



CITY COUNCIL Agenda

520 E. Cascade Avenue - PO Box 39 - Sisters, Or 97759 | ph.: (541) 549-6022 | www.ci.sisters.or.us

Wednesday, November 8, 2023

This City Council meeting is accessible to the public in person in the Council Chambers at 520 E. Cascade Avenue, Sisters, OR 97759

This meeting is open to the public and can be accessed and attended in person or remotely. Members of the public may view the meeting via Zoom at the link below:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84845473165>

Visitor Communication: To offer written comments, send an email to kprosser@ci.sisters.or.us no later than 3:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting. If attending the meeting via Zoom and wish to speak, submit your name, address, phone number, and the topic you intend to address to kprosser@ci.sisters.or.us by 3:00 p.m. on the meeting day. For those attending the meeting in person, you may complete a request to speak form on-site.

5:30 PM WORKSHOP

1. Urban Growth Boundary Discussion
2. Other Business

6:30 PM CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING

1. **CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
2. **ROLL CALL**
3. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
4. **VISITOR COMMUNICATION**
5. **CONSENT AGENDA**
 - A. Minutes
 1. October 11, 2023 – Workshop
 2. October 25, 2023 – Regular
 3. October 25, 2023 - Workshop
6. **COUNCIL BUSINESS**
 - A. **Discussion and Consideration of a Motion** to Approve the Second Intergovernmental Agreement with Deschutes County and the Cities of Bend, La Pine, Redmond, and Sisters for the Coordinated Houseless Response Office and Authorize the City Manager to Execute the Agreement.

This agenda is also available via the Internet at www.ci.sisters.or.us

7. **OTHER BUSINESS**
 - A. Staff Comments
8. **MAYOR/COUNCILOR BUSINESS**
9. **ADJOURN**

Pursuant to ORS 192.640, this agenda includes a list of the principal subjects anticipated to be considered at the above-referenced meeting; however, the agenda does not limit the ability of the Council to consider or discuss additional subjects. This meeting is subject to cancellation without notice.

This meeting is open to the public, and interested citizens are invited to attend. This is an open meeting under Oregon Revised Statutes, not a community forum; audience participation is at the discretion of the Council. The meeting may be recorded. The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made to the City Recorder at least forty-eight (48) hours in advance of the meeting.

Executive Sessions are not open to the public; however, members of the press are invited to attend.

The City of Sisters is an Equal Opportunity Provider



CITY COUNCIL Agenda Item Summary

Meeting Date: November 8, 2023

Staff: Woodford

Type: Workshop

Dept: CDD

Subject: Discussion of Possible Sisters Urban Growth Boundary Amendment

Action Requested: Direction from the City Council on next steps the Council would like staff to take regarding the results of the City of Sisters Urban Growth Boundary Sufficiency Analysis, which identified a need for expanding the Urban Growth Boundary.

Background:

Oregon's unique land use system, enacted by Senate Bill 100 in 1973, included the creation of urban growth boundaries as a measure to limit sprawl, preserve farms and forest land, and require cities to thoughtfully plan for and manage growth. The UGB is the line that separates the urban areas from the rural lands and designates the areas where the city expects to grow over the next 20 years. In Sisters, our current UGB matches the boundary of our existing city limits, meaning that there is no land outside of the existing city boundaries that are currently designated for future growth.

State law requires municipalities in Oregon to create and periodically update a comprehensive plan, which is the City's major policy document that outlines our community's growth management strategy and addresses various aspects of growth such as housing, transportation, economic development, and natural resources.

In 2021, the City of Sisters updated its [Comprehensive Plan](#), which included an update to its [Housing Needs Analysis](#) (HNA) and [Economic Opportunities Analysis](#) (EOA), as well as an Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) Sufficiency Report, which provided a framework for evaluating the results of the HNA and EOA. The UGB report analyzed whether the city had enough land within its existing UGB to meet its 20-year housing and employment needs, as identified in the HNA and EOA. The sufficiency report followed the completion and implementation of land use efficiency measures as strategies for the city to use land more efficiently within the City's current urban growth boundary. The [land use efficiency evaluation](#) is a process that is required by ORS 197.296 as part of the analysis for the consideration of amendments to a City's URB that are needed to accommodate growth.

Recently, staff updated the [UGB Sufficiency Report](#) to include revised population projections from Portland State University's Population Research Center and to better understand where we are with our projected housing and employment needs measured against the capacity of our existing municipal boundaries to accommodate the demand in the next twenty years, as the State of Oregon land use planning law requires municipalities to do.



Agenda Item Summary

The updated UGB Sufficiency Report revised the housing and employment projections based on the new population numbers and updated the [Buildable Lands Inventory](#) (BLI) to reflect development that has occurred since 2021 (the last time it was updated) in order to determine whether sufficient capacity exists within our existing city boundary to accommodate the projected housing and employment needs. It also provided an estimate of future land needs for other uses, including schools, utilities and public facilities, and parks. The report concluded that our 20-year land needs exceed our existing supply, shown in gross acreage needed in the chart below.

| Land Type | Demand (Net Acres) | Supply (Net Acres) | Net Acreage Need* | Gross Acreage Need** |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Residential Land* | 183.8 | 73.6 | 110.3-136.3 | 137.9-170.4 |
| Low Density Residential | 158.9 | 22.6 | 136.3 | 170.4 |
| High Density Residential | 24.9 | 50.9 | -26.0 | -32.5 |
| Employment Land | 106.0 | 64.6 | 41.4 | 51.7 |
| Schools | - | - | 15.0 | 15.0 |
| Parks | - | - | 2.0-19.0 | 2.0-19.0 |
| Total | 289.8 | 138.2 | 168.8-211.7 | 206.6-256.15 |

** The surplus of high-density land should not necessarily be considered available to meet low-density residential needs. This potential mismatch between the supply of lands for these types of developments may need to be addressed further as part of a potential UGB expansion process and/or by continuing to monitor the relative supply of each type of land in the future. As a result, the net acreage need is shown as a range for purposes of this report.*

*** Gross acreage includes additional land area to account for needed infrastructure. This consists of new rights-of-way (20%) and stormwater/other infrastructure needs (5%).*

According to OAR 660-038-0080, if the amount of buildable residential land is less than the amount of land needed for residential development, the city must expand the UGB to provide the amount of land needed. Further OAR 660-038-0150 states that if the amount of buildable employment land in the UGB is less than the amount of land needed for either commercial or industrial development, then the UGB may be expanded to provide the amount of land needed.

UGB Amendment Process: If the City Council directs staff to pursue a UGB Amendment, the process would first include hiring a consultant through a Request for Proposals (RFP), to assist the city with the process. The UGB expansion process includes substantial community review and involvement, creating a study area and evaluating the parcels of land within the area, studying alternatives, and adopting findings.



Agenda Item Summary

Estimates for the timeframe to complete the process, once started, could take between 12-16 months to complete with an extra 6-12 months to prepare Area Plans for new urban land (Area Plans provide more detail to the locations of different land uses, a general traffic circulation plan, how areas will be served by utilities, the desired characteristics of the development, etc.).

Ultimately, expansion of an urban growth boundary does not mean that growth would immediately occur in those areas. UGBs are intended to be the future land supply for the next 20 years to accommodate community growth. Landowners must apply to annex into the city, which is a multi-step process that is usually accompanied by master plans or subdivision applications that are consistent with the City’s Area Plans for the expansion areas.

