



FINDINGS

CLEAR & OBJECTIVE TEXT AMENDMENTS – GOAL 5

I. **APPLICABLE CRITERIA:**

Deschutes County lacks specific criteria in DCC Titles 18, 19, 22, or 23 for reviewing a legislative text amendment. Nonetheless, since Deschutes County is initiating this amendment, the County bears the responsibility for demonstrating consistency with Statewide Planning Goals and the existing Comprehensive Plan.

II. **BACKGROUND:**

Beginning in 2017, the Oregon State Legislature passed a series of bills to encourage efforts to expand the supply of housing statewide. The passage of Senate Bill (SB) 1051 prohibited cities from denying applications for housing developments within urban growth boundaries, provided those applications complied with “clear and objective standards, including but not limited to clear and objective design standards contained in the county comprehensive plan or land use regulations.”¹

The provisions of SB 1051, along with subsequent bills, modified Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 197.286–197.314. Of relevance to the current project is ORS 197.307(4)² which was modified to state:

- (1) Except as provided in subsection (6) of this section, a local government may adopt and apply only clear and objective standards, conditions and procedures regulating the development of housing, including needed housing. The standards, conditions and procedures:
 - (a) May include, but are not limited to, one or more provisions regulating the density or height of a development.
 - (b) May not have the effect, either in themselves or cumulatively, of discouraging needed housing through unreasonable cost or delay.

In 2023, ORS 197A.400³ (formerly ORS 197.307, as referenced above) was established by House Bill (HB) 3197⁴. The newly established ORS 197A.400 will become effective on July 1, 2025, and states the following [emphasis added]:

¹ <https://olis.oregonlegislature.gov/liz/2017R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/SB1051/Enrolled>

² https://oregon.public.law/statutes/ors_197.307

³ https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/ors/ors197a.html

⁴ <https://olis.oregonlegislature.gov/liz/2023R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/HB3197/Enrolled>

- (1) Except as provided in subsection (3) of this section, a local government may adopt and apply only clear and objective standards, conditions and procedures regulating the development of housing, including needed housing, on land within an urban growth boundary, **unincorporated communities designated in a county's acknowledged comprehensive plan after December 5, 1994, nonresource lands and areas zoned for rural residential use as defined in ORS 215.501.** The standards, conditions and procedures:

- (a) May include, but are not limited to, one or more provisions regulating the density or height of a development.

- (b) May not have the effect, either in themselves or cumulatively, of discouraging needed housing through unreasonable cost or delay

...

- (3) In addition to an approval process for needed housing based on clear and objective standards, conditions and procedures as provided in subsection (1) of this section, a local government may adopt and apply an alternative approval process for applications and permits for residential development based on approval criteria that are not clear and objective if:

- (a) The applicant retains the option of proceeding under the approval process that meets the requirements of subsection (1) of this section;

- (b) The approval criteria for the alternative approval process comply with applicable statewide land use planning goals and rules; and

- (c) The approval criteria for the alternative approval process authorize a density at or above the density level authorized in the zone under the approval process provided in subsection (1) of this section.

These provisions require local governments to apply only clear and objective standards, criteria, and procedures to applications for housing projects and may not discourage housing through unreasonable cost or delay. Application of typical discretionary standards (e.g. "adequate public facilities" or "effective mitigation") is prohibited. The statute is intended to address the concern that use of discretionary criteria leads to uncertainty, inconsistent administration, and delays that do not serve the goal of efficiently providing an adequate supply of housing stock.

III. BASIC FINDINGS

Numerous sections and language included in the Deschutes County Code (DCC) do not currently meet the identified thresholds for "clear and objective standards." The primary focus of the Clear and Objective Code Compliance Project is to ensure the DCC complies with state statute and the objectives of the Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan.

With the assistance of consultants from MIG, planning staff have identified areas of the DCC that are not in compliance with statute and drafted packages of text amendments to address each issue.

