



City Planning Commission Minutes  
Thursday, November 19, 2015 – 5:30 P.M.  
City Hall Council Chambers, 520 E. Cascade Avenue, Sisters, OR 97759

Commissioners Present: David Gentry, Roger Detweiler, Jack Nagel, Jeff Seymour, Daryl Tewalt, and Bob Wright

Commissioners Absent: Roy Dean

City Staff: Patrick Davenport, Community Development Director, Darcy Reed, Associate Planner, Carol Jenkins, Planning Technician

I. CALL TO ORDER

*Chairman Gentry* opened the public hearing at 5:30 p.m. with a quorum of (6 of 7) present.

*A recording of this hearing is available on the City of Sisters website.*

II. VISITOR COMMUNICATION

No one came forward.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

*Chairman Gentry* asked the Commission if they would like to make a motion to approve the minutes for the August 20, 2015 and September 17, 2015 at this time.

*Commissioner Wright* made a motion to approve the August 20, 2015 minutes with changes.  
*Commissioner Nagel* seconded. Motion carries.

*Commissioner Wright* made a motion to approve the September 17, 2015 minutes with changes.  
*Commissioner Detweiler* made a few corrections to the minutes at this time.  
*Commissioner Seymour* seconded. Motion carries.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS

File No: MOD15-06 - ClearPine

Applicant: 3 Sisters Partners, LLC – Peter Hall

Request: Modification of subdivision preliminary plat (SUB15-01) to revise the rear yard setbacks along the northern property line. The application is being processed as a Type IV decision.

Location: The property consists of lots 9-19 and Tract A of the Three Sisters Business Park I subdivision. The property is situated north of Lundgren Mill Drive, east of N. Pine St. and west of the

intersection with East Sun Ranch Drive. The subject property is identified as Tax Lots 100-1200 on Deschutes County Assessors Map #151004BC.

*Chairman Gentry* read aloud a statement summarizing the issue and hearing procedures at this time. No commissioner disclosed pre-hearing contacts, ex-parte contacts, or conflicts of interest. No one in the audience challenged any commissioner for bias, prejudice, or personal interest.

*Chairman Gentry* asked for staff to come forward and present the staff report at this time.

*Staff* came forward and gave the background on MOD15-06 ClearPine owned by 3 Sisters Partners, LLC. The project consists of 77 single-family homes and support infrastructure on approximately 18 acres in the Residential zoning district. It is approximately 2-acres of Multi-family zoned property – not included in the Master Plan and Subdivision. The project entitlements, the 2001 Development Agreement between the City, School District, and the County at this time.

*Staff* addressed the Existing Option 1 – approved preliminary subdivision plat (SUB15-01) as well as Existing Option 2 – approved preliminary subdivision plat (SUB15-01). The request is for a modification to the setbacks along the northern property line to a 20' setback for all structures, or revert to the current Development Code requirements. The City Council approved the original development agreement, and the Planning Commission will make a recommendation for the final approval by City Council (Type IV decision).

*Staff* addressed 4.1.700.J General Provisions: Major Modifications at this time. A visual was given of the proposed subdivision plat modifying the setbacks along the northern property line. The modification, if approved, will not have any effect on the previous conditions of approval. All terms in the conditions of approval per the City Council's decision on 06/25/15 remain in effect should this Modification request be approved.

The Commission held a discussion regarding Option 1, Option 2, and an additional Option 3 (leave as is) regarding setbacks, density bonus, and alleys.

*Chairman Gentry* asked if staff received any other correspondence on this matter other than those items included in the agenda materials.

*Staff* stated that no additional correspondence was received other than what was in the packet. There were several letters from Mr. Duane Lee on this matter that were included in the packet.

*Chairman Gentry* opened the public testimony portion of the hearing at this time. He asked if anyone would like to come forward and speak in favor of the proposed text changes at this time.

Peter Hall  
1195 N. Redfield Circle  
Bend, OR 97703

*Mr. Hall* came forward and addressed the Commission on his project request, entitlements, issues and/or concerns pertaining to his proposal on MOD15-06 at this time.

*Mr. Hall* asked that the image of the aerial map with conditions showing the property locations be put into the record at this time.

Miles Conway – Peter Hall’s Attorney  
404 SW Columbia  
Bend, OR 97701

*Mr. Conway* came forward and addressed the Commission regarding the Development Agreement back in 2001, and specifics to their proposal at this time. A copy of this agreement is available upon request.

