.



There are several watershed councils in Clatsop County, who aim to work with the stakeholders of the watershed communities to protect, conserve, restore, and sustain the health and functions of the watershed.

| Necanicum WC               | Upper Nehalem WC      | Lower Nehalem WC   | NCWA Coastal Council: | NCWA River Council         |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Circle Creek               | Nehalem River         | Nehalem River      | Ecola                 | Skipanon River             |
| Volmer Creek               | Rock Creek            | Salmonberry River  | Arch Cape             | Youngs Bay                 |
| Beerman Creek              | Pebble Creek          | George Creek       | Short Sands           | Big Creek                  |
| Skipanon River             | Quartz Creek          | Cronin Creek       | Necarney              | Columbia River Drainages   |
| Kloutchie Creek            | Dairy Creek           | Gods Valley Vreek  | Clayton Creek         | Youngs River               |
| South Fork Necanicum River | Lewis and Clark River | Soapstone Creek    | Red Rock Creek        | Lewis and Clark River      |
| Bergsvik Creek             | Fishhawk Creek        | Coal Creek         | Shark Creek           | Moosmoos Creek             |
| Grindy Creek               | Clatskanie River      | Humbug Creek       | Asbury Creek          | Wallooskee River           |
| Litle Humbug Creek         | Dog Creek             | Gravel Creek       | Arch Cape Creek       | North Fork Klaskanie River |
| Lewis and Clark River      | Kenusky Creek         | Big Rackheap Creek | Indian Creek          | John Day River             |
|                            | Carcus Creek          |                    | Canyon Creek          | Bear Creek                 |
|                            |                       |                    |                       | Big Creek                  |

\*The above watersheds are included in the watershed council jurisdictions, but not all are listed.

**Watersheds and Water Quality:** At the suggestion of the Citizen Advisory Committes, Clatsop County is working on providing a layer on the GIS WebMaps tool showing drinking water district boundaries. Below is a list of permitted water systems in Clatsop County. There are several types of water districts, both public and private, that take water from these sources:

- Surface Water (SW) is provided directly from runoff in rivers and creeks. There is a higher potential for surface water to come in contact with pollutants than naturally-filtered ground water. It is generally used by public or larger private/community water districts who have the ability to process and treat the water to meet water quality standards. These districts include the Arch Cape Water District, the Youngs River/Lewis and Clark Water District, and the City of Astoria Water District.
- Ground Water (GW) is supplied from aquifers and wells. In Clatsop County, it is generally smaller districts and individual landowners who provide this type of water access. These districts include the Wauna Water District, the Sunset Lake RV Park, and the Knappa Water Association, to name a few.