The anticipated steps in the process and rough cost estimates are provided in the chart below. They are rough numbers and would need more refinement as the scope of work is narrowed, but for working numbers, the consultant costs would be between \$140,000 to \$300,000. The city budgeted \$160,000 for contracted services with the thought that most, if not all, of this would be for a UGB Amendment if Council directed staff to pursue one. In addition, the city applied for and received a Housing Planning Assistance Grant through the State of Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development to help offset the costs associated with a UGB Amendment. The State has not yet determined how much grant funds they will provide to the city, but we should know by the end of November.

| Task | Timeline | Cost |
|---|------------|---|
| Project Management | n/a | About \$10K (20 meetings) |
| Create public process (form committees, draft process plan, and conduct committee meetings) | 2-3 Months | About \$7-16K |
| Finalize Land Need | 1 Month | \$2-5K to revised technical memos developed to date (HNA, EOA, BLI, etc.) |
| Analyze Study Area (Goal 14 Factors) | 2-3 Months | \$10-30K (pending further detailed analysis) |
| Create and Analyze Alternatives | 2-3 Months | \$20-40K (pending further detailed analysis) |



Agenda Item Summary

| | | |
|--|----------------|---|
| Public Open House(s) | 1 Month (each) | \$5-10K each |
| Create and further analyze preferred alternative | 2 Months | \$10-20K |
| UGB Amendment Findings and Adoption Hearings | 3-4 Months | \$12-15K for findings \$3-6K for hearings participation support |
| Preparation of Area Plans of New Urban Land | 6-12 Months | \$60-150K, depending on the extent of planning and level of detail, and potential need to develop developer or landowner agreements |

Staff will be available at the workshop to provide answers to questions. A representative from the planning firm that compiled the UGB Sufficiency Report for the city will also be on hand to answer questions from the Council.

Staff is seeking the Council’s direction to proceed and return to Council on November 29 with a formal decision to proceed with the UGB Amendment and prepare an RFP and scope of work for the effort. Following that decision and the issuing of an RFP and receipt of proposals, staff would return to Council for the contract approval.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michael Preedin Mayor
Andrea Blum Council President
Jennifer Letz Councilor
Gary Ross Councilor
Susan Cobb Councilor

STAFF PRESENT:

Jordan Wheeler City Manager
Joe O'Neill Finance Director
Kerry Prosser Assistant City Manager
Scott Woodford CDD Director
Paul Bertagna PW Director

GUESTS:

Bob Townsend Area Manager, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
Peter Hoover Executive Director, Sisters Habitat for Humanity
Joe Rambo Board Chair, Sisters Habitat for Humanity
John Barentine Dark Sky Consulting

Mayor Preedin called the workshop to order at 5:30 p.m.

1. US20 at Locust Street Roundabout Project Update

Bob Townsend, Central Oregon Area Manager, ODOT, gave a [presentation](#) on the HWY20 at Locust St. roundabout. He reviewed project funding and background, roundabout design, traffic management, the project timeline, right-of-way acquisition, and the finalization of the intergovernmental agreement.

Council President Blum asked what condition the areas that were not part of the highway would be left in, and whether they would be under ownership of ODOT. Area Manager Townsend said they would remove the old highway pavement and said some of the area would be used for the truck route and pathways. He said the property belonged to ODOT, but they were willing to transfer it to the city. Council President Blum inquired about the lighting on the roundabout. Area Manager Townsend replied that it would match the local lighting code.

Councilor Ross asked about the expected opening date of South Locust Street. Area Manager Townsend estimated it should be open by the end of July.

Councilor Letz raised concerns about ODOT's funding issues and its potential impact on the project. Area Manager Townsend confirmed that the project's funding was allocated but mentioned the possibility of needing more funds in case of overruns.

Mayor Preedin praised the efforts of Director Bertagna on this project and emphasized the importance of moving forward quickly due to ODOT's current funding situation.

2. Habitat for Humanity

Peter Hoover, the Executive Director of Sisters Habitat for Humanity, was thankful for the support and collaboration they had received from the city over the past 30 years. He noted that the city had provided grants, assistance with zoning and planning, and fee waivers to help make affordable housing projects more achievable.

Mr. Hoover reviewed past achievements, including building over 80 homes in the Sisters area, which was significant considering the city's population. Future Initiatives included:

- Increasing home completion, with a goal to build five to six homes per year for the next three years.
- Expanding into different forms of home development, including multifamily housing, townhomes, and workforce housing.
- Implementing a quick response home repair service, to address issues such as water heaters and heating systems, with a goal to respond within one to two weeks.
- Expanding into energy efficiency and weatherization programs to help homeowners maintain affordability.
- Launching a tool lending program to provide necessary tools for home repairs.
- Offering community learning opportunities, including legal and do-it-yourself skills-building classes.
- Partnering with other community entities and service providers to extend the reach of affordable housing and homeowner services.

Councilor Letz asked if they would offer home repair to only Habitat Homes or if any homes were eligible. Mr. Hoover explained the organization intended to serve the entire community, not just the affordable housing inventory created by Habitat.

Mr. Hoover reviewed that they were actively seeking partnerships with organizations like Family Access Network (FAN), NeighborImpact, and others to provide a broader range of services to the community. He stressed the importance of guidance and input from the City Council and the community to achieve their goals of providing affordable workforce housing.

Joe Rambo, Board President, said the Habitat Board recently voted to appoint Mr. Hoover as the full-time Executive Director, ending his acting status. He said they were refocusing their mission to make a more significant impact in the community. Over the past five years, Habitat had built 1.7 homes a year amid challenges like COVID. To increase their impact, they shifted their construction process. Instead of relying solely on volunteers, they contracted CS Construction to frame two of their homes in the Woodlands project, and they planned to continue this relationship. This year, they would provide housing for four individuals, with plans to dedicate two more homes, with six additional homes scheduled for 2024. These homes were part of the Woodlands and Village Green projects.

Mr. Rambo said the organization was working on making a direct impact on workforce housing. While they had traditionally focused on affordable housing for those below 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI), they now planned to address the needs of those in the 80% to 120% AMI range. They were currently exploring options with their existing property in the downtown commercial district. He emphasized the importance of building partnerships with the city and other stakeholders in the community to address affordable and workforce housing. Habitat believed that by working together, they could make a meaningful difference in these areas.

Councilor Cobb asked if Habitat would help with defensible space in the community. Mr. Hoover mentioned the possibility of coordinating with volunteer groups for this work. Councilor Cobb also suggested developing a program to help people who could not afford to bring their homes up to fire hardening code.

Councilor Ross expressed appreciation for the progress on Habitat projects in town and how they were making a positive impact in the community.

Mayor Preedin, Councilor Letz, and Council President Blum were excited about the projects Habitat was taking on and expressed interest in partnering with them in the future.

3. Dark Skies Lighting Development Code Amendments

Director Woodford gave a [presentation](#) on updates to the proposed outdoor lighting ordinance. The primary goal of the workshop was to discuss recent changes made to the ordinance based on the Council, Planning Commission, and consultant suggestions, address unresolved issues, and seek final direction from the Council.

Director Woodford reviewed updates that included changes to definitions, including adding an illustration for "downcast," enhancing the definition of "light trespass," and adding a definition for "net acre." A provision about lights being turned off when not needed was revised for better enforceability. Adjustments were made to landscape and deck lighting requirements.