*Chairman Gentry* asked if anyone against the proposal would like to come forward at this time.

Meriel Darzen – Mr. Duane Lee’s Attorney  
222 NW Irving  
Bend, OR 97701

*Ms. Darzen* came forward and addressed Mr. Lee’s concerns and possible solutions for an agreement to the project at this time. She asked that they be granted a 60-day continuance to the January hearing due to Mr. Lee’s health concerns and to further work with the applicant. She stated that they will submit a written submission to the previous decisions for the record. Ms. Darzen gave a copy of a letter dated November 19, 2015 re: Comments on MOD15-06 to add into the record.

Mr. Lee  
15665 Trapper Point  
Sisters, OR 97759

*Mr. Lee* came forward and addressed his property and the project request at this time. He addressed his concerns with the project, but is trying to work with Mr. Hall to come to some resolution. He asked for a 60-day continuance due to health issues and wanting to work with the applicant to come to a consensus for both of them.

*Mr. Hall* came forward and stated that what Mr. Lee has requested seems reasonable. He addressed the delay in the process and stated that he would like to have a decision tonight. He would like to meet with the adjoining neighbors and that a two month delay is unreasonable. He asked that the Planning Commission recommend that the setbacks be modified and that this can go to the City Council for approval.

*Staff* read the part of the Code - Chapter 4.1.600 that addresses a request for a continuance at this time.

The Commission held a discussion regarding the setbacks, noticing of a continuance, possible Urban Growth Boundary expansion, the agreement points between Mr. Hall and Mr. Lee, negotiations by both parties, meeting with all the neighboring parties, actual lot numbers that will be in the agreement to protect the view sheds, and the height restrictions at this time.

*Ms. Darzen* came forward and stated that she did not want to go into the settlement details at this time. She stated that what is being discussed by both parties are the height restrictions as well as

setbacks. This would allow the Planning Commission to make a recommendation to the City Council with the support of the opposition and the applicant.

The Planning Commission discussed that the next possible hearing date for the continuance, and it was decided that *January 7, 2015 at 5:30 pm* would work.

*Mr. Hall* discussed a letter submitted from the Reynolds stating that they want fencing and to not have an alley on their property. He stated that this is not a settlement agreement, the Planning Commission makes the decision. Mr. Hall addressed the three issues that involve the alley or no alley, setbacks of 20-feet, and the height restriction at this time.

*Ms. Darzen* came forward and addressed the settlement agreement, the setbacks that were originally approved, and is asking for another opportunity to work this out with the applicant at this time.

*Chairman Gentry* closed the public testimony portion of the hearing at this time.

*Commissioner Wright* made a motion to continue the hearing to January 7, 2015 at 5:30 pm.

*Commission Nagel* seconded. Motion carries to continue the hearing to January 7, 2015.

*Staff* stated that there will be no legal ad in the Nugget for this continued hearing and there will be mailings to those previously noticed.

File No: EXT15-01

Applicant: McKenzie Meadow Village – Bill Willitts

Request: Type III Review of a request to expand a previously approved subdivision plat (SUB10-03) on a 30.0 acre property, for a 10-Phase, 103-lot subdivision. The subdivision received an administrative extension on November 3, 2014 and the Sisters Development Code requires this extension request to be considered by the Planning Commission in a public hearing format.

Location: The property is situated on the north side of W. McKinney Butte Road, west of Freemont Street and east of Sisters High School. The subject property is identified as Tax Lots 5500 on Deschutes County Assessor's Map # 151005CB.

*Chairman Gentry* asked for staff to come forward and present the staff report at this time.

*Staff* came forward and gave the background on McKenzie Meadow Village, as well as the Extension Request of the Subdivision Plat and previous extensions that were granted. Staff also gave visual examples of the Phases of the project, and the McKenzie Meadow Village Criteria in Code Chapter 4.3.400.F: Extensions, Chapter 4.3.44.F.2: Additional Extension by Original Decision-Making Body, Chapter 4.3.44.F.2: Additional Extension by Original Decision-Making Body at this time.

*Staff* stated that the Planning Commission was the original decision making body for this subdivision. *Staff* granted an administrative extension last year in 2014, therefore, the Planning Commission has power to approve, or deny this subdivision extension request.