These packages have been broken into distinct segments to provide the public, the Deschutes County Planning Commission (Commission), and the Deschutes County Board of Commissioners (Board) the opportunity to review and vet the proposed changes in a structured manner.

Where possible, planning staff have drafted amendments that effectuate a policy-neutral conversion of existing discretionary language to non-discretionary language. This ensures the original intent and purpose of each amended code provision are preserved. Where that approach is not viable, alternative standards or criteria have been proposed. Additionally, certain amendments have been proposed to broadly remove ambiguity from implementing sections of the DCC, maintain conformity across all development standards, and ensure review clarity for staff and members of the public.

This amendment package encompasses areas of the DCC that address Goal 5 resources and related language, specifically:

- Definitions for the Deschutes County Zoning Code – DCC 18.04
- Multiple Use Agricultural Zone – DCC 18.32
- Surface Mine Impact Area (SMIA) – DCC 18.56
- Rural Residential Zone – DCC 18.60
- Terrebonne Rural Community Zoning District – DCC 18.66
- Landscape Management Combining Zone – DCC 18.84
- Wildlife Area Combining Zone – DCC 18.88
- Sensitive Bird and Mammal Habitat Combining Zone – DCC 18.90
- Urban Unincorporated Community Zone; Sunriver – DCC 18.108
- Supplementary Provisions – DCC 18.116
- Exceptions – DCC 18.120
- Conditional Use – DCC 18.128

IV. METHODOLOGY:

Clear and objective standards use terms, definitions, and measurements that allow for consistent interpretation. Any two people applying the same standard or criterion to a proposed development would get the same result. There is no need for the reviewer to exercise discretion in application of the standard, and no ability to do so. The standards and criteria should provide a predictable outcome in a wide variety of contexts .

Per state statute, the clear and objective standards cannot be so strict that they have the effect, either in themselves or cumulatively, of discouraging housing through unreasonable cost or delay. After discussion with County Legal Counsel and review of ordinances of other jurisdictions which have implemented similar code amendments, staff has determined there are a variety of approaches that can be used to craft clear and objective standards:

- **True/False Standards** – These can be used to evaluate whether a proposed development has satisfied a certain objective criterion. (e.g. – is the structure on a lot or parcel within a rural residential zone?)

- **Counts and Measurements** – These standards are typically based on a minimum value, a maximum value, or an acceptable range of values. (e.g. - maximum building height of 30 feet)
- **Lists/Menus** – Lists and menus provide flexibility for applicants to meet a standard by choosing among several options. Lists can specify a range of acceptable options (“Any of the following...”) or can require selection of a minimum number of elements (“At least two of the following five options...”)
- **Two-Track Systems: Discretionary Review** – While a clear and objective review path is required for residential development, the flexibility provided by discretionary review may continue to be attractive for some projects and it may not be practical or achievable to write clear and objective standards that work in every development situation. ORS 197A recognizes this, and allows local governments to also provide an optional discretionary review path or parallel track. To that end, the amendments proposed as part of this package in some cases maintain the existing standards as an optional, discretionary track for housing. These discretionary standards will also remain in place for all non-residential development. The advantage of a two-track system is that it offers both certainty and flexibility. Applicants willing to work within the clear and objective standards have the option of a simplified review process that saves time and increases the certainty of approval. Clear and objective standards also offer certainty to reviewers, who can review applications more efficiently with less time devoted to interpreting discretionary/unclear requirements, and to the public, who will benefit from knowing whether a project will or will not be approved. For applicants with creative ideas or unique circumstances that don’t meet the objective standards, discretionary review is available, which can provide more flexibility.

V. **FINDINGS:**

CHAPTER 22.12, LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURES

Section 22.12.010.

Hearing Required

No legislative change shall be adopted without review by the Planning Commission and a public hearing before the Board of County Commissioners. Public hearings before the Planning Commission shall be set at the discretion of the Planning Director, unless otherwise required by state law.