Director Woodford addressed the exemption of public outdoor lighting in the right-of-way and the need to evaluate compliance with the International Dark Sky Association (IDA) certification. Compliance with IDA certification included factors like fully shielded lighting, color temperature limits, and a maximum brightness requirement. Non-conforming lights must be brought into compliance within a specific timeframe if the city pursued IDA certification. A cost estimate for retrofitting the Cascade Avenue Street lights to meet dark sky requirements was presented, and questions were raised about the cost and design aesthetics.

Director Woodford asked if the Council wanted to commit to retrofitting public lighting. If not, they could proceed with other aspects of the ordinance and reconsider retrofitting in the future.

The Council discussed retrofitting public lighting. Director Bertagna provided context on the history of the current light fixtures and the community's involvement in choosing the design.

Mayor Preedin expressed strong support for pursuing dark sky certification. He thought it was the city's role to lead the way and considered it a worthwhile investment for the community.

Council President Blum would like to know how we could retrofit city lights without it being prohibitively expensive.

Councilor Cobb favored pursuing the dark sky certification.

Councilor Ross expressed concerns about the timeline and resources required for replacing lights and emphasized the need to proceed carefully. He suggested delaying the application for certification to allow for more planning.

Councilor Letz did not want to exempt public lighting from the code and believed the five-year timeline was sufficient to work towards dark sky certification.

Mr. Barrentine offered information on the potential options and timelines for seeking dark sky certification, suggesting that the city did not need to rush the process and could revisit it in the future.

Mayor Preedin reiterated support for not exempting public lighting and focusing on achieving dark sky certification.

Director Woodford discussed how to regulate string lights. Options included banning them, permitting them with restrictions on light spillage, limiting their use in certain areas, and imposing a curfew, as well as restricting their brightness and color. The Planning Commission did not want to ban string lights and suggested implementing a curfew and limiting brightness and maximum color temperature. Director Woodford asked the Council if they would like to ban string lights or allow them with restrictions and which restrictions they supported.

The Council discussed string lights. Mayor Preedin asked how you would restrict lumens and questioned the necessity of such restrictions if the lights were turned off after a specific time. He proposed setting a curfew of 10:00 pm.

Councilor Ross mentioned the difficulty of determining brightness and color temperature, noting that it would be hard to enforce. He suggested implementing a curfew and providing timers to residents to turn off lights automatically. He was also concerned about light trespass from string lights in residential neighborhoods.

Councilor Letz thought limiting brightness and color would be extremely difficult. She would like a definition of string lights in the code and asked whether holiday lights were exempt.

Councilor Cobb was not in favor of the lumen's requirement and suggested restricting lights to single rows rather than multiple rows. She favored setting a curfew at 10:00 pm.

The Council discussed how the code would be enforced.

Director Woodford explained the challenges of enforcing brightness limitations. He emphasized the importance of educating people about light pollution. He also discussed the possibility of a business curfew being tied to closure time.

Director Woodford reviewed creating a timeframe for when non-conforming lights must be brought into conformance; 2-10 years was typical. He said a strong education campaign would be important, along with the possibility of financial incentives to offer property owners to assist with upgrading their lighting. If you decided on applying for IDA certification, there were strict timelines of 5 years for public lights and ten years for private lights to comply.

Council President Blum asked whether newly constructed structures in the community, built after the last lighting ordinance update, complied with that ordinance. Director Woodford replied that the expectation was that new construction should comply with the current lighting ordinance. However, he could not guarantee 100% compliance.

Councilor Ross asked what role the electrical inspector had in checking compliance with the dark sky lighting requirements. Director Woodford replied they did not; city staff checked before a certificate of occupancy was issued. Councilor Ross also asked whether compliance was checked if it was not an occupied space. Director Woodford said in that situation, they would not check for compliance; that might be a loophole in the code.

Director Woodford said business owners had expressed strong support for the dark skies concept but raised concerns about the need for adequate lighting at all times, especially in

places like hotels with late-night check-ins and for the safety of visitors who may not be familiar with the area. Some business owners believed that strict curfews, like those set at 11:00 pm. or within one hour of closing, might not work for them. There was a suggestion to consider exemptions for certain businesses that required safety lighting beyond the curfew hours.

Councilor Letz asked about gas stations' need for security lighting at night and whether it differed from other businesses. Mayor Preedin said that this issue might be common among all business owners. Councilor Letz suggested that fuel deliveries at night might be a reason for needing the lighting. Mayor Preedin mentioned the importance of having adequate lighting for safety and transportation security, not just for deterring crime.

Council President Blum asked Director Woodford if staff had discussed the lighting code with the sheriff; he had not but would reach out.

Councilor Ross said having dark sky compliant lighting was a way to address safety and security concerns while minimizing light pollution. Mayor Preedin suggested that hotels could have exemptions with dark sky lighting rated lights and signs.

Director Woodford said there was strong support from the businesses for financial assistance for retrofitting lights. The Council discussed potential grants and fundraising efforts to support businesses and residents.

Mayor Preedin expressed a desire for uniformity in the city's lighting requirements and his willingness to support those efforts. He thanked the people who had sent letters to the Council in support of the code update.

4. Other Business - None

The meeting adjourned at 6:57 p.m.

Kerry Prosser, Recorder

Michael Preedin, Mayor

MEMBERS PRESENT

Michael Preedin Mayor
Andrea Blum Council President
Jennifer Letz Councilor
Susan Cobb Councilor
Gary Ross Councilor - Zoom

STAFF PRESENT:

Jordan Wheeler City Manager
Joe O'Neill Finance Director
Kerry Prosser Assistant City Mgr.
Scott Woodford CDD Director
Paul Bertagna PW Director

1. CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Preedin at 7:12 pm.

2. ROLL CALL

A roll call was taken, and a quorum was established.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Council President Blum made a motion to approve the agenda. Councilor Cobb seconded the motion. Preedin, Blum, Letz, Ross, and Cobb voted aye; the motion carried 5-0.

4. VISITOR COMMUNICATION

- Michael, no address given, spoke on numerous topics.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Minutes

1. September 27, 2023 – Regular
2. September 27, 2023 – Workshop
3. October 11, 2023 - Regular

- B. Approve a contract change order for HPC Industrial in the amount not to exceed \$36,100.00 for additional bio-solids removal and authorize the City Manager to execute the change order.

Councilor Cobb made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Councilor Letz seconded the motion. Preedin, Blum, Letz, Ross, and Cobb voted aye; the motion carried 5-0.

6. COUNCIL BUSINESS - None

7. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Staff Comments

City Manager's Office - City Manager Wheeler, ACM Prosser

- The Library re-grand opening was on Saturday, October 28th, at noon.
- Trick or Treating downtown would be held on Halloween from 3–5 pm.

- Sisters Parks and Recreation District (SPRD) will hold a community outreach meeting on the redevelopment of the elementary school on November 2nd.
- Republic Services Fall clean-up would be held the week of November 6th.
- Staff met with community members to discuss an arts and cultural district.

Finance – Director O'Neill

- The new utility billing process would go live on November 13th.
- The county mailed property tax bills this week.
- The affordable housing fund had approximately \$62,000, with another \$20,000 in the housing reserve.