The Planning Commission discussed the letter from Pinnacle Group and why it states that the Planning Commission cannot approve this extension request due to the SDC prohibits a 3rd quasi-

judicial extension. A brief discussion took place and staff stated that he does not agree with that statement at this time.

*Staff* stated that no additional correspondence was received other than those items included in the agenda at this time.

*Chairman Gentry* asked for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the proposed text changes to come forward at this time.

Mike Reed  
291 W. Cascade Ave.  
Sisters, OR 97759

*Mr. Reed* came forward and addressed the project and vision for the McKenzie Meadow Village project. He addressed the history and original agreement with Pinnacle Alliance Group back in 2010, the economy at the time, termination of their agreement, and another prospect surfaced being Kevin Cox with Ageia, and entered into an agreement with them. He discussed the delay in construction for Phase I, the delay in the LUBA Appeal, the agreement with the City, and the reason for the Extension and reasons for needing an Assisted Living Facility in Sisters at this time.

*Staff* stated that the delay with the LUBA Appeal is in getting the record correct – the appellant has objected to the record, but since then, the City has provided more documentation to satisfy that objection. It has not been heard to date.

A discussion took place regarding the adjacent property owners, narrow roads, increased traffic, an option of allow pedestrian and bicycle traffic, and putting in a fire gate with the approval of the Fire Marshall.

Steve McGhehey  
313 S. Pine St.  
Sisters, OR 97759

*Mr. McGhehey* came forward and addressed the project, the LUBA Appeal, costs associated with the delay, and the need to approve the Extension at this time.

The Commission asked if this extension could be extended for more than a year to a time certain for the decision by LUBA. They asked staff what the rules are, process, and the timeline for a LUBA appeal.

*Staff* stated that by the Code, it is only for an additional one-year extension. It is not clear what happens in this instance when entitlements are nearing expiration and something is being appealed, if it stops the clock or not. There is nothing in the Development Code about that – it is more case law and needing legal support. The information for LUBA has been provided by the City Recorder to the City Attorney. The City Attorney will review that information and send it off to Salem.

*Chairman Gentry* closed the public testimony portion of the hearing at this time.

*Chairman Gentry* asked if the Commission would like to make a motion at this time.

*Commission Nagel* made a motion to approve the Extension  
*Commission Wright* seconded. *Motion carries.*

File No: SUB15-03

Applicant: Don Denning Homes, Inc.

Request: Type III Review of a subdivision to divide a 13.43 acre property into thirty-five (35) lots and establish a ½ acre City Park and City Well site. The address is 310 E. Sun Ranch Drive, Sisters, OR 97759.

Location: The property is located in the west ½ of Section 4, Township 15 South, Range 10 East, Tax Lot 100, Tax Map 151004BD.

*Chairman Gentry* asked for staff to come forward and present the staff report at this time.

*Staff* came forward and addressed the tentative subdivision plan, file no. SUB15-03 and the applicant Don Denning Homes, Inc. The subdivision name is known as Kuivato located in the northern most part of Sisters to the west of the Sisters Eagle Airport. The Request, Background, Annexation, Comprehensive Land Use and Zoning Entitlements, City Park dedication, City well site, Open Space, lot sizes, building heights, Airport Runway Protection Zone, pedestrian easement, Plat from 2006, access, Tracts A and B of the project at this time.

*Staff* discussed the affordable housing process, Exhibits F & G, the Skygate subdivision (visual), Housing Works, conditions and entitlements at this time.

*Chairman Gentry* asked if any correspondence has been received other than what was in the packet at this time.

*Staff* stated yes - on November 18<sup>th</sup> and November 19<sup>th</sup> – two separate letters which have been submitted into the record.

*Chairman Gentry* asked if anyone in favor of the proposal to come forward at this time.

Don Denning - Applicant  
22647 Rosby  
Bend, OR 97701

*Mr. Denning* came forward and stated that the project has been pretty well outlined. He discussed price ranges of the homes, lot sizes, configuration of the properties, density, intent of the lots, and the advantages of the single level homes at this time.

Susan Trask  
15685 Trapper Point Rd.  
Sisters, OR 97759

*Ms. Trask* came forward and stated that she is in full support of the project and is an adjoining neighbor to the affected property owner. She stated that this project is very well thought out with a lot of integrity in putting this together. She stated that in full disclosure she is a Real Estate Agent

with Sotheby's and has been involved with various single-family projects with Mr. Denning for seven years. She gave examples of the homes that Mr. Denning builds at this time.