FINDING: This criterion is met because a public hearing was held before the Deschutes County Planning Commission (Commission) on 4/24/2025 and a public hearing was held before the Board of County Commissioners (Board) on 5/28/2025.

Section 22.12.020, Notice

Notice

A. *Published Notice*

1. ***Notice of a legislative change shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the county at least 10 days prior to each public hearing.***
2. ***The notice shall state the time and place of the hearing and contain a statement describing the general subject matter of the ordinance under consideration.***

FINDING: This criterion is met as notice was published in *The Bulletin* newspaper on 4/13/2025 for the Commission public hearing and on 5/18/2025 for the Board public hearing.

- B. *Posted Notice. Notice shall be posted at the discretion of the Planning Director and where necessary to comply with ORS 203.045.***

FINDING: Posted notice was determined by the Planning Director not to be necessary.

- C. *Individual notice. Individual notice to property owners, as defined in DCC 22.08.010(A), shall be provided at the discretion of the Planning Director, except as required by ORS 215.503.***

FINDING: The proposed amendments are legislative and do not apply to any specific property. Therefore, individual notice is not required.

- D. *Media notice. Copies of the notice of hearing shall be transmitted to other newspapers published in Deschutes County.***

FINDING: Notice was provided to the County public information official for wider media distribution. This criterion has been met.

Section 22.12.030 Initiation of Legislative Changes.

- A legislative change may be initiated by application of individuals upon payment of required fees as well as by the Board of County Commissioners.***

FINDING: The application was initiated by the Deschutes County Planning Division at the direction of the Board and has received a fee waiver. This criterion has been met.

Section 22.12.040. Hearings Body

- A. *The following shall serve as hearings or review body for legislative changes in this order:***
1. ***The Planning Commission.***
 2. ***The Board of County Commissioners.***
- B. *Any legislative change initiated by the Board of County Commissioners shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission prior to action being taken by the Board of Commissioners.***

FINDING: This criterion is met as the Commission held a public hearing on 4/24/2025. The Board held a public hearing on 5/28/2025.

Section 22.12.050 Final Decision

All legislative changes shall be adopted by ordinance

FINDING: The proposed legislative changes included in file no. 247-25-000171-TA will be implemented by ordinances upon approval and adoption by the Board. This criterion will be met.

VI. Oregon Statewide Planning Goals:

Statewide Planning Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement:

This goal outlines the citizen involvement requirement for the adoption of Comprehensive Plans and changes to the Comprehensive Plan and implementing documents.

FINDING: The County's citizen involvement program ensures that any amendments to the County's development code are reviewed through a duly noticed public process. This legislative process to review the proposed amendments will require two public hearings, one before the Commission on 4/24/2025 and one before the Board on 5/28/2025.

Information was distributed throughout the process via the project website and through social media and email. All Commission and Board work sessions were open to the public and noticed in accordance with the County's rules and regulations. All work session materials, including meeting recordings and summaries, were available on the County's website. All the aforementioned venues provided the opportunity for gathering feedback and comments.

As part of the legislative process, public notice requirements for the Commission and Board public hearings were met. The notice was sent to persons who requested notice, affected government agencies, and was published in the 4/13/2025 and 5/18/2025 issues of the Bend Bulletin. The notices invited public input and included the phone number of a contact person to answer questions. The notice also included the address of the County's webpage where the draft of the proposal can be viewed.

Statewide Planning Goal 2 – Land Use Planning:

This goal outlines the land use planning process and policy framework. The County's Comprehensive Plan was acknowledged by DLCD as being consistent with the statewide planning goals.

FINDING: Deschutes County has an acknowledged Comprehensive Plan and enabling ordinances. The amendments to the DCC are being undertaken to bring residential development standards, criteria, and procedures into compliance with state statutes.

