

Deschutes County 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update

File No. 247-23-000644-PA

Modules # 3 and #4

	Issue Area	Applicable Plan Provision	Support / Opposition	Staff Comment	PC Decision Points
1	Should policy language be added to <u>require</u> collaboration among city, county, and state agencies on recreation topics?	<p>Chapter 8, Recreation</p> <p>Policy 8.1.5. Support efforts to coordinate recreation planning between the County, park and recreation districts, school districts, irrigation districts, unincorporated communities, and cities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: Commentors expressed a desire for coordination among agencies on recreation topics to be required rather than encouraged to avoid overuse of natural resources and impacts to farm and forest lands. • Opposition: N/A 	<p>Staff notes the current language promotes collaboration among agencies on recreation topics. There is limited authority to require coordination, therefore staff anticipates any changes to require coordination would likely not be enforceable. Additionally, this policy may have the effect of invalidating processes where agencies might not have the resources or staff to participate, which could have negative consequences.</p> <p>Staff recommends retaining the current language as drafted.</p>	<p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend Option A (amended policy): Policy 8.1.5. Support efforts to <u>Require coordinate coordination on</u> recreation planning <u>topics</u> between the County, park and recreation districts, school districts, irrigation districts, unincorporated communities, and cities.</p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining current language as drafted.</p>
2	Should a specific policy be added to support the footbridge tentatively planned near the southern edge of Bend's Urban Growth Boundary?	<p>Chapter 8, Recreation</p> <p>Policy 8.1.1. Reduce barriers to regional parks and recreation projects in Deschutes County, including acknowledgement or adoption of federal, state and local parks district trail and facility plans.</p> <p>Policy 8.1.2. Collaborate with partners to develop a regional system of trails and open spaces, prioritizing recommendations from local parks districts, County, state, and federal recreational plans and studies.</p> <p>Policy 8.1.5. Support efforts to coordinate recreation planning between the County, park and recreation districts, school districts, irrigation districts, unincorporated communities, and cities.</p> <p>Policy 8.1.6. Support the development of parks and trails identified in locally-adopted plans.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: 47 commentors in support of the specific footbridge. City of Bend supportive of regional trails generally. • Opposition: Commentors expressed concern regarding the impacts of trails on neighboring properties, and potential impacts to farmland, forestland, and natural resources. Another commentor expressed concern regarding the wild and scenic river status of this area. 	<p>This project is currently listed in Bend Parks and Recreation's Master Plan and is not proposed to be designed or constructed at this time.</p> <p>The Board of County Commissioners recently voted to retain Bend Parks and Recreation's Master Plan by reference into the TSP. It is important to note that regardless of inclusion or exclusion of a policy related to this item, the County is not responsible for designing, funding, or constructing this bridge. If BPRD were to move forward and land use review were to be required (depending on its location in city or county jurisdiction) development code criteria would determine approval, not comprehensive plan language.</p> <p>The draft policy language sought to balance the general desire for more interconnecting and regional parks projects, while acknowledging that the County has a very limited role in planning or development of specific parks projects. Staff recommends retaining the current language as drafted.</p>	<p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend Option A (new policy): Policy x.x.x Support efforts to establish a new river crossing south of Bend's Urban Growth Boundary.</p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining current language as drafted.</p>