Community Development Department – Director Woodford

- Planner Martin was attending the Oregon American Planning Association conference in Eugene. He would be speaking on efficiency measures and the housing plan update process.
- At the next Planning Commission's workshop, they would discuss community involvement.

Director Woodford reviewed the county was considering disbanding its Historic Landmarks Commission due to difficulties finding members and achieving a quorum. If the county disbands its commission, the responsibility for reviewing landmark alterations would fall on the City Council. The disbandment would affect the grant received by the city from the county, potentially impacting funding for historic preservation efforts. The City Council may have to decide whether to take on the responsibility of reviewing landmark alterations or encourage the county to reinstate its Landmarks Commission.

City Manager Wheeler explained the issue had implications for Sisters in terms of an increased role in managing historic resources. Currently, the City Council handles the designation of historic landmarks, but the proposed change would expand their responsibilities to include reviewing alterations. He said the activity of landmark commissions tends to fluctuate based on proposals for properties or buildings to be added to the historic register. He noted it might be worth considering providing comments or contacting the county regarding their decision.

Mayor Preedin suggested that the Planning Commission could potentially take on the role if the need arose.

Public Works – Director Bertagna

- The Happy Girls race would be this Saturday, including a 5K, 10K, and half marathon on the Peterson Ridge Trail system. The race runs through town to the west side, starting at Five Pine.

- Staff participated in the Carbon Reduction Grant kick-off meeting with the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT).
- East Portal Phase I design was moving forward with Kittleson & Associates. Construction could start in July or August 2024.
- Construction was progressing on Sunset Meadows, with sewer line testing completed, and they were now working on waterline and water systems.
- The biosolids removal project went well and would be wrapping up soon.

Councilor Cobb discussed the idea of renaming the East Portal. She asked if there was a timeframe for involving the public in the renaming process, and she suggested that staff should work on determining when this public involvement might occur. City Manager Wheeler replied that currently, there was no naming policy in place, so the process for renaming the East Portal could be developed as needed. We could consider public input, potentially including the Parks Board, or going directly to the City Council to determine the name.

Mayor Preedin asked staff to outline a few parameters for a renaming process.

8. MAYOR/COUNCILOR BUSINESS

Councilor Cobb attended an event at Sisters Community Church where people were invited to donate to Ukrainian children. She reviewed that the Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council (COIC) was working on the Consolidated Economic Development Strategy (CEDS). The finalization of the strategy was expected in mid-November, delayed from its initial September deadline.

Councilor Letz attended the League of Oregon Cities (LOC) Conference and took part in a session on UGB (Urban Growth Boundary) expansion, where she learned important do's and don'ts in the process. Another session focused on councilor compensation and the different compensation models cities used. Councilor Letz also met the Executive Director of a daycare in Boardman, who created a successful model through partnerships with large employers, which did not rely heavily on public funding. She had a meeting scheduled with her to learn more about their process. Councilor Letz would be attending the Deschutes County Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee summit in Sunriver tomorrow.

Council President Blum reviewed that COIC was establishing a regional committee to address homelessness that would include Crook and Jefferson counties. COIC was already involved in many activities related to homelessness, but this committee would expand its efforts. This initiative involved creating a new group with new bylaws and strategies; this was in addition to the Coordinated Homeless Response Office (CHARO). Council President Blum noted a CHARO meeting was scheduled for tomorrow, where the focus was on engaging federal and state lands partners to discuss joint issues.

Council President Blum said there was an upcoming Central Oregon Area Commission on Transportation (COACT) meeting, and they were asking for input on transportation priorities. The Transportation Commission sought support from local transportation committees to appeal to the legislature for more funding. She said local agencies have had their decision-making power reduced when it came to project prioritization.

Mayor Preedin discussed the need for the community to actively participate in recruiting future leaders and council members. He noted it was not the sole responsibility of the Council; the entire community should be part of identifying potential leaders. He acknowledged the challenges and criticisms that came with the role of City Councilor but emphasized the overall satisfaction in serving. He raised the idea of exploring compensation or stipends for Council members. He noted that the Council was tackling substantial issues, and these challenges were expected to continue.

Councilor Cobb would like to include the possibility of introducing a stipend for Councilors that required financial support for childcare expenses.

Mayor Preedin attended the LOC conference where he interacted with a dark skies lighting manufacturer; he would pass on the information he gathered to staff. He also discussed the possibility of laying conduit for broadband infrastructure while working on other projects, such as sewer and water lines.

Mayor Preedin visited two facilities in Eugene during the LOC Conference to learn about homelessness solutions. One facility had indoor tents in a large warehouse, and the other was an outdoor facility with a collaborative farming aspect. Both were operated by religious groups in Eugene and cost between \$40 and \$60 per person per day, which did not include staffing and nonprofit expenses. Mayor Preedin was uncertain about scaling these solutions for Sisters, given the lack of available land and the substantial financial resources they needed.

Mayor Preedin said it was challenging to accurately determine the local needs for the houseless, as some individuals were not seeking housing. He mentioned the need for better data collection to understand the local homelessness situation accurately. Mayor Preedin said there were ongoing discussions about emergency weather shelter solutions and noted that the Council could help facilitate rapid action if needed.

9. ADJOURN: 8:06 pm.

Kerry Prosser, Recorder

Michael Preedin, Mayor

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michael Preedin Mayor
Andrea Blum Council President
Jennifer Letz Councilor
Gary Ross Councilor - Zoom
Susan Cobb Councilor

STAFF PRESENT:

Jordan Wheeler City Manager
Kerry Prosser Assistant City Manager
Joe O'Neill Finance Director
Scott Woodford CDD Director
Paul Bertagna PW Director
Jacob Smith Code Compliance
Chad Davis Lt. DCSO

GUESTS:

Jackie Keogh Executive Director, RootedHomes

Mayor Preedin called the workshop to order at 5:30 p.m.

1. Deschutes County Sheriff's Office (DCSO) Update

- The county legal department and the DCSO legal team were reviewing the amendment to the sheriff's contract for a fourth deputy.
- A new patrol deputy was undergoing field training with the Sisters' team before attending the Academy.
- The number of calls received each year increased by 300 to 400 calls annually. Lt. Davis planned to compile an end-of-year report that would show a comprehensive comparison of calls for service from 2021, 2022, and 2023, providing insights into the trends and workloads.

2. Rooted Homes Presentation

Jackie Keogh, the Executive Director of RootedHomes, a nonprofit affordable housing developer in Central Oregon, discussed their unique approach to affordable housing. RootedHomes operated as a community land trust, ensuring long-term affordability by retaining control of the land where affordable homes were built. They also focused on sustainability, building high-quality, energy-efficient homes. Their homes serve a broad income range, from 30% to 120% of the area median income (AMI).

In the city of Sisters, they were initiating a pilot program to provide workforce housing. They were prioritizing Sister School District employees and offering two homes at a reduced price with down payment assistance. The program operated on a shared equity model, where homeowners commit to not earning full market equity upon selling their homes, allowing future low-income buyers to access affordable housing. The project was fully funded through contributions from the developer of the Woodlands, Deschutes County, the Sister School District, and private investors. RootedHomes was requesting a \$100,000 investment from the city to support the program. This subsidy would be permanently embedded in the homes and would not require additional funding in the future.