The amendments are being processed in accordance with the County's adopted procedures, which requires any applicable statewide planning goals, federal or state statutes or regulations, comprehensive plan policies, and the County's implementing ordinances be addressed as part of the decision-making process. The amendments are being processed as a post-acknowledgement plan amendment (PAPA) and noticing requirements have been met. All applicable review criteria have been addressed within this staff report; therefore, the requirements of Goal 2 have been met.

Statewide Planning Goals 3 and 4 – Agricultural Lands and Forest Lands:

FINDING: The standards of ORS 197A.400 require clear and objective standards for all housing development "...on land within an urban growth boundary, unincorporated communities designated in a county's acknowledged comprehensive plan after December 5, 1994, nonresource lands and areas zoned for rural residential use as defined in ORS 215.501." The identified areas do not include resource zoned lands (i.e. - Exclusive Farm Use, Forest Use, etc.), and staff understands ORS 197A.400 to implicitly exempt resource zoned properties, as those areas are governed by separate statutory standards. Staff finds that these goals do not apply to the proposed amendments.

Statewide Planning Goal 5 – Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces:

This goal requires the inventory and protection of natural resources, open spaces, historic sites and areas.

FINDING: The proposed amendments included in this package do not alter the County's acknowledged Goal 5 inventories or impact areas. The proposed amendments ensure Deschutes County remains in compliance with state statute and administrative rules by continuing to allow residential construction in areas with Goal 5 resources, providing applicants with a clear and objective process using standards and criteria that maintain the same level of protection as the discretionary process that was previously adopted and, in most cases, remains an option for applicants.

Local governments, as part of the Comprehensive Planning process, are required to inventory the extent, location, quality, and quantity of significant natural resources within their jurisdictional boundaries. Following this inventory, local governments then conduct an economic, social, environmental, and energy (ESEE) analysis to determine the extent to which land uses should be limited in order to adequately protect significant resources. Following an ESEE analysis, governments then establish a program to protect significant natural resources. Deschutes County established its initial Goal 5 natural resource inventory, ESEE analyses, and protection programs between the years of 1988-1994, as part of periodic review.

Deschutes County reviewed its adopted ESEE analyses for significant Statewide Planning Goal 5 resources in the following ordinances:

Surface Mining:

Ord. No. 90-014 (7/12/90)

Ord. No. 90-029 (7/12/90)

Fish and Wildlife:

Ord. No. 92-041 (8/5/92) - General

Ord. No. 94-004 (6/15/94) – Updated Sensitive Bird and Mammal and Townsend’s Big-Eared Bat inventories

Ord. No. 94-007 (7/20/94) – Updated Wetland and Riparian inventory

Rivers and Streams, Lakes and Reservoirs:

Ord. No 92-052 (11/25/92)

The County’s adopted ESEE analyses identified seventeen (17) inventoried resources, impact areas and potential conflicting uses, and included findings concerning the economic, social, energy and environmental consequences of prohibiting, limiting or allowing conflicting uses in identified impact areas, pursuant to OAR 660-023-0040 – ESEE Decision Process.

The County’s adopted ESEE analyses are sufficient to demonstrate that the proposed clear and objective standards amendments are consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 5. The proposed amendments do not allow any new conflicting uses that were not previously analyzed, nor do they change the impact areas.

The following findings address each inventoried resource and describe the manner in which the clear and objective amendments achieve the program to protect the resource in the adopted ESEE analyses.

1. Fish Habitat

Fill or removal: requirements are outlined in DCC 18.128.270 and in the proposed clear and objective standards in DCC 18.128.271. In the existing code, a conditional use permit is required for all fill or removal in riparian and wetland areas. The proposed approach to code amendments is that any fill or removal greater than 1 cubic yard requires a conditional use permit. The amount of fill or removal allowed without a conditional use permit review in the clear and objective path is intended to minimize conflicts with protected resources. The proposed clear and objective path only allows 1 cubic yard of fill and/or removal. Also, a signed statement by a professional engineer licensed in the state of Oregon must confirm that the proposed fill or removal will not adversely impact water quality, flooding, the stability of the bank, or other hydrologic characteristics of the water body, and that erosion will be adequately controlled during and after the project. This determination that hydrology will not be adversely impacted will ensure that fill or removal will have minimal to no impact to the protected resource. A conditional use permit continues to be required for the majority of fill or removal projects, which typically exceed 1 cubic yard.