3	Should a policy be added to limit trails near farm and forestry operations?	<p>Chapter 8, Recreation</p> <p>Policy 8.1.1. Reduce barriers to regional parks and recreation projects in Deschutes County, including acknowledgement or adoption of federal, state and local parks district trail and facility plans.</p> <p>Policy 8.1.2. Collaborate with partners to develop a regional system of trails and open spaces, prioritizing recommendations from local parks districts, County, state, and federal recreational plans and studies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: Commentors expressed concern regarding negative impacts to farm and forestry operations from trails. • Opposition: Commentors expressed a general desire for increased recreational opportunities and regional trails. 	<p>Throughout development of the plan, community members expressed desire for more regional trail projects, particularly those that could connect cities in Deschutes County.</p> <p>The language, as drafted, promotes coordination and support for regional parks and recreation projects. Staff notes that projects on land within the County’s jurisdiction are still beholden to Oregon Administrative Rule and Revised Statute requirements, including those related to farm and forest lands, as well as case law.</p> <p>Staff recommends retaining the language as currently drafted.</p>	<p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend Option A (new policy): Policy x.x.x Explore additional requirements (such as buffers) to limit impacts from regional trail projects to nearby farm and forestry operations.</p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining current language as drafted.</p>
4	Should a policy be amended to consider balancing land, infrastructure, environment, and resource capacities with economic development?	<p>Chapter 9, Economic Development</p> <p>Policy 9.1.1. Promote rural economic initiatives, including home-based businesses, that maintain the integrity of the rural character and natural environment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: Commentor expressed support for an amended policy that balances economic development with other factors aside from monetary gain. • Opposition: Commentors expressed support to limit restrictions and protect private property rights. 	<p>The current language has been carried over from the 2010 plan and amended for clarity. Staff notes the existing language generally promotes balancing economic development with natural resources and livability for rural residents.</p> <p>The proposed language would go a step further and express a desire to balance capacity of resources with economic development. Staff notes that economic development in rural commercial and industrial zones is heavily regulated by state law and the County’s existing development code.</p> <p>Staff recommends retaining the current language as drafted.</p>	<p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend Option A (amended policy): Policy 9.1.1. <u>Explore legislative updates to balance</u> Promote rural economic initiatives, including home-based businesses, <u>with infrastructure, environment, and resource capacities.</u> that maintain the integrity of the rural character and natural environment.</p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining current language as drafted.</p>

5	Should additional narrative text be added to recognize development and housing as key to promoting and growing the economy?	Chapter 9, Economic Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: Commentor expressed support to include reference to the impact of housing and development on growing the economy. • Opposition: N/A 	<p>The Economic Development chapter provides a summary of the County's top industries. Trade, transportation, and utility jobs are noted as a large industry in Deschutes County's economy and relates to the construction of housing.</p> <p>Staff has no concerns about expanding on this topic and providing additional narrative text noting the impact of housing and development on Deschutes County's economy.</p>	<p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend Option A (amend narrative): Direct staff to note the importance of development and housing for the economy in Deschutes County.</p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining current language as drafted.</p>
6	Should the County integrate Central Oregon Landwatch (COLW)'s recommended edits to rural commercial goal and policy language?	<p>Chapter 9, Economic Development</p> <p>Goal 9.2: Support creation and continuation of rural commercial areas that support rural communities while not adversely affecting nearby agricultural and forest uses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: Central Oregon Landwatch expressed concern that the goal was contrary to state law and should be deleted. • Opposition: Commentors addressed a general desire for additional economic development opportunities. 	<p>Deschutes County has a Rural Commercial (RC) zoning district and comprehensive plan designation. This designation originally applied to properties with certain levels of commercial development that predated the Oregon Land Use System but were not at the level of intensity as unincorporated communities such as Tumalo or Terrebonne. New properties could be rezoned and redesignated to Rural Commercial if specific criteria are met through state statute. The Oregon Land Use Board of Appeals and Oregon Court of Appeals verified this during a recent appeals process.</p> <p>The policies in this section were organized under Goal 1 (noted above), and this goal was added to summarize the general intent of those policies.</p> <p>If Commissioners found the need to amend the policy, staff has provided two additional options.</p>	<p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend Option A (amended language): Goal 9.2: Support creation and continuation of rural commercial areas <u>as state law allows</u>, that support rural communities while not adversely affecting nearby agricultural and forest uses.</p> <p>Option B (alternative language): Goal 9.2: <u>Maintain rural commercial areas as currently designated and consider expansions of existing areas or establishment of new areas if otherwise allowed by state law.</u></p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining current language as drafted.</p>