David Campbell  
15820 Barclay Dr.  
Sisters, OR 97759

*Mr. Campbell* came forward and stated that he is in favor of all of the north end development and looks forward to a neighborhood like this close to the Airport. He addressed the Airport restrictions both for noise and land use planning.

A brief discussion took place regarding a letter from Jeff Caines with the Department of Aviation at this time.

Shane Lundgren  
26266 SW Metolius Meadows Dr.  
Camp Sherman, OR 97730

*Mr. Lundgren* came forward and stated that he is representing Dutch Pacific Properties – the developer at the north end of the Business Park in the Residential. He stated that he is excited to be working with Mr. Denning because of the many different challenges and all the different aspects in working with the neighbors and physical topography of the layout. He discussed the physical constraints, density, creating larger lots, single level homes, affordable housing aspects where the roads are in, lots are platted, and the deal is done with Housing Works.

A brief discussion took place regarding the noise at the Airport, if there is any type of language associated with this, and are there any steps that can be taken if they do get complaints, etc.

*Ms. Trask* came forward and gave examples of the different days and times that the Airport is busy and stated that the people at Trapper Point do not have a problem with the Airport noise. She stated that this new development will be far better insulated, it will be better built with buffers that will help with the noise.

Duane Lee  
15665 Trapper Point Rd.  
Sisters, OR 97759

*Mr. Lee* came forward and stated that he approves of this project. He stated that the spirit is still there after many years of putting this together for this project. He discussed the mix of housing, placement of where it goes, etc. He read his letter to the Commission dated November 19, 2015. He addressed setbacks, lot sizes, height restrictions, and fencing at this time.

Danny Ebner  
69111 Camp Polk Rd.  
Sisters, OR 97759

*Mr. Ebner* came forward and stated that they own the property just to the north of the boundary lines. He discussed working with Mr. Lundgren over the years and stated that he is an honest guy.

He wants this to be a great development and wants to make sure the rights of the people are protected. He stated that the neighbor's key concerns are the vision corridors to the mountains and gave examples at this time. He discussed density, larger lots, view corridors, and the Airport noise issues at this time.

Dave Hoffman  
15822 Kitty Hawk  
Sisters, OR 97759

*Mr. Hoffman* came forward and stated that his only concern is on the Airport noise. He stated that he wants to make sure that it gets conveyed to the property owners – if it is recorded with a deed, or how it transfers to the property.

*Mr. Denning* came forward to clarify some issues that came up with regards to the height of the buildings. He stated that the entire development is designed for the view corridor and discussed the building heights at this time. He stated that there is a form that the buyers of any of these properties, in a certain zone that has been predetermined, that they will need to sign. It is essentially a release in disclosure regarding the Airport noise – a hold harmless agreement.

A discussion took place regarding the connection of Camp Polk Rd., any improvements being done, different lot sizes, building heights, pedestrian easement, target sale prices for the different lot sizes, home square footages, and offering package deals along with upgrades, etc.

*Chairman Gentry* stated that the applicant is entitled to seven (7) days after the record is closed to all other parties to submit final written arguments in support of the application. Alternatively, the applicant may waive this seven (7) day waiting period. Does the applicant choose to waive the additional seven (7) days?

*Mr. Denning* stated that he would like to waive the seven (7) day waiting period.

*Chairman Gentry* closed the public testimony portion of the hearing at this time.

*Chairman Gentry* asked if the Commission would like to make a motion at this time.

*Commissioner Nagel* made a motion to approve the application.

*Commissioner Wright* seconded. Motion passes 6-0.

## V. WORKSHOP

File No: TA15-03  
Applicant: City of Sisters  
Request: Various Text Amendments

*Staff* came forward and gave the background of the text amendments at this time. *Staff* requests that the Planning Commission continue consideration of the text amendments.

*The Planning Commission recommendations will be forwarded to the City Council for their input prior to scheduling a public hearing.*

Staff stated that they have been directed to drop from this “bundle” the issue about requiring a garage. Right now, the Code requires a garage for a new residential home in the Multi-Family Residential District, and the Downtown Commercial District if building a residence in the Downtown Commercial District basically, the Adams St. area. Staff has been advised to leave the garage requirement as it is for now.