| <b>Drinking Water Districts Clatsop County</b> | <b>Primary Source</b> | <b>Connections</b> | <b>Population</b> |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| ARCH CAPE WATER DISTRICT                       | SW                    | 293                | 150               |
| ASTORIA, CITY OF                               | SW                    | 4076               | 9802              |
| BURNSIDE WATER ASSOCIATION                     | SWP                   | 112                | 315               |
| CAMP 18  | GW                    | 5                  | 69                |
| CAMP 18 LOGGING MUSEUM                         | GW                    | 1                  | 25                |
| CAMP RILEA                                     | GW                    | 75                 | 136               |
| CANNON BEACH, CITY OF                          | GW                    | 1781               | 1710              |
| CANNON VIEW PARK INC                           | GW                    | 50                 | 75                |
| ELDERBERRY LODGE WATER ASSOC                   | GW                    | 12                 | 24                |
| ELDERBERRY NEHALEM WS                          | GW                    | 60                 | 140               |
| EVERGREEN ACRES                                | GW                    | 47                 | 100               |
| FALCON COVE BEACH WATER DISTRICT               | SW                    |                    |                   |
| FERNHILL COMMUNITY WTR SYSTEM                  | SWP                   | 91                 | 300               |
| GEARHART WATER DEPARTMENT                      | SWP                   | 1400               | 1465              |
| GEORGIA PACIFIC CO LLC WAUNA                   | SW                    | 1                  | 700               |
| HAMLET QUICK-STOP                              | SW                    | 1                  | 30                |
| JEWELL SCHOOL DISTRICT #8                      | SWP                   | 1                  | 700               |
| JOHN DAY WATER DISTRICT -                      | GW                    | 101                | 350               |
| KNAPPA WATER ASSOCIATION                       | GW                    | 574                |                   |
| ODF NORTHRUP CREEK HORSE CAMP HP               | GW                    | 1                  | 55                |
| ODF SPRUCE RUN PARK HP                         | GW                    | 1                  | 40                |
| ODF/WL NEHALEM FISH HATCHERY                   | GW                    | 7                  | 12                |
| ODOT HD SUNSET SPRINGS RA                      | GW                    | 3                  | 500               |
| OLNEY-WALLUSKI WATER ASSN                      | SWP                   | 233                | 530               |
| ONEYS RESTAURANT/LOUNGE                        | GW                    | 6                  | 60                |
| OPRD BRADLEY STATE WAYSIDE                     | GW                    | 2                  | 383               |
| OPRD SADDLE MOUNTAIN SP                        | GW                    | 5                  | 150               |
| RIVERVIEW HOME SITES                           | GW                    | 7                  | 15                |
| SEASIDE WATER DEPARTMENT                       | SW                    | 3691               | 6605              |
| STANLEY ACRES WATER ASSN                       | SWP                   | 112                | 315               |
| SUNSET LAKE RV PARK                            | GW                    | 100                | 170               |
| VINEMAPLE ACRES WS                             | GW                    | 13                 | 23                |
| WARRENTON, CITY OF                             | SW                    | 3404               | 9100              |
| WAUNA WATER DISTRICT                           | GW                    | 68                 | 188               |
| WESTPORT HEIGHTS                               | GW                    | 40                 | 90                |
| WESTPORT WATER ASSOCIATION                     | GWP                   | 165                | 550               |
| WICKIUP WATER DISTRICT                         | SW                    | 636                | 1590              |
| WILLOW DALE WATER DISTRICT                     | SWP                   | 125                | 300               |
| YOUNGS RIVER LEWIS & CLARK WD                  | SW                    | 1004               | 2530              |

Information pertaining to the water areas, watersheds and groundwater resources of Clatsop County are discussed in the Air, Water, and Land Resources Quality Background Report and the Public Facilities Background Report. Where appropriate, the Community Plans element of the Comprehensive Plan also contain information on these resources.

#### WETLANDS

The Statewide Planning Goals define wetland as "land areas where excess water is the dominant factor determining the nature of soil development and the types of plant and animal communities living at the soil surface. Wetland soils retain sufficient moisture to support aquatic or semi-aquatic plant life. In marine and estuarine areas, wetlands are bounded at the lower extreme by extreme low water; in fresh-water areas, by a depth of six feet. The area below wetlands are submerged lands".

Clatsop County contains substantial amounts of wetlands. The majority of these wetlands are either estuarine wetlands, which are covered by the Goal #16 element of the County's Plan, or wetlands found in the Coastal Shoreland which are covered in the Goal #17 element of the County's Plan.

In addition, three other types of freshwater wetlands were identified. The first and most important group consisting of seven major non-coastal shoreland wetlands. These sites are found either immediately east of the "coastal shoreland wetlands" of the Clatsop Plains, or along the Columbia River in areas that are defined to be outside of Oregon's Coastal Zone. The following are descriptions taken from Significant Shoreland and Wetland Habitats in the Clatsop Plains, by Duncan Thomas.

#### SITE 1 (CP9)

Location: Along the Skipanon River, south of Warrenton and SE of Hwy. 101 realignment.

Size: About 93 acres.

Wetland Vegetation Types: 5, 8, 11 (dry var.) 9.