7	Should the County integrate Central Oregon Landwatch (COLW)'s recommended edits to rural industrial goal and policy language?	<p>Chapter 9, Economic Development</p> <p>Goal 9.3: Support the creation and continuation of rural industrial areas that support rural communities while not adversely affecting nearby agricultural and forest uses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: Central Oregon Landwatch expressed concern that the goal was contrary to state law and should be deleted. • Opposition: Commentors addressed a general desire for additional economic development opportunities. 	<p>Similar to above, Deschutes County has a Rural Industrial (RI) zoning district and comprehensive plan designation. This designation originally applied to properties with certain levels of industrial development that predated the Oregon Land Use System but were not at the level of intensity as unincorporated communities such as Tumalo or Terrebonne. Staff notes that new properties could be rezoned and redesignated to Rural Industrial if specific criteria are met through state statute. The Oregon Land Use Board of Appeals and Oregon Court of Appeals verified this during a recent appeals process.</p> <p>The policies in this section were organized under Goal 1 (noted above), and this goal was added to summarize the general intent of those policies.</p> <p>If Commissioners found the need to amend the policy, staff has provided two additional options.</p>	<p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend Option A (amended language):</p> <p>Goal 9.2: Support creation and continuation of rural industrial areas <u>as state law allows</u>, that support rural communities while not adversely affecting nearby agricultural and forest uses.</p> <p>Option B (alternative language):</p> <p>Goal 9.2: <u>Maintain rural industrial areas as currently designated and consider expansions of existing areas or establishment of new areas if otherwise allowed by state law.</u></p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining current language as drafted.</p>
8	Should policy language be amended to discourage short-term or vacation rentals?	<p>Chapter 10, Housing</p> <p>Policy 10.1.8 Evaluate the impacts of short-term rentals and consider regulations to mitigate impacts, as appropriate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: Commentors expressed support to regulate, discourage, or ban short-term rentals. • Opposition: Commentors expressed general desire to limit impacts to private property rights. 	<p>Recent case law prohibits short term rentals in farm and forest zones, although the courts did not provide explicit guidance for regulation of short-term rentals on other lands.</p> <p>The Board of County Commissioners was recently briefed on this item and is continuing to discuss approaches including the potential for a land use decision process for short term rentals.</p> <p>As this issue is currently being discussed, staff recommends retaining the current language to support ongoing conversations on this issue.</p>	<p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend Option A (new language):</p> <p>Policy x.x.x. Explore creation of additional requirements for short-term rentals.</p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining current language as drafted.</p>

9	Should the County amend policy language to better reflect collaboration with cities on affordable housing within Urban Growth Boundaries (UGBs)?	<p>Chapter 10, Housing</p> <p>Policy 10.4.2. Partner with cities to incentivize development within urban growth boundaries and reduce infrastructure costs for workforce and affordable housing.</p> <p>Policy 10.4.4. Utilize County owned land in city limits for affordable and workforce housing, where appropriate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: Commentors expressed support for housing development in urban growth boundaries, rather than allowing additional housing opportunities in the rural county. Commentors expressed concern regarding sprawl and costs associated with rural housing. • Opposition: Commentors expressed support for housing development generally, in and outside UGBs, to aid in the ongoing housing shortage. Commentors expressed concern on utilizing county owned property for private housing development. 	<p>This chapter includes a variety of policies related to rural housing including opportunities for additional housing creation and flexibility under existing state law and grants to support maintenance of existing housing stock.</p> <p>These two policies relate to support of housing in Urban Growth Boundaries. The language was crafted to promote coordination among cities and the County on infill development in UGBs, where there are fewer restrictions on development and infrastructure siting.</p> <p>Additionally, a new policy was added related to use of County land in city limits for housing, which reflects opportunities for partnership in housing development, where available land is often a key challenge.</p>	<p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend Option A (new language): Policy x.x.x. Prioritize collaboration with cities on affordable housing development within UGBs.</p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining current language as drafted.</p>
10	Should the County add a policy to limit secondary accessory farm dwellings in the MUA-10 zone?	Chapter 10, Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: Commentor expressed support for limiting secondary housing, specifically secondary accessory farm dwellings in the MUA-10 zone. • Opposition: N/A 	<p>Secondary accessory farm dwellings are a local allowance in Deschutes County's code that has been in place since the establishment of the County's zoning code. Currently, these types of dwellings are allowed through a conditional use permit and only manufactured homes, not stick built, can qualify for this housing type.</p> <p>Only a few properties have historically received approval for this housing type, although this generated interest in a recent hearing process.</p> <p>Staff recommends retaining the current language as drafted, but if interested, staff recommends a policy exploring additional criteria for this housing type, rather than an outright limitation.</p>	<p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend Option A (new language): Policy x.x.x. Explore additional requirements for secondary accessory farm dwellings in the MUA-10 zone.</p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining current language as drafted.</p>