Mayor Preedin asked about the length of the lease. Ms. Keogh explained that Rooted Homes implements a 99-year renewable land lease on their homes at the time of purchase. This lease served as a permanent affordability covenant, ensuring the home remained affordable over the long term. The covenant governs resale, equity building, and the relationship between RootedHomes and the homeowner.

The Council discussed the complexities of building affordable housing, pricing, and the specific model used by RootedHomes.

Ms. Keogh explained that current homes on the market in the Woodlands were priced at around \$700,000. In contrast, RootedHomes offered a land lease model that significantly reduced the purchase price to approximately \$430,000. This lower price point made homeownership more accessible for individuals like teachers who might be unable to afford the higher market rates. The land lease ensured that if the home were resold, it would be available to another low-income family, creating a long-term community opportunity rather than benefiting only a few.

Council President Blum questioned the high cost of these homes, given that they did not include the land. Ms. Keogh explained that the land was part of the overall cost of the home. The development (Woodlands) had invested in infrastructure and had subsidized the homes to make them affordable for buyers who couldn't otherwise afford the price. She reiterated that the prices were based on what the homeowners could afford, and the subsidy was applied to reach the target purchase price of \$430,000.

Mayor Preedin thought the pricing was reasonable. He appreciated the investment made by the Woodlands in providing some affordable housing and acknowledged the challenges in creating workforce housing.

Councilor Cobb asked when a teacher purchased a home in the development and later decided to sell it would they benefit from the full profit of the sale. Ms. Keogh explained that the former owners received only a portion of the profit. Homeowners earned equity over time, about 1.5% annually on their mortgage. The equity earned was protected from market fluctuations and downturns. This system ensured the home remained affordable and benefited the broader community rather than a single family.

City Manager Wheeler asked about the timing of the funding request of \$100,000 from the city; the Council was not prepared to decide at tonight's workshop. He asked about the preference points and lottery system and who was eligible for these preferences.

Ms. Keogh replied that RootedHomes had a civil rights preference that gave preference to local employers whose demographics met certain criteria. Sister School District employees

received one preference point, but anyone could apply. She further explained that the city's contribution could be made closer to the project's closing date in 2024, allowing time for the city to decide about funding.

City Manager Wheeler said there were challenges in determining where the funds would come from and reviewed the city's current commitment to an affordable housing project and the timing of the funding for that project.

Ms. Keogh brought this to the Council in October so that they would have close to six months to think about it and decide. RootedHomes was actively fundraising to fill the gap if we did not get that contribution from the city. Ms. Keogh did not know if RootedHomes would continue building in the city of Sisters without financial commitment because of the demonstration of a lack of partnership.

Councilor Letz asked if it was an employment-based point system, and the homeowner worked for the district for two years and then left and got another job somewhere else, would that impact their ability to stay in that home. Ms. Keogh replied once they owned the home, they were in. RootedHomes did not believe that housing should be contingent on employment. Councilor Letz asked if you had used this model with mobile home parks. Ms. Keogh said they had not explored this model with mobile home parks.

Councilor Cobb thought that given the average median income (AMI) in Sisters, which was \$75,000, and considering current interest rates and the average pay for a teacher, \$430,000 might not make the home truly affordable. Ms. Keogh said the homes in question were three-bedroom homes designed for two earners or a double-income household. She explained that based on the Sisters School District pay schedule if two earners had salaries of the average teacher, they would be well-qualified to purchase the home.

The Council discussed the energy efficiency of the homes.

Councilor Ross was concerned about the \$100,000 commitment from the city for the affordable housing project. He thought if the city contributed public funds, they should prioritize city employees or local employers. Councilor Ross was concerned with Ms. Keogh's comment that not providing the money by June or July may be interpreted as a lack of commitment from the city.

Ms. Keogh replied they were looking at the city's affordable housing fund, which typically had around \$100,000. She had been in discussions with City Manager Wheeler about accommodating preferences for city staff or other employers in subsequent rounds. She emphasizes the importance of shared financial contributions and the need for a long-term

Partnership with the city. Councilor Ross noted the money Ms. Keogh referenced may already be earmarked for another affordable housing project.

Ms. Keogh said they were flexible in considering different contribution amounts from the city. Mayor Preedin said that was a conversation the Council needed to have, and tonight was just a starting point.

3. Tree Code – Tree Regulations on Private Property

Director Woodford and Code Compliance Officer (CCO) Smith presented the staff report on the proposed amendments to the tree removal code that was being revised and relocated from the development code to the municipal code.

CCO Smith said one of the primary objectives of the code was to address private tree removal based on the size of what was considered a "significant tree," which was defined as having an 8-inch diameter or larger. Currently, the Development Code adheres to the 8-inch standard, and if the two codes had differing requirements, it could be problematic. Staff thought maintaining consistency in the specified tree size across both codes was important.

COO Smith reviewed that any trees in the city right of way had a separate code. He noted there was an upcoming update to the urban/rural interface code, which was for trees considered fire hazards. This code was currently being rewritten, and the updated code would provide standards and definitions for identifying trees that were considered fire hazards, allowing for their removal without a permit.

CCO Smith explained there was an exemption in the code for immediate threats. An example of the immediate threat exemption might be a tree that posed a danger, such as one on the verge of falling after a storm.

COO Smith reviewed when individuals applied to remove a significant tree, they were required to provide information about its location, other trees on the property, and the reason for its removal. Additionally, a certified arborist must validate the justification for removal. The application process involved an assessment based on the approval criteria, which primarily focused on removing dead or hazardous trees, considering alternatives for tree preservation, or providing justifications for not replacing the tree. The code also emphasizes the importance of prioritizing the retention of trees during construction improvements.

Director Woodford explained a key difference between the old and new code was the addition of provisions for property improvements. The code provided the city with the

ability to inquire about the necessity of the chosen location of improvements and explore alternative spots that might not require the removal of a significant tree.

CCO Smith asked for feedback on the penalty for taking a tree without a permit. Currently, the penalty ranges from \$200 to \$1000, but there was a concern that this amount may need to be raised to discourage individuals from simply cutting down trees and accepting the penalty as a cost of doing business. Director Woodford asked if the Council thought it was appropriate to charge a fee for the tree removal permit.

Councilor Cobb offered several suggestions regarding the proposed tree removal code including adding a purpose statement to clarify its intent, adding definitions for heritage trees, identifying all the heritage trees within the city, requiring a qualified specialist to perform tree cutting, avoid charging a fee for tree removal permits, higher fines for violations, and adding information in the code about how to report dangerous trees to code enforcement.

Councilor Letz thought mandating professionals for tree removal might pose a financial burden for many homeowners and the necessity for professional services was dependent on the tree's size and type. She would like to specify certain trees, such as juniper, that were undesirable due to factors like flammability. Councilor Letz would like to understand the implications of the fire and defensible space codes before making a final decision.

The Council discussed the cost of arborists, when tree permits would be needed, fines, and when the code should be implemented.

Councilor Cobb would like to have the code in place to address tree-cutting happening now and in the spring.

Council President Blum said we already had code around private tree removal; it just needed to be moved to the Municipal Code.

Mayor Preedin was trying to find the right balance between conservation and private property rights. He emphasized the importance of being thoughtful about the community's needs, especially considering the area's fire-prone environment.

Council President Blum asked if the arborist's report should include alternatives to removal and a proposal for replacement trees. Director Woodford replied that the code did not require tree replacement in all cases and that having a replacement proposal did not automatically allow tree removal if the tree was not diseased. He explained a replacement policy did exist in the development code, where for every three trees removed, one tree must be replaced, no such requirement currently applied to private tree removal.