Riparian Vegetation: About 2,000 ft. x 50 ft. along the Skipanon, north of the wetlands.

Soils: Brallier Muck.

Site Description: This peat bog site has reverted to native wetland vegetation. The Skipanon River, which passes through this site, supports populations of warm water fish. The swamps to the east of the Skipanon are extensively used by elk. The bog area is important habitat for wetland avifauna, and probably supports populations of aquatic furbearers. The site includes an osprey nest.

### Natural Areas

1. Significant natural and scientific areas and scenic sites should be set aside for preservation and managed so as to protect the unique characteristics of the area.
2. The County will cooperate with appropriate State and Federal agencies and private groups to ensure that examples of the full range of Oregon's natural ecosystem are preserved for future study and enjoyment.
3. A 1/4 acre site, located on the portion of Onion Peak designated Natural, shall be reserved for a potential radio transmission facility. The siting and placement of such a facility shall minimize impacts on the area's natural qualities.
4. The Natural designation for Sugar Loaf Mountain shall not affect the continued operating and maintenance of the radio transmitter facility located there.

### Water Resources

1. The County will cooperate and coordinate with State and Federal agencies in assuring the maximum beneficial use of all water areas in the County.
2. The County will coordinate its actions with water quality planning and implementation activities carried out by such state agencies as the Department of Environmental Quality, the Soil and Water Conservation Commission, the Department of Forestry, and the Department of Water Resources.
3. Where municipalities or water districts have identified possible conflicts between forest management practices and the maintenance of the integrity of their watershed, the County encourages these to work with the Northwest Region Forest Practices Committee in the development of amendments to the Oregon Forest Practices Act that will provide needed modification and protection of state licensed water supply systems.
4. The County encourages the development of community dock facilities rather than individual piers or docks.

### Historic Sites

1. The County encourages the State Parks Division, when developing a master program for Ecola Park, to give proper recognition to the historical activities that occurred there.
2. The County encourages the State Highway Division to relocate the Cannon Beach Cannon at a suitable new location should Highway 101 widening ever make the present site unsuitable.
3. The County Parks Department, to the extent funding permits, will continue to maintain the Lindgren House.

### \* Other Policies

Clatsop County shall rely upon the Forest Practices Act and any supplemental agreements between the Fish and Wildlife Commission and the Board of Forestry to protect critical wildlife habitat sites.

### \* Wilderness Areas

Clatsop County shall work with federal agencies in the protection of federal wilderness areas.

### \* Watersheds

As information becomes available, Clatsop County shall apply Goal 5 Administrative Rules to the 14 identified watersheds and the small or minor watersheds identified in this element.

\* Amended, 84-9, dated May 23, 1984

70 b.

**GOAL 5**  
33

WATERSHEDS AND GROUNDWATER RESOURCES

INVENTORY: State-wide Planning Goal 5 requires that the County inventory its watersheds and groundwater resources, including information on the location, quality and quantity of each resource. This section provides information as to the location of the major watershed systems in the County. This information is summarized in tabular form below, and on Map \_\_\_\_\_, included by reference. Clatsop County does not presently have information on the quality and quantity of the watersheds listed below. The rest of the Goal 5 process for these watersheds will be delayed, pursuant to OAR 660-16-000(1B).