Rimrock setbacks: the current code requires all new structures to be set back 50 feet from the rimrock in all zones (DCC 18.84.090(D), 18.116.160), but allows exceptions in certain situations

using discretionary provisions. In the proposed clear and objective path, exceptions are not permitted at all; an applicant would need to follow the discretionary review path if deviating from the standard. Therefore, the proposed amendments retain the existing regulations, explicitly separating the clear and objective and discretionary options. This is consistent with the existing program to protect.

River and Stream setbacks: the current Landscape Management Combining Zone (LM) requires all new structures and additions to structures to be set back at least 100 feet from the OHW line of designated streams and rivers. (DCC 18.84.090(C)). Exceptions are permitted if the discretionary criteria in DCC 18.120.030(E) are met. In the proposed clear and objective path, exceptions are not permitted at all; an applicant would need to follow the discretionary review path if deviating from the standard. Therefore, the proposed amendments retain the existing regulations, explicitly separating the clear and objective and discretionary options. This is consistent with the existing program to protect.

Therefore, the proposed program aligns with the existing program to protect.

2. Deer Winter Range

In the current Wildlife Area Combining Zone (WA) zone regulations, new dwellings are required to be entirely within 300 feet of an existing road, which is intended to minimize the extent of impacts to protected resources. Exceptions are permitted if the discretionary criteria in DCC 18.88.060(B) are met. In the proposed clear and objective path, exceptions are not permitted at all; an applicant would need to follow the discretionary review path if deviating from the standard. Therefore, the proposed amendments retain the existing regulations, explicitly separating the clear and objective and discretionary options. This is consistent with the existing program to protect.

In the WA zone, the proposed clear and objective lot size standard in the deer winter range (minimum 40 acres) is the same as the existing regulations.

There are no proposed changes to fence standards.

Therefore, the proposed program to protect aligns with the existing program to protect.

3. Furbearer Habitat

Furbearer habitat is currently protected by the existing Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) and Forest Use zoning, the provisions to protect farm use and forest use, and the provisions to protect wetlands and riparian areas. There are no proposed changes to the EFU or forest zones as part of this code amendment project, therefore that component of the program to protect furbearer habitat remains the same. See Item 7 (Wetland and Riparian Areas) for findings addressing wetland and riparian regulations and their consistency with the existing program to protect.

4. Elk Habitat

The WA Combining Zone was recognized as the only program to achieve the goal to protect elk habitat. See Item 2 (Deer Winter Range) for findings addressing the proposed WA zone amendments and their consistency with the existing program to protect.

The proposed clear and objective lot size standard in elk habitat areas (minimum 160 acres) is the same as the existing regulations.

Therefore, the proposed program aligns with the existing program to protect.

5. Waterfowl Habitat

See findings for Item 1 (Fish Habitat) addressing the proposed fill or removal amendments, river and stream setback, and rimrock setback regulations and their consistency with the existing program to protect.

In the proposed clear and objective standards for the Landscape Management (LM) zone, conservation easements continue to be required as a condition of approval for all landscape management site plans involving property adjacent to the Deschutes River, Crooked River, Fall River, Little Deschutes River, Spring River, Whychus Creek, and Tumalo Creek (DCC 18.84.081(I)). This is the same as the current regulations.

Therefore, the proposed program aligns with the existing program to protect.

6. Upland Game Bird Habitat

For all of the upland game birds except sage grouse, the habitat is currently protected by the existing EFU and forest zoning and the provisions to protect wetlands and riparian areas to achieve the goal of protecting upland game birds. There are no proposed changes to the EFU or forest zones as part of this code amendment project; therefore, that component the program to protect remains the same. See Item 7 (Wetland and Riparian Areas) for findings addressing wetland and riparian regulations and their consistency with the existing program to protect.