Council President Blum questioned who determined whether it was impractical to preserve a tree when it prevents reasonable improvements to the subject property. She was concerned about how the code could impact property owners, especially when dealing with trees they consider unattractive.

Mayor Preedin said there was a fine line between preserving historic and significant trees and considering property owners' preferences and rights. He suggested recognizing certain trees as "heritage trees" or a different class based on their diameter, specifically those with a diameter greater than 18 inches.

Council President Blum stated on the one hand, we were asking people to have 50 feet of defensible space, and on the other, we had trees that were dumping fire hazard materials on the property, and you could not remove them.

The Council was in favor of the 8-inch diameter for significant trees; they did not want to charge a fee for the tree removal permit at this time and thought the fine for cutting a private tree without a permit should be up to \$2,000, with a lower limit to be determined.

4. Other Business - None

The meeting was adjourned at 7:07 p.m.

Kerry Prosser, Recorder

Michael Preedin, Mayor



Meeting Date: November 8, 2023

Type: Regular Meeting

Subject: IGA for the Coordinated Houseless Response Office

Staff: Wheeler/Prosser

Dept: CMO

Action Requested: Motion to approve the Second Intergovernmental Agreement between Deschutes County and Cities of Bend, La Pine, Redmond, and Sisters for the Coordinated Houseless Response Office.

Summary Points:

The original Intergovernmental Agreement with the Coordinated Office on Houselessness, was adopted by participating cities in June 2022. Since then, Deschutes County and the cities of Redmond, Sisters, La Pine, and Bend approved moving the CHRO under the general direction of COIC. This second IGA outlines how the Coordinated Houseless Response Office (CHRO) will operate under the general direction of Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council (COIC) and its Executive Director. The program will be subject to oversight and policy direction by the CHRO Board. COIC's roles and responsibilities, payments, timelines, and check-ins, etc., will be set in a separate MOU agreement, including the scope of work, between COIC and Deschutes County.

Changes/Updates to IGA

- COIC will provide functional general direction of the Office (instead of an Executive Director)
- Local Continuum of Care, Homeless Leadership Coalition and Community Action Agency, NeighborImpact representatives will be added as ex-officio, non-voting members to the CHRO Board as requested by the COIC Board.

Financial Impact: NA

Attachments:

- Second IGA Coordinated Houseless Response Office
- CHRO Board Bylaws

**SECOND INTERGOVERNMENTAL
AGREEMENT COORDINATED HOUSELESS
RESPONSE OFFICE (“IGA”)**

****10-2-23****

PARTIES

- Deschutes County, a political subdivision of the State of Oregon, (“County”)
- City of Bend, an Oregon Municipal Corporation, (“Bend”)
- City of La Pine, an Oregon Municipal Corporation, (“La Pine”)
- City of Sisters, an Oregon Municipal Corporation, (“Sisters”)
- City of Redmond, an Oregon Municipal Corporation, (“Redmond”)

RECITALS

- A. ORS 190.010 authorizes units of local government to enter into Intergovernmental Agreements (“IGA”) for the performance of any or all functions which a Party to the IGA has the authority to perform.
- B. The Parties to this IGA agree to support a joint effort to implement [HB 4123](#) and establish and provide oversight for a Coordinated Houseless Response Office Pilot (“Office”).
- C. The participating local government agencies under HB 4123 include: Deschutes County and Cities of Bend, La Pine, Redmond, and Sisters (County/Cities). The Oversight Board for the Office and the HB 4123 project has been comprised of one (1) elected official from each County/Cities. In addition, one (1) Central Oregon Continuum of Care Board representative and one (1) NeighborImpact representative will be added to the Board as non-voting members (“Board”).
- D. The Board provides policy direction to the Office. The Board submitted a Coordinated Houseless Response Office (“CHRO”) 5-Year Strategic Plan, dated August 14, 2023, to guide the work of the Office, to the State in compliance with HB 4123.
- E. The Parties entered into an Intergovernmental Agreement Coordinated Office on Houselessness, effective December 7, 2022 (“original IGA”). The Parties intend that the Office will now operate under the general direction of the Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council (“COIC”) Executive Director or designee with consultation from HB 4123 participating local government agencies or administrative leadership, and subject to oversight and policy direction by the oversight Board. COIC’s roles and responsibilities, payments, timelines and check-ins, etc., will be set forth in a separate agreement, including a Scope of

Work, between COIC and Deschutes County.

- F. COIC's legal representative will act as legal advisor to the COIC for matters related to the Office and COIC's role in operating the Office. It is expected that COIC's legal counsel will consult with attorneys for the Parties as needed. Deschutes County counsel will represent the County Administrator and the County, and the other parties will be represented by their own legal counsel for the purpose of implementing this IGA. Nothing in this IGA is intended to abrogate, waive, or diminish the attorney-client privilege or other confidentiality provisions applicable between County/Cities elected officials and County/Cities employees and legal counsel for their respective County/Cities.
- G. Parties to this IGA will appoint a staff liaison to attend Board meetings and work/coordinate with the Office.
- H. Board members will serve as the sole liaisons between their respective elected body or organization and the Office to provide updates and/or request for commitments or actions.
- I. The Board's purpose, authority, membership, terms, roles, and responsibilities, and more are outlined in the Board bylaws in the attached Exhibit 1.
- J. As an entity authorized by statute and formed by an IGA with the authority to make decision on policy and administration, the Board is considered a public body for the purposes of the public meetings law, will hold noticed meetings open to the public, and otherwise act in accordance with Oregon Public Meetings Law.
- K. The Office will include an Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee's Description, Distinction from the Governance Board, Roles and Responsibilities, Membership Categories and Advisory Committee Terms, are outlined in the Board bylaws in the attached Exhibit 1.
- L. The Office will coordinate with and develop partnerships with local and regional stakeholders as specified in House Bill 4123.
- M. The Office is funded with initial pilot funding of \$1,000,000 provided by the State of Oregon. County/Cities are responsible for continuing future funding commitments as required in HB 4123 to continue the Office for no less than five years.

TERMS OF AGREEMENT

- 1. **Original Agreement Void.** The parties intend that upon the effective date of this IGA, the Original IGA shall be void and of no further effect. All references to the "IGA" in this document are to the Second IGA between the Parties.

2. **Effective Date/Duration.** This IGA shall be effective when signed by the last Party to the Agreement. Unless extended or earlier terminated in a writing signed by all of the Parties, this IGA terminates on June 30, 2027.
3. **Commitment to Support.** Parties to this IGA commit to support the Office for a total of not less than five fiscal years from the time the Parties received the grant funding under HB 4123 which was June 2022, or until this IGA terminates on June 30, 2027 (unless extended). The Parties understand that this IGA will need to be amended as the funding and commitments for years 3-5 are further defined and clarified by the Parties.
4. **Strategic Plan.** The Board adopted a five-year strategic plan as required by HB 4123. The Board may update and change the five-year strategic plan.
5. **Member Obligations.**
 - a. Subject to the ongoing financial commitment of each participating agency as outlined in Section 3 above, Deschutes County will enter into a separate agreement with COIC to provide functional general direction of the Office, including high level coordination, centralized communication, strategic visioning, leveraging existing funds and accessing new resources, leading the implementation of the strategic plan, helping create a responsive system county-wide for residents experiencing homelessness and other task as further set forth in the separate agreement. The separate agreement will include COIC's roles and responsibilities, payments, timelines and check-ins, and other tasks, including a Scope of Work. Deschutes County will continue to be the grant recipient and maintain its responsibility for managing the \$1 million fund and reporting to the state, including when designating and assigning work to COIC, consistent with the State Grant Agreement. A
 - b. Deschutes County will provide a staff liaison.
 - c. Bend will provide a staff liaison.
 - d. La Pine will provide a staff liaison.
 - e. Sisters will provide a staff liaison.
 - f. Redmond will provide a staff liaison.
6. **General Terms.**
 - a. Assignment. This IGA, and each Party's rights and responsibilities associated with this IGA may not be assigned.