11	Should the County amend policy language to address homelessness through partnering with agencies, providing services, outreach, and housing first strategies?	<p>Chapter 10, Housing</p> <p>Policy 10.4.3. Partner with local, state, and federal agencies to address and limit nuisance and public health issues related to homelessness.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: Commentors expressed a desire to address homelessness through assistance and providing housing. • Opposition: Commentor expressed concern regarding allowance of camping on public property by individuals experiencing homelessness. 	<p>Staff notes the existing language was intended to be broad enough to cover a variety of strategies and initiatives. This work is currently being led by Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council, although a defined region-wide strategy for homelessness has not yet been released.</p> <p>Services and outreach are conducted through the County’s health department and are not under the purview of the Comprehensive plan.</p> <p>The “housing first” approach typically prioritizes providing a safe place to live without other preconditions such as sobriety, treatment, or other service participation requirements. Staff notes that other policies discuss coordination specifically related to development of affordable housing.</p> <p>Staff recommends retaining the current language as drafted.</p>	<p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend the language in Option A (amended): Policy 10.4.3. Partner with local, state, and federal agencies to address and limit nuisance and public health issues related to homelessness <u>by providing services, outreach, and a housing first approach.</u></p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining current language as drafted.</p>
12	Should policy language be amended to list workforce, transitional housing, and secure shelter housing types in goals and policies, and/or to advocate for changes to state law to allow shelter or safe parking areas outside of UGBs?	<p>Chapter 10, Housing</p> <p>Goal 10.2: Support agencies and non-profits that provide affordable housing.</p> <p>Policy 10.4.1. Collaborate with cities and private sector partners on innovative housing developments to meet the region’s housing needs.</p> <p>Policy 10.4.2. Partner with cities to incentivize development within urban growth boundaries and reduce infrastructure costs for workforce and affordable housing.</p> <p>Policy 10.4.4. Utilize County owned land in city limits for affordable and workforce housing, where appropriate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: Commentor expressed support for amended language to ensure all housing types are included and to advocate at the state level to allow transitional housing or shelters outside UGBs. • Opposition: Commentor expressed concern regarding impacts of homelessness on adjacent property owners. 	<p>Staff notes the existing language is likely broad enough to be inclusive of these housing types, if the Board were to pursue these types of projects. Option B allows for the PC to specifically add these housing types to the relevant policies.</p> <p>Staff notes existing state law limits building large scale workforce or temporary shelter type developments outside UGBs. If the PC were interested in advocating for these types of developments, staff suggests a policy such as Option A which first explores this topic and allows for much more extensive community conversations.</p>	<p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend the language in Option A (new): Policy x.x.x. Support changes to state law that allow shelters or safe parking areas outside urban growth boundaries subject to certain standards.</p> <p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend Option B, to incorporate workforce, transitional housing, and secure shelter housing types into Goal 10.2 and policies 10.4.1, 10.4.2, and 10.4.4.</p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining current language as drafted.</p>