7. Wetland and Riparian Areas

See findings for Item 1 (Fish Habitat) addressing the proposed fill or removal amendments, river and stream setback, and rimrock setback regulations and their consistency with the existing program to protect.

Location of septic systems is recognized as a conflicting use for riparian resources. The current LM zone includes a discretionary standard, which requires on-site sewage disposal systems to “minimize the impact on the vegetation along the river or stream” and “allow a dwelling to be constructed on the site as far from the river, stream, or lake as possible.” The proposed clear and objective path applies the same 100-foot setback from the ordinary high water line that applies to dwellings to on-site sewage systems. Exceptions are only permitted through discretionary review (DCC 18.120.030(E)). These proposed regulations are consistent with the

recommendations in the ESEE to protect the riparian resource because they minimize impacts with significant setbacks.

Therefore, the proposed program aligns with the existing program to protect.

8. Ecologically and Scientifically Significant Natural Areas – Little Deschutes River/Deschutes River Confluence

See findings for Item 1 (Fish Habitat) addressing the proposed fill or removal amendments and their consistency with the existing program to protect.

Therefore, the proposed program aligns with the existing program to protect.

9. Landscape Management Rivers and Streams

The existing LM combining zone design standards (DCC 18.84.080) address building and roof color and reflectivity, setbacks, height, lighting, screening, and access. The intent of these standards is to minimize the visual appearance of structures from specified view corridors in order to maintain scenic views and the natural appearance to the greatest extent possible. The proposed amendments provide a parallel clear and objective approval path. These amendments codify the types of designs that County staff would approve under the current regulations. Standards for building color, screening, trees, and setbacks have been updated with the intent to achieve equivalent outcomes to the existing program to protect. This includes:

- The discretionary requirement for “muted earth tones” is replaced by an approved palette of specific earth tone colors (DCC 18.84A) or with natural wood or stone.
- The requirement for non-reflective materials is replaced by an objective solar reflectance index (SRI) standard.
- The discretionary requirement for use of existing features to reduce visual impacts is replaced by a standard that states equivalent requirements using clear and objective language.
- The vague and discretionary screening requirements are replaced by specific tree planting standards.

These objective standards are intended to provide a narrow approval pathway. The site designs that would meet these standards could also be approved by County staff under the discretionary review path, thereby achieving equivalent outcomes.

Conservation easements are also recognized as part of the program to protect this Goal 5 resource. See findings in Item 5 (Waterfowl Habitat) addressing the proposed amendments related to conservation easements and their consistency with the existing program to protect.

See findings for Item 1 (Fish Habitat) addressing the proposed fill or removal amendments, river and stream setback, and rimrock setback regulations and their consistency with the existing program to protect.

Therefore, the proposed program aligns with the ESEE program recommendations.

10. State Scenic Waterways and Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers

See findings for Item 1 (Fish Habitat) addressing the proposed fill or removal amendments, river and stream setback, and rimrock setback regulations and their consistency with the existing program to protect.

The LM zone design standards have been updated with the intent to achieve equivalent outcomes to the existing program to protect, including fill and removal permits, wetland removal regulations, rimrock setbacks, conservation easements, and landscape management. See findings for Item 9 (Landscape Management Rivers and Streams).

Therefore, the proposed program aligns with the existing program to protect.

11. Deer Migration Corridor

In the current regulations, residential land divisions in the Bend/La Pine Deer Migration Corridor, where the underlying zone is RR-10, are only permitted as a cluster development. Because cluster development review is designed to balance a variety of development goals in a discretionary, site-specific manner, it cannot be used for clear and objective reviews. Applicants seeking a land division can still follow the discretionary pathway. Cluster development standards follow the existing program to protect. Therefore, the proposed amendments retain the existing protections, explicitly separating the clear and objective and discretionary options.