- b. Entire Agreement. This IGA sets forth the entire agreement of the parties with respect to the subject matter of the IGA and supersedes any and all prior negotiations, discussions, agreements and understandings of the parties.
- c. Recitals. The Recitals are incorporated into and made part of this IGA.
- d. Board Meetings. The Board has established a schedule where they meet regularly at noticed public meetings. See Board bylaws in attached Exhibit 1 for more information about Board meetings including membership, terms, attendance policy, frequency, officers, and other relevant provisions.
- e. Dispute Resolution. The Parties agree to attempt to resolve any disputes related to this IGA first by meeting between the City Managers involved in the dispute and the County Administrator. As needed, the Parties will communicate with the COIC Executive Director but understand that COIC is not a party to this IGA. In the event dispute resolution is unsuccessful, this IGA will be construed, applied and enforced in accordance with the laws of the State of Oregon. Any action or proceedings arising out of this IGA will be initiated in the Circuit Court of Deschutes County, Oregon.
- f. Severability. If any provision of this IGA is held illegal or unenforceable in any respect, the remaining provisions remain in full force and effect to the extent possible.
- g. Access to Records. All parties to the IGA shall maintain fiscal records and all other records pertinent to this IGA.
 1. All fiscal records shall be maintained pursuant to generally accepted accounting standards, and other records shall be maintained to the extent necessary to clearly reflect actions taken.
 2. All records shall be retained and kept accessible for at least three years, or as otherwise required to be retained by Oregon law.
 3. If an audit, litigation or other action involving this IGA is started before the end of the three-year period, the records shall be retained until all issues arising out of the action are resolved or until the end of the three-year period, whichever is later.
 4. All Parties to this IGA and their authorized representatives have the right to direct access to all associated books, documents, papers, and records related to this IGA for the purpose of conducting audits and

examinations and making copies, excerpts, and transcripts.

5. In the event of a public records request, the COIC is considered the custodian of the public records of the Board. To the extent more than one public body is the custodian of a given public record, when a city or county receives a request, it has received from another public body, it may consult with the originating body to determine whether the records may be exempt from disclosure.
- i. Amendment/Extension. This IGA may be amended or extended by mutual written agreement of the Parties.
- j. Indemnification. Subject to the limits of the Oregon Tort Claims Act and the Oregon Constitution, each Party shall defend, indemnify, and hold each other Party, and its officers, agents, employees and volunteers, harmless against all liability, claims, losses, demands, suits, fees and judgments (collectively referred to as "claims") that may be based on, or arise out of, damage or injury (including death) to persons or property caused by or resulting from any act or omission of the Party in connection with the performance of this IGA or by conditions created thereby or based upon violation of any statute, ordinance or regulation. This indemnification shall not apply to claims caused by the sole negligence or willful misconduct of the other Party, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers. The Parties agree that they are not agents of each other and are not entitled to indemnification and defense under ORS 30.285 and ORS 30.287.
- k. Each Party has reviewed this IGA with its own legal counsel.
- l. The persons signing below acknowledge they have read and understood this agreement and certify that they have authorization from their governing bodies to execute this IGA and be bound by its terms.

CITY OF BEND

DESCHUTES COUNTY

By: Eric King, City Manager

Nick Lelack, County Administrator

Date: _____

Date: _____

CITY OF LA PINE

Title:
Date: _____

CITY OF SISTERS

Title:
Date: _____

CITY OF REDMOND

Title:
Date: _____

Exhibit 1

Insert CHRO Board Bylaws



Deschutes County and Cities of Bend, La Pine, Redmond, and Sisters
Coordinated Houseless Response Office (CHRO)

BOARD BYLAWS

Introduction

Deschutes County and the Cities of Bend, La Pine, Redmond, and Sisters worked together to secure \$1 million in state funding via House Bill 4123 (HB4123) to pilot and operationalize a Deschutes County and Cities of Bend, La Pine, Redmond, and Sisters – Coordinated Houseless Response Office (CHRO or Office) and were successful. The Office was established to help streamline and complement the work of dozens of local organizations serving our regional houseless population enabling a community-wide approach to addressing houselessness under a shared set of principles, priorities, and strategies.

Purpose of the Board under HB4123

The Office's Board of Directors (Board) is the governing body mandated by the State of Oregon that comprise of representatives from the governing body of each member government and with specific roles of each member to support the advisory committee and Office.

IGA Relationship

The Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) is between Deschutes County and the Cities of Bend, La Pine, Redmond, and Sisters. The Board will provide recommendations to parties of the agreement on various issues relating to homelessness in Deschutes County, including the creation of a countywide five-year strategic plan to address homelessness on a regional basis in Deschutes County.

Authority

The Board serves an advisory and sole liaison function but does not manage the Office. Its role is to:

- Support the advisory committee and Office as per HB4123
 - This support can take the form of financial support, resources, assistance, ensure sustainability, public engagement, partnerships.
- Policy – solely general advice and consent functions.

- Five-year strategic plan
 - Provide input & direction;
 - Approval and commitment; and
 - Political leadership in implementing.
- Review and provide input into the Office’s budget on a yearly basis.
- Act as a liaison to the advisory committee
 - Appoint members of the advisory committee
 - Participate as able in advisory committee meetings.
- Support and general guidance to entity holding the Office.
- Serve as a liaison to their individual governing bodies and between their governing body and Board (example: weighted voting, financial, and/or in-kind contributions)
 - Represent the strategic plan and the Office to their governing body.

Board Membership

The Board is comprised of elected officials from each participating County and Cities as required by HB 4123.

1. One (1) elected official from Deschutes County
2. One (1) elected official from the City of Bend
3. One (1) elected official from the City of La Pine
4. One (1) elected official from the City of Redmond
5. One (1) elected official from the City of Sisters
6. One (1) representative from the OR-503 Continuum of Care (ex-officio, non-voting)
7. One (1) representative from the NeighborImpact (ex-officio non-voting)

The Board composition can change with the approval of the voting Board members and with guidance from the Office and the entity holding the Office. An update to the bylaws and a vote on the amended bylaws will be necessary to proceed.

The governing body of the participating County and Cities shall each appoint one representative and an alternate from their elected body to serve on the Board. Notification of the appointments will be provided to the Office upon action of each of the parties.