13	Should a policy be added to incorporate statutory language to limit creation and expansion of destination resorts within 24 airmiles of Bend, except to provide housing for employees and management of the resort?	<p>Chapter 11, Unincorporated Communities and Destination Resorts</p> <p>Policy 11.7.2. Create and implement additional limitations on the siting and development of destination resorts that go beyond current state regulations to ensure protection of water quality, recreational resources, and other County resources and values.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: Commentors expressed a desire to update the Comprehensive Plan to align with state law. Other commentors generally wanted to limit the development of destination resorts. • Opposition: Commentors noted ambiguity in state law. Other commentors noted that destination resorts are a valuable economic asset to Deschutes County and shouldn't be further limited beyond state law. 	<p>Staff notes the Planning Commission contemplated this issue through an applicant-initiated text amendment. The Board of County Commissioners ultimately voted to deny the amendment.</p> <p>The existing language was drafted as a middle-ground approach to promote further community conversation on this topic. Staff recommends the PC retain the current language.</p>	<p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend the language in Option A (new): Policy x.x.x. Review county code and comprehensive plan goals policies to confirm compliance with ORS 197.455, in relation to siting of destination resorts.</p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission could remove policy 11.7.2.</p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining current language as drafted.</p>
14	Should policy language related to water availability and destination resort siting be amended?	<p>Chapter 11, Unincorporated Communities and Destination Resorts</p> <p>Policy 11.7.2. Create and implement additional limitations on the siting and development of destination resorts that go beyond current state regulations to ensure protection of water quality, recreational resources, and other County resources and values.</p> <p>Chapter 5, Natural Resources</p> <p>Policy 5.1.3. Consider potential impacts on water quality and availability in surrounding areas as part of the siting, planning, and approval processes for Destination Resorts and other large-scale developments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: Commentors expressed a desire to place greater limitations on the siting or expansion of destination resorts including criteria related to impacts on water and other natural resources. • Opposition: Commentors noted that destination resorts are a valuable economic asset to Deschutes County and shouldn't be further limited beyond state law. Additionally, commentors expressed support for protection of private property rights. 	<p>During the initial community outreach process, many community members expressed concern regarding the development of new destination resorts and impacts on natural resources. Water availability and impacts on certain areas of the county was often cited as a concern.</p> <p>The existing requirements for destination resorts in the County's development code include review of water availability and a 'no net loss' standard related to impacts to fish and wildlife resources, although certain criteria have proved to be difficult to interpret.</p> <p>The existing language was drafted as a middle-ground approach to promote further community conversation on this topic. Staff recommends the PC retain the current language as drafted.</p>	<p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend the language in Option A (new language): Policy x.x.x Explore additional limitations on destination resorts, including a restriction on new or expanded resorts in groundwater mitigation areas.</p> <p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend the language in Option B (amended language): Policy 5.1.3. Consider <u>Require analysis and mitigation of potential impacts on water quality and availability in surrounding areas as part of the siting, planning, and approval processes for Destination Resorts and other large-scale developments, and/or residential projects requiring water rights.</u></p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission could remove policy 11.7.2 and/or 5.1.3.</p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining current language as drafted.</p>