See Item 2 (Deer Winter Range) for findings addressing the proposed amendments to the building placement standards in the WA zone and their consistency with the existing program to protect.

There are no proposed changes to fence standards.

Therefore, the proposed program aligns with the existing program to protect.

12. Antelope Habitat

The proposed clear and objective approval path in the WA zone (DCC 18.88.051(C)) retains the existing minimum lot size of 320 acres for new parcels in the antelope range. This represents no change to the existing program to protect the resource.

For other proposed amendments in the WA zone, see findings in Item 2 (Deer Winter Range).

The proposed amendments are consistent with the existing program to protect.

13. Habitat for Sensitive Birds

Existing site plan review criteria in the Sensitive Bird and Mammal Habitat (SBMH) zone (DCC 18.90.060) require all development to conform to the requirements of the ESEE decision for the subject sensitive habitat site. The proposed clear and objective standards (DCC 18.90.061) retain this requirement, and state that where the provisions of the ESEE decision and DCC conflict, the more restrictive provision prevails.

The current site plan review criteria require the site plan to “provide protection that will prevent destruction of the subject nesting site, hibernation site or rookery.” Each site-specific ESEE decision establishes requirements such as setbacks and buffers from the habitat site, which are intended to ensure site protection. The proposed clear and objective approach relies on the ESEE requirements to establish the standards that protect the resource, rather than reiterating the protection requirements in the site plan criteria (DCC 18.90.061(A) and (B)(1)).

The current criteria also require that “new roads, driveways or public trails shall be located at the greatest distance possible from the nest, rookery or hibernation site unless topographic or vegetation or structural features will provide greater visual and/or noise buffer from the nest, rookery or hibernation site.” The proposed clear and objective approach requires that new roads or driveways be located at least 500 feet from the sensitive habitat site. This provides equivalent protection as requiring such features be located “at the greatest distance possible,” by minimizing impacts to the habitat site from roads, driveways, and vehicles, while removing discretionary language around buffer features (DCC 18.90.061(B)(2)).

The existing requirement for preservation of existing vegetation and prohibition of land divisions that create residential building sites within the habitat area are proposed to be retained in the clear and objective path, but worded to remove discretion (DCC 18.90.061(B)(3) and (4)).

In the current criteria, all exterior lighting must “be sited and shielded so that the light is directed downward and does not shine on” the sensitive habitat site. The proposed clear and objective path replaces this with more specific shielding and cut-off standards to ensure light does not shine on the habitat site.

Therefore, the proposed program aligns with the ESEE program recommendations.

14. Habitat Area for Townsend’s Big-Eared Bats

There are no proposed changes to the EFU zones, where bat caves are located, as part of this code amendment project. The proposed clear and objective standards for the SBMH combining zone are only applicable to residential development (see Item 13 for findings addressing the SBMH zone).

Therefore, the proposed program aligns with the existing program to protect.

15. Lakes and Reservoirs

The regulations identified as applicable to this Goal 5 resource do not require amendments to achieve a clear and objective review pathway for residential development and therefore are not addressed in the proposed amendments.

16. Wilderness Areas, Areas of Special Concerns, Energy Sources, and Groundwater Resources

This resource was not analyzed as they are either located on federal land or clear and objective requirements are not applicable.

17. Surface Mining and Mineral and Aggregate Inventory Sites

The proposed clear and objective path for site plan review and other standards in the Surface Mining Impact Area (SMIA) combining zone maintains limitations on residential uses that are the same as the existing standards, which require new dwellings to be at least 250 feet from a surface mining zone and one-quarter mile from surface mining processing or storage sites. The only difference is that the clear and objective regulations are limited to dwellings and exceptions to the setback standards are not permitted in the clear and objective path.

There are no proposed substantive changes to the site plan review or approval criteria. Therefore, the proposed program aligns with the existing program to protect.

Statewide Planning Goal 6 – Air, Water, and Land Resource Quality:

To maintain and improve the quality of air, water, and land resources of the state.

FINDING: The County is currently in compliance with the State’s Goal 6 program. The amendments do not alter the County’s acknowledged land use programs regarding water quality. The amendments are consistent with Goal 6.

Statewide Planning Goal 7 – Areas Subject to Natural Hazards:

To protect people and property from natural hazards.

FINDING: The County is currently in compliance with the State’s Goal 7 program through adoption and implementation of the County’s Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan⁵. No changes will occur to County programs related to flood management, wildfire mitigation, or other natural hazards. The amendments are consistent with Goal 7.

Statewide Planning Goal 8 – Recreational Needs:

⁵ https://sheriff.deschutes.org/2021_NHMP.pdf

To satisfy the recreational needs of the citizens of the state and visitors and, where appropriate, to provide for the siting of necessary recreational facilities including destination resorts.

FINDING: The County is currently in compliance with the State's Goal 8 program. The proposed amendments do not address or alter any County recreational programs or land use requirements related to parks and recreation. The proposed amendments are in compliance with Goal 8.

Statewide Planning Goal 9 – Economic Development:

To provide adequate opportunities for a variety of economic activities vital to the health, welfare, and prosperity of Oregon's citizens.

FINDING: The County is currently in compliance with the State's Goal 9 program. The proposed amendments do not alter the County's compliance with Goal 9. The proposed amendments are in compliance with Goal 9.

Statewide Planning Goal 10 – Housing:

To provide adequate housing for the needs of the community, region, and state.

FINDING: The currently proposed Clear and Objective Code Amendment Package and upcoming code amendment packages will ensure Deschutes County remains in compliance with state statute and administrative rules and Goal 10 by continuing to allow residential construction to proceed through a Clear and Objective process using clear and objective standards and criteria. Adoption of the proposed amendments will reduce the administrative burden and uncertainty, removing barriers to housing within areas of the County identified for residential development. The proposed amendments are in compliance with Goal 10.

Statewide Planning Goal 11 – Public Facilities and Services:

To plan and develop a timely, orderly, and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as framework for urban and rural development.

FINDING: The County is currently in compliance with Goal 11 through its acknowledged Comprehensive Plan. The amendments do not alter the County's compliance with Goal 11 and are consistent with this goal.

Statewide Planning Goal 12 – Transportation:

To provide and encourage a safe, convenient, and economic transportation system.

FINDING: The County is currently in compliance with Goal 12 and Metro's Regional Transportation Plan through its acknowledged Comprehensive Plan and TSP as required by Oregon Administrative Rule 660-012 (Transportation Planning Rule - TPR). Additionally, the Deschutes County Senior Transportation Planner reviewed the proposed amendments for potential TPR effects and found

that the proposed amendments appear to comply with TPR provisions. As such, the proposed amendments do not alter the County's compliance with Goal 12.

Statewide Planning Goal 13 – Energy Conservation:

Land and uses developed on the land shall be managed and controlled so as to maximize the conservation of all forms of energy, based on sound economic principles.

FINDING: The County is currently in compliance with Goal 13 through its acknowledged Comprehensive Plan. The amendments do not alter the County's compliance with Goal 13 and are consistent with this goal.

Statewide Planning Goal 14 – Urbanization:

To provide for orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use, to accommodate urban population and urban employment inside urban growth boundaries, to ensure efficient use of land, and to provide for livable communities.

FINDING: The County is currently in compliance with Goal 14 through its acknowledged Comprehensive Plan and land use regulations. The County also has signed Joint Management Agreements with the cities of Bend, Redmond, and Sisters as required by ORS 195.065. The amendments do not alter the County's compliance with Goal 14 and are consistent with this goal.

VII. CONCLUSION:

Based on the information provided herein, staff recommends the Board of County Commissioners approve the proposed text amendments that make changes necessary to conform with state statutory requirements regarding clear and objective standards for housing development.