A discussion took place regarding affordable workforce housing, changes in development, maximizing the use of properties, cost of land and development, funding and fees, density and garages, requiring a Variance application, etc. at this time.

Staff stated that the text amendments are “bundled” into TA15-03:

- Approve “as-is”
- Modify / remove amendments
- Re-visit at future workshop

Staff stated that the items being discussed are:

#### Chapter 1.3 – Formula Food Establishments

The Commission agreed on 20 FFE’s or more regardless of ownership or location. This would enable a smaller regional FFE to locate in the City.

*Commissioners Gentry, Nagel, Seymour, Tewalt, and Wright voted yes – (5).*

*Commissioner Detweiler voted no (1).*

Chapter 2.2 – Residential: Amendment to Development Code Section 2.2.300 to clarify setbacks and reduce garage (front-loaded) setbacks when accessed from an alley. Setbacks for front-loaded garages in alleys are currently 20’. Prior proposal from 11/19/15 workshop was to decrease setback to 10’. A discussion at the workshop led to a new proposed setback of 15’. This would enable most vehicle types to park parallel to the garage openings while keeping out of the alley and making more efficient use of the lots. Text for setbacks is further clarified.

The Commission discussed the sizes of the vehicles, parking, driveway width requirements, turning radius, and backyard setback of a building, etc.

*Commissioners Gentry, Detweiler, Nagel, Seymour, Tewalt, and Wright agreed to the proposed setback of 15 ft. minimum – Garage (front-loaded) when accessed from an alley to be 15-ft. minimum. (6-0).*

Chapter 2.3 – Multi-Family Residential: Amendment to Table 2.3.1 Use Table for the Multi-Family Residential District to establish higher density projects to be a Conditional Use project, therefore require a Type III procedure and more thorough review by staff. Currently, the MFR zone is 9-units minimum 20 units max per gross acre, and the R zone is 3 units min – 8 units max per gross acre density. Currently, there is a gap in the residential density between R zoning 8-DU/AC max and MFR 9 DU/AC minimum. This would allow for a 1 unit per gross acre density overlap with the Residential zone.

*Staff* stated that the Multi-Family District – this is an addition of Multi-Family dwelling units with a density greater than 15 up to 20 gross units per acre is just a Minor Conditional Use. This is an added exercise by staff to make sure that the criteria for a Minor Conditional Use permit is being met and to help prove that these types of units are suitable in the area that they are being proposed in.

A comment was made that this would be a good opportunity to discuss when addressing increasing the height – 15-ft up to 20-ft gross units per acre, etc.

*Commissioners Gentry, Detweiler, Nagel, Seymour, Tewalt, and Wright voted yes – (6-0).*

Chapter 2.3 (cont'd) – Amendment to Table 2.3.2 to establish standards for fourplex dwellings and dwelling consisting of 5 or more units. Also, establishing a different height requirement for 5 or more units. Current maximum height is 30' causing three-story buildings to be difficult to construct and market. The prior proposal from 11/19/15 workshop – increase allowable height for multi-family (5 or more units) residential uses to 35' and allow non-inhabited architectural features to be constructed between 35' up to 45' maximum height. A new discussion is to increase allowable height for multi-family (5 or more units) residential uses to 35' and allow non-inhabited architectural features to be constructed between 35' up to 50' maximum height. Either proposal would enable a three story multi-family building with appropriate architectural features.

The Commission discussed the parking requirements, minimum lot sizes, number of units, square footages, open space requirements, (structures with more than 5 units), building heights, height restrictions, roof pitches, views, storage, density, guidelines for design, and the MFR and DC Districts at this time.

The Commissioners agreed to revisit the Table 2.3.2 at a later date – height being the emphasis showing photographs and different examples. Staff stated that there are three (3) different revisions to this table.

Chapter 2.3 (cont'd) – Amendment to Code Section 2.3.300 to clarify setbacks and reduce garage (front-loaded) setbacks when accessed from an alley. *Staff* stated that this is a repeat from the Residential District and a compromise of 15-ft. and everything else stays the same.

Chapter 2.3 (cont'd) – Amendment to Code Section 2.3.300.G: MFR Density Standards to close gap/provide overlap between maximum density for Residential and minimum density required for MFR. *Staff* stated that there is a gap – the maximum density in the Residential is 8 units an acre. The minimum density in the MFR is 9 units an acre.

*Staff* stated that nothing can be built in the 8 to 9 units an acre. This is an attempt of proposing an overlap between the maximum and the minimum of R and MFR. Right now, it is being proposed 7 units an acre as a minimum, and 20 units an acre as a maximum in the MFR and this provides a one (1) unit per acre overlap. Residential density standards apply to all land divisions in the Multi-Family Residential District and to multi-family housing on individual lots. The density range for the Multi-Family Residential District shall be 9-7 units per gross acre minimum and 20 units per gross acre maximum.

*Commissioners Gentry, Detweiler, Nagel, Seymour, Tewalt and Wright agreed to the proposed 7 units an acre as a minimum and 20 units an acre as a maximum in the MRF District.*

(6-0).

Chapter 2.3 (cont'd) – Amendment to Code Section 2.3.300 to modify open space requirements for multi-family housing.

K. Additional Design Standards for Multi-Family Housing: In addition to the design standards set forth, development of multi-family housing (4 5 or more units) shall also comply with the following additional standards. Usable open space is added in the definition and would apply to developments with 5 or more units.

1. Common Usable open space shall be ~~A minimum of 15 percent of site area, inclusive of required setbacks but~~ exclusive of dedicated street right-of-ways, land dedicated to other public uses like parks and schools, and vehicular circulation and parking areas. Sensitive lands and historic buildings or landmarks open to the public and designated by the Comprehensive Plan may be counted toward meeting the common open space requirements.

Additional discussion is to increase all other residential development in MFR from 30' to 35' maximum. Requiring Minor Conditional Use for 15-20 gross units per acre. Currently, MFR density is 9-20 units per acre with no MCU required. The MCU allows City staff to perform a more thorough review for projects which have a higher density. Lot sizes are proposed to be revised to enable a fourplex dwelling on a 10,000 square foot minimum lot. Multi-family structures of 5 or more units would require 12,000 square feet minimum with an additional 200 square feet of usable open space per unit. This would enable the specific number of units proposed require a specific area of usable open space.

Chapter 2.4 – Amendment to Table 2.4.2 to clarify setbacks and reduce garage (front-loaded) setbacks when accessed from an alley. A discussion on setbacks for alley loaded garages in Chapter 2.2 and Chapter 2.3.

Table 2.4.2.a – Development Standards for Stand-Alone Residential uses located within the Downtown Commercial District. These standards only apply to the lots fronting Adams Avenue and on lots that are located within 114' of Adams Avenue to the south, and 256' to the north of Adams Avenue.

*Staff* stated that it was suggested to bring to the attention of the Planning Commission the maximum parking requirement – there is a minimum of one (1) space per 400-ft. of floor space – a ratio for minimum. There is also in the Code that you cannot exceed more than 20 percent of the minimum so there is a cap on the maximum parking as well.

*Staff* asked the Commission if they would be interested in taking a look at the maximum parking because a lot of the feedback is that this is a very strange requirement. The original feedback from a former staff member was that the committee did not want to have an ocean of parking lots.

*The Commission agreed to revisit the maximum parking at the next meeting.*

The Commission asked if signs could be addressed as well as banners at one of the next workshops.

*Staff* asked for the Commission to address specific sites, signs, banners, sandwich boards and properties that they feel are not in compliance and they will be paid a visit.

Chapter 3.2 – Landscaping: Reducing the minimum caliper for required street trees from 2" to 1 ½". Planted trees shall have a minimum caliper size of ~~two (2)~~ "one and one-half (1 ½) inches" and shall conform to the standards described by the ANSI A300 standards for nursery stock, latest edition.

*Commissioner Gentry, Detweiler, Nagel, Seymour, Tewalt, and Wright agreed on reducing the minimum caliper size to 1 1/2". (6-0).*

A comment was made to staff that at the next meeting a discussion be held on the "no garage" language. *Staff* stated that this discussion could be held at the December 17<sup>th</sup> workshop.

#### VI. OTHER COMMISSION BUSINESS

*Staff* stated that they have received communication that the Agendas need to have more information on them, and there will be a determined effort to have the Agenda items clearly explained about what is being proposed, etc.

#### VII. ADJOURN

*Chairman Gentry* adjourned the meeting at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Jenkins, Recording Secretary