Having a local Continuum of Care (CoC) as Board member strategically aligns with HB4123 requirement to coordinate with a local CoC, a federally mandated and funded program. The Homeless Leadership Coalition (HLC) is the local CoC also known as OR-503 servicing Central Oregon. It is designed to promote communitywide commitment to the goal of ending homelessness; provide funding for efforts by nonprofit providers, and State and local governments to quickly rehouse homeless individuals and families while minimizing the trauma and dislocation caused to homeless individuals, families, and communities by homelessness; promote access to and effect utilization of mainstream programs by homeless individuals and

families; and optimize self- sufficiency among individuals and families experiencing homelessness. (Source: [HUD Exchange](#))

NeighborImpact represents and serves economically disadvantaged residents of Central Oregon with a mission to support people and strengthen communities. NeighborImpact provides a diversity of services that not only meet basic human needs for food and shelter, but also enrich people’s lives by providing access to increased education, skills, and hope for the future. Their services assist people to become more independent and self-sufficient, recognizing there is a continuum of support that all people need throughout their life. Until recently, they were also the fiscal agent for HLC. NeighborImpact administers electronic data collection system called the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) that allows homeless service providers to record client information and track services provided and are working alongside HLC to produce a public data dashboard that the Office Board deems a priority. NeighborImpact also offers houselessness prevention programs and resources, which aligns with the Office’s strategic priority of homeless prevention.

The HLC and NeighborImpact shall select a representative and an alternate who are able to speak on behalf of their organization to serve on the Board. Notification of the appointments will be provided to the Office upon action of each of the parties.

Terms of Service

All members will serve at the pleasure of their appointed Commission/Council/Board during the duration of the intergovernmental agreement.

Attendance Policy

All Board members must be able to attend meetings regularly. When emergencies happen, Board members will communicate as soon as possible with the Office staff. Prior notice must be given to the Office staff if a planned absence occurs and if the appointed alternate from their participating County or City is available to attend a meeting and act as proxy. A Board member will no longer be able to serve on the Board if they fail to participate in any scheduled Board meetings for 90 days. The governing body of the participating County or City shall appoint a new representative from their elected body to serve on the Board. Notification of the appointments will be provided to the Office upon action of each of the parties.

Meetings

Public Meetings. The Board is a public body subject to the public meetings laws as stated in ORS 192.640. All meetings, other than executive sessions allowed by law, will be open to the public.

Administrative Support for Public Meetings. The Office shall establish a venue for the meetings, provide proper notice to members of the public, and prepare appropriate agenda background materials for the Board.

Notice. In addition to Board members, the Office will give notice of any meetings to interested persons and news media that have requested notice and general public notice, of the time and place for holding meetings.

Regular Meetings. The Board will meet monthly. Regular meetings may be canceled or changed to another specific place, date, and time as provided in the notices given for the meeting.

Special Meetings. Special Board meetings may be called by the Chair or any three members to the intergovernmental agreement when business needs to be transacted outside of the regular meeting schedule. Special meetings require public notice of not less than 24 hours prior to the commencement of the meeting.

Voting Members. The Chair will ask for the roll call of each party to the agreement at the beginning of the meeting to determine whether the representative, or alternate representative, will be a voting member for that party. In the event that both the representative and alternate representative are present, the representative will be the voting member.

Quorum. The majority of members to the Board will constitute a quorum for the transaction of all business at meetings.

Minutes. The Office will draft the minutes and distribute them to the Board for review and approval. Minutes will include the voting members present, other parties present, and will include motions, resolutions, and orders acted on by the Board during that meeting. The results of all votes shall be listed by each member of voting.

Agendas. Items may be placed on a meeting agenda by the Chair or any Board member. The agenda will be distributed by the Office at least 72 hours in advance of a regular meeting.

Public Comment. Each regular meeting will include an opportunity for public comment, discussion, and input by guests and the general public.

Officers

Chair. The Board Chair will act as the leader of the convened meeting and as a parliamentarian. The Chair will enforce Board directives, guidelines, and ensure that the

meetings are held in accordance with the bylaws adopted by the Board. The Chair will participate in agenda setting (with guidance from the full Board) with the Vice Chair.

Vice Chair. In the absence of the Chair, the Vice Chair will assume the Chair's responsibilities. If neither the Chair nor Vice Chair is available for a publicly convened meeting, then the assembled quorum of the meeting shall select a temporary person to conduct the meeting.

Election of Officers. The Chair and Vice Chair shall be elected by the Board to serve in that capacity upon approval of the bylaws and serve until the last meeting of the calendar year. At the first meeting of each subsequent calendar year, the Chair and Vice Chair will be elected by the Board to serve in those capacities.

Advisory Committee

Description. The Office's advisory committee will be comprised of 12-16 members appointed by the Board. Subcommittees may be created for efficiency. Members shall have subject-matter-expertise that align with the Office's strategic plan priority goals to be determined by the Board. Each member of the Advisory Committee will serve a two-year term, following a vote by the Board. Initial terms will be staggered to ensure the entire committee does not change in one year. The advisory committee shall meet monthly or as directed by the Board.

Distinction from Governance Board or Board of Directors. The role of the advisory committee is to provide current knowledge, critical thinking, and analysis to increase the decision-maker's understanding of the issues. The advisory committee is not a decision-making body.

Roles & Responsibilities. The responsibilities of the advisory committee are to assist the Board in achieving the goals of the Office's strategic plan. These include:

- Provide input and recommendations on funding needs, partnerships, policy changes, and other actions that improve the homelessness service delivery system.
- Provide the Board with input on houselessness related legislation.
- Share information and identify emerging issues and trends within the homeless, recently housed, and at-risk of homelessness communities.
- Ensure that the Board is advancing goals, steering policy, and making informed decisions.
- Participate in and/or facilitate community engagement activities and events.

- Foster and promote cooperation between governmental agencies, community-based non-governmental non-profit organizations, and business interests to ensure the efficient and timely implementation of the Office’s strategic plan.
- Provide information regarding the needs and other factors affecting the smooth implementation of the plan.
- Determine roadblocks affecting program implementation and recommend corrective measures to the Board.

Membership Categories

- (1) representative from organizations with expertise in communications
- (1) representative from organizations with expertise in real estate
- (1) representative from Economic Development of Central Oregon (EDCO) and/or City Chamber of Commerce
- (1) representative from a faith-based organization
- (2) representatives from organizations that deliver direct services including case management, behavioral or mental health or addiction treatment
- (2) representatives from organizations that provide emergency housing/shelter services
- (1) representative from affordable housing developer
- (1) representative with lived experience
- (1) representative from federal or state land management agencies
- (1) representative from the medical system
- (1) representative from county or city law enforcement
- (2) at-large

Membership

- Appointed by the voting members of the Board with guidance from the non-voting members the Office, and the entity holding the Office.

Terms of Service

- Initial members shall serve staggered one- and two-year terms. Subsequent terms will be two years.
- There is no term limit.

Funds Granted through House Bill 4123

These funds will be managed by the Office. Per HB 4123, eligible use of funds is as follows:

- Hire staff.
- Communications & public engagement
- Community outreach and policy development
- Stipends for people with lived experience

- Technical assistance and capacity building including consultants.
- Other expenses necessary to meet requirements.
- If excess of funds available, eligible use:
 - To support the delivery of homeless services and shelters consistent with the Strategic Plan, including through contracts with service providers.

Budget

Review and provide input into the Office's budget on a yearly basis. As required by HB 4123, the participating County and Cities are to identify and set goals for addressing funding to support the Office's ongoing operations in the Office's five-year strategic plan.