| <u>Reference Number</u> | <u>Major Waterway(s)</u>   | <u>Approximate Acreage</u> |
|-------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| 1.                      | Plympton Creek/West Creek  | 8,900                      |
| 2.                      | Hunt Creek   | 5,100                      |
| 3.                      | Blind Slough/Grizzley Slough                                       | 24,700                     |
| 4.                      | Big Creek/Little Creek/Fertile Valley Creek                        | 29,000                     |
| 5.                      | Mary's Creek/Bear Creek/Farris Creek                               | 14,500                     |
| 6.                      | John Day River   | 4,400                      |
| 7.                      | Young's River/Klaskanine River/Walluski River                      | 80,300                     |
| 8.                      | Lewis & Clark River  | 42,800                     |
| 9.                      | Neawanna Creek/Thompson Creek                                      | 4,700                      |
| 10.                     | Canyon Creek   | 2,100                      |
| 11.                     | Mecanicum River  | 30,300                     |
| 12.                     | Nahalem River  | 213,200                    |
| 13.                     | Elk Creek  | 15,200                     |
| 14.                     | Arch Cape Creek/Asbury Creek/Shark Creek/Fall Creek/Red Rock Creek | 7,100                      |
| 15.                     | (This drainage area is almost entirely within the City of Astoria) |                            |
| 16.                     | Clatsop Plains — see below   |                            |

- O. These small or minor watersheds are not included. They consist of small coastal creeks and small creeks draining into the Columbia River. They are not included at this time due to lack of information.

The Clatsop Plains area (Map \_\_\_\_\_, number 16) consists of two major waterways: the Skipanon River, which drains to the north, and Neacoxie Creek, which drains to the south. The Clatsop Plains area is not notable for its watersheds: it is, however, notable for its groundwater resources.

Clatsop County has complete inventory information for the Clatsop Plains groundwater resource. This information is found in two documents:

R.L. Beck and Associates. Clatsop Plains Ground Water Protection Plan: Summary Report and Environmental Assessment. March, 1982.

Sweet, Edwards and Associates. Clatsop Plains Ground Water Protection Plan: Ground Water Evaluation Report. December, 1981.

These two reports identify conflicting uses, (2) determine the economic, social, environmental and energy consequences of allowing the conflicting uses, and (3) suggest policies to restrict conflicting uses in order to protect the groundwater resource. These reports are included here by reference. The County Board of Commissioners adopted the proposals in these reports on the 24th of March, 1982. The Environmental Quality Commission adopted regulations pursuant to these recommendations on 27 August, 1982 (revised 15 October, 1982).

## Introduction

Clatsop County is fortunate in that it generally has clean air and water. The quality of the County's environment is a factor that yearly draws many visitors to the area and also contributes greatly to the quality of life of its residents.

## Basic Findings

### Air Quality

The small population, strong year round ocean winds and large amounts of forest lands help to mitigate and remove what localized air quality problems exist in Clatsop County during most of the year. The major point sources of air pollution in the County are the Wauna paper mill and the Astoria plywood mill, both of which are meeting the requirements of their Air Contaminant Discharge Permits. The Wauna mill has installed air pollution control equipment which is removing an estimated 90-95% of its air contaminants.

DEQ air quality officials do not feel that there are significant air pollution problems in Clatsop County. Air Contaminant Discharge Permits are monitored on a regular basis by the State, and the combination of pollution control equipment and the wind in the area mitigate against the need for additional controls. Several major sources of air pollution will be eliminated when the County closes the remaining burning dumps after approval of a new landfill site.

Under EPA and DEQ regulations some air quality deterioration through industrial development could take place in Clatsop County without exceeding national air quality standards.

### Water Quality

Because of its coastal location, high rainfall and presence of the Coast Range Mountains, Clatsop County is rich in water resources. Besides the rivers (including the Columbia River, the largest river in western North America), streams, creeks and lakes, there are two known aquifer areas; Clatsop Plains and Gnat Creek aquifers.

Pollution sources in Clatsop County's streams and rivers come from point (direct sources such as sewage outfalls) and non-point (indirect sources such as sedimentation) sources. Point sources require discharge permits and are closely monitored by the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Non-point sources are regulated by DEQ under the 208 Program. This program contains a statewide assessment of the location, type and severity of water quality problems including streambank erosion, sedimentation, excessive debris, water withdrawal, elevated water temperature and nuisance algae. A complete ranking of the above problems indicated that the Nehalem River has the greatest amount of water quality problems in Clatsop County. The ranking system was arbitrary but was designed to indicate relative problem areas within a region or county.