15	Should narrative text be amended to recognize destination resorts as a key recreational strategy of the County?	<p>Chapter 11, Unincorporated Communities and Destination Resorts</p> <p>Page 11-3</p> <p>Policy 11.7.2. Create and implement additional limitations on the siting and development of destination resorts that go beyond current state regulations to ensure protection of water quality, recreational resources, and other County resources and values.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: Commentors cited support to recognize destination resorts as a key recreational strategy. • Opposition: Commentors noted a general desire to limit the development of destination resorts. 	<p>Staff notes there is a reference to destination resorts in the tourism summary for Chapter 9, Economic Development.</p> <p>During the initial community outreach process, many community members expressed concern regarding the development of new destination resorts and impacts on natural resources. The existing language as draft notes the history of the development of Destination Resorts and summarizes community concerns from the outreach process.</p> <p>Staff do not have any concerns with adding additional text on the recreational benefits associated with destination resorts.</p>	<p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend the language in Option A (amended narrative): Direct staff to note the importance of development and housing for the economy in Deschutes County.</p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining current language as drafted.</p>
16	Should policy language relating to renewable energy be amended to consider adverse impacts to natural resources?	<p>Goal 14, Energy</p> <p>Goal 14.1: Promote Energy Conservation and Alternative Energy Production</p> <p>Policy 14.1.3. Encourage energy suppliers to explore innovative alternative energy conservation technologies and provide energy audits and incentives to patrons.</p> <p>Policy 14.1.5. Promote development of solar, hydropower, wind, geothermal, biomass and other alternative energy systems while mitigating impacts on neighboring properties and the natural environment.</p> <p>Policy 14.1.6. Provide incentives for homes and businesses to install small-scale on-site alternative energy systems consistent with adopted County financing programs.</p> <p>Policy 14.1.8. Use the development code to promote commercial renewable energy projects while addressing and mitigating impacts on the community and natural environment.</p> <p>Policy 14.1.9. Use Oregon’s Rural Renewable Energy Development Zones to support the creation of renewable energy projects.</p> <p>Policy 14.1.10. Identify, protect, and support the development of significant renewable energy sites and resources.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: Commentors noted general support for renewable energy production. • Opposition: Commentors expressed concern regarding impacts to wildlife and natural resources from energy production. 	<p>Staff notes that many of the policies in this chapter are carried over from the 2010 plan but have been amended for clarity or to incorporate new terminology. These policies are generally very support of renewable energy production on a commercial and personal scale, while still recognizing concern on the impacts to natural resources and seeking to mitigate negative impacts.</p> <p>Staff recommends the PC retain the current language as drafted.</p>	<p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend the language in Option A (new language): Policy x.x.x Include evaluation of adverse impacts to natural resources as part of renewable energy siting processes.</p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining current language as drafted.</p>

17	Should verbiage throughout the plan be strengthened to avoid loopholes or misinterpretations?	Entire Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: Commentors expressed concern that language in the plan such as “support”, “coordinate”, and “explore” should be strengthened to ensure compliance and avoid misinterpretations. • Opposition: Commentors expressed concern that coordination policies could be seen as additional requirements during review of development applications. 	<p>Staff notes that the Comprehensive Plan has a limited role as criteria in development review. The Comprehensive Plan goals and polices are intended to provide a policy framework for decision makers and represent community values during consideration of legislative matters such as text amendments.</p> <p>Case law indicates mandatory Comprehensive Plan language can act as criteria and may invalidate zoning code that is not in alignment. The purpose of the zoning code is to implement the higher-level guidance of the Comprehensive Plan, with much more specific requirements that are vetted by community and agency review as the code is developed.</p> <p>Staff notes that policies with the words “support, coordinate, or explore” were intended to promote further research and discussion on certain topics, rather than create specific criteria. Staff recommends retaining the current language as drafted, as the PC has already reviewed specific goals and policies and considered strengthening or altering language for specific topics.</p>	<p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend the language in Option A (amended language): Direct staff to strengthen verbiage throughout the plan.</p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining current language as drafted.</p>
18	Should narrative in Chapter 5 be amended to include Central Oregon Irrigation District’s October 25 and November 30, 2023 comments related to irrigation canal piping?	<p>Chapter 5, Natural Resources</p> <p>Water Resources, Page 5-3</p> <p>...The high desert climate of Central Oregon poses many challenges with water supply and allocation. Water laws are seen as antiquated by many and issues related water levels in private residential wells, irrigation allocation to farmers, and protection of habitat areas for dependent species arise frequently.</p> <p>A 2021 report by the Oregon Department of Water Resources found that groundwater levels through Deschutes County are declining, by as much as 50 feet of total decline in the central part of the basin. This decline is considered “excessively declined” per state statute and is attributed toward a shift in overall drier conditions since the late 1990s, a warming trend in the basin, and decreased snowpack. Ongoing development and piping of canals (which limits artificial groundwater recharge while conserving canal water) also exacerbate the issue.</p> <p>Deschutes County has limited jurisdiction of water use, instead playing a coordination role with irrigation districts, water users, and owners of private wells...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: COID provided recommended edits. • Opposition: COLW provided alternate language discussing revisiting water allocation and noting concerns about loss of groundwater seepage. 	<p>Staff is generally comfortable with the intent of these edits but would prefer to continue to amend the language to represent perspectives of COID and community members.</p> <p>COID’s recommended edits on page 5-3 provide additional detail regarding the benefits of piping irrigation canals. OWRD noted that piping could have impacts to groundwater recharge conditions in certain areas due to loss of water seepage. Staff would prefer to incorporate the language regarding the benefits of piping, while also adding a sentence relating to potential impacts from loss of groundwater seepage.</p> <p>Staff recommends the PC direct staff to revise this language to include more detail on benefits of piping, and also information on potential community member concerns regarding impacts to water availability from loss of water seepage.</p>	<p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend the language in Option A (amended narrative): Direct staff to amend narrative language to incorporate COID’s recommended edits and add additional context regarding groundwater seepage.</p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining current language as drafted.</p>

