



City Parks Advisory Board – Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, April 5, 2023 – 4:00 P.M.
520 E. Cascade Avenue, P.O. Box 39, Sisters, OR 97759

City Parks Advisory Board Attendees:

Board Members: Eli Madrone, Emily Curtis, Molly Baumann, Asa Sarver, Doug Buell, Emily Coonrod, Nancy Connolly
Council Representatives: Gary Ross, Absent
Staff: Scott Woodford, CDD Director, Paul Bertagna, Public Works Director, Matthew Martin, Principal Planner, Emme Shoup, Associate Planner, Kerry Prosser, City Recorder
Visitor: Jennifer Holland, SPRD, Absent
Recording Secretary: Carol Jenkins

I. CALL TO ORDER

Board Chair Madrone called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm. A quorum was established.

Board Member Sarver made a motion to approve the agenda as presented.

Board Member Connolly seconded. Motion passes.

II. VISITOR COMMUNICATION

None

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Board Chair Madrone asked the Board to make a motion to approve the minutes for November