Since about 86% of the land area of Clatsop County is forest land, timber management has a significant effect on water quality. The Oregon Forest Practices Act and rules have been designated the best management practices to control forestry related water quality problems. The County has no local control over the enforcement of the Forest Practices Act.

Possible nitrate pollution of the Clatsop Plains aquifer has prompted the County, in conjunction with Warrenton, Hammond and Gearhart, to study and monitor the quality of the groundwater under the 208 Program.

A comparison of existing water rights with average monthly stream flows on most of the major rivers and streams in the County shows that water rights exceed minimum recommended stream flows for aquatic life. No appropriations of water except for human consumption, livestock consumption and water legally released from storage should be granted by a state agency when the average stream flow is less than that sufficient to support aquatic life.

### Noise Control

The most probable future noise control problems in Clatsop County would be due to conflicts between noise sensitive properties and noisy industrial users, noise from major arterials and noise conflicts created by airports. In order to minimize these conflicts, noise considerations can be used when designating new industrial zoned land. In addition, performance standards for noise can be used in approving new commercial and industrial uses to minimize any conflicts with surrounding noise sensitive properties. The State Highway Department should be encouraged to use noise pollution considerations when realigning, improving, or building new highways.

The Seaside airport and its clear zones are located in the City of Seaside's and Gearhart's Urban Growth Boundaries. Appropriate zoning limiting conflicting uses will be developed during the UGB adoption process.

Areas surrounding the Clatsop County Airport that are or in the future may be exposed to an aviation noise environment of 55 Ldn have been planned and zoned for industrial, exclusive farm use, and low density residential use (in areas of existing residential use). The current large amounts of open space and agricultural, industrial, and low density residential zoning should result in compatibility with noise standards.

### Policies

1. The County shall encourage the maintenance of a high quality of air, water and land through the following actions:
  - (a) encouraging concentration of urban development inside Urban Growth Boundaries,
  - (b) encouraging maintenance and improvement of pollution control facilities,

(c) cooperating with the State Highway Department to provide an efficient transportation system. Methods to reduce congestion and air pollution on Marine Drive/Commercial Street should be explored.

(d) encouraging indigenous, clean industries such as fishing, boat building, tourism, and forest products utilization and

(e) encouraging development of resource recovery mechanisms such as recycling centers and wood waste processing.

2. The County Planning Department shall work with the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) to monitor and keep its environmental data base current including information on air quality, surface and groundwater quality, and land quality including waste disposal and erosion problems.

3. The cumulative effect of development on the County's environment should be monitored and, where appropriate, regulated. When evaluating proposals that would affect the quality of the air, water or land in the County, consideration should be given to the impact on other resources - important to the County's economy such as marine resource habitat and recreational and aesthetic resources important to the tourist industry.

4. The County shall continue its efforts to find an acceptable regional solid waste disposal site or an acceptable alternative (i.e. recycling, electricity generation).

5. Recovery of wood wastes, rather than slash burning, shall be encouraged as a means of reducing air and water pollution, improving the economy, and for producing energy.

6. Upon completion of the Clatsop Plains Groundwater Study, the County shall reevaluate the Clatsop Plains Community Plan to determine whether existing policies and standards are adequate to protect water quality in the aquifer, lakes and streams. Consideration shall be given to protection of the lakes from further degradation (eutrophication), and possible remedial actions to improve water quality.

7. The County shall work to maintain the quality of its estuarine waters through participation in the regional Columbia River estuary planning process.

8. The County shall cooperate with DEQ, State Forestry Department, State Transportation Department and other agencies in implementing best management practices to reduce non-point pollution.

9. The County shall recommend that state agencies regulate the issuance of water rights so as to insure that the total water rights of a stream bed do not exceed the minimum stream flow.

10. Subdivisions adjacent to major arterials shall address the reduction of noise impacts in their site plans.