19	Should narrative in Chapter 5 be amended to include Central Oregon Irrigation District's October 25 and November 30, 2023 comments related to the stability of the Deschutes River?	<p>Chapter 5, Natural Resources</p> <p>Water Resources, Page 5-6</p> <p>...Deschutes County is fortunate to be underlain on the western side by relatively young volcanic lava sponge. This sponge is highly porous and is able to absorb large quantities of water during the wet season and gradually release it via abundant springs along the eastern slope. The great advantage this provides is that the resulting summer flows into the Deschutes basin are not as dependent on overground flow of snowmelt, and therefore are expected to maintain a relatively stable water supply even as snowpack decreases into the next century...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: COID provided recommended edits. • Opposition: None. 	<p>COID's recommends adding an additional sentence to this paragraph notes that the Deschutes River is one of the most stable rivers in the western United States.</p> <p>Staff did not see information in the record providing context on this statement, and therefore would need more information before considering adding this text.</p> <p>Staff recommends the PC retain the current language and encourage COID to provide additional information during the Board's public hearing process.</p>	<p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend the language in Option A (amended narrative): Direct staff to amend narrative language to incorporate COID's recommended edits.</p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining current language as drafted.</p>
19	Should narrative in Chapter 14 be amended to include Central Oregon Irrigation District's October 25 and November 30, 2023 comments?	<p>Chapter 14, Energy</p> <p>Hydroelectric Energy Generation, Page 14-4</p> <p>...Several water districts in Deschutes County have implemented hydropower projects to harness the energy of moving water. These projects may have impacts on wildlife habitat and migration, as well as construction, visual, and noise impacts.</p> <p>Currently, Deschutes County has three approved "in conduit" hydroelectric facilities that are owned and operated by irrigation districts within existing irrigation district canals. Approval of these facilities has previously been contentious with many community members expressing concern about wildlife and impacts to other basin users. Irrigation districts have expressed interest in reducing barriers to permitting these types of developments to promote renewable energy development using man-made waterways...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: COID provided recommended edits. • Opposition: COLW provided alternate language acknowledging code updates to distinguish between in-conduit and in-channel projects and would prefer additional language be added to ensure revenues from facilities are partially used to restore fish and wildlife habitat. 	<p>Staff is generally comfortable with the intent of these edits but would prefer to continue to amend the language to represent perspectives of COID and community members.</p> <p>COID's recommended edits on page 14-4 provide additional detail regarding community concerns with hydroelectric facilities and cite outdated county code as the primary concern from community members on natural resources and visual impacts from these facilities. In particular, COID notes that the code was originally intended for in-channel facilities that impact natural waterways and rivers, whereas in-conduit facilities impact man-made channels.</p> <p>Staff recommends the PC direct staff to revise this language to incorporate feedback from COID and Central Oregon Landwatch.</p>	<p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend the language in Option A (amended narrative): Direct staff to amend narrative language to incorporate COID's and COLW's recommendations.</p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining current language as drafted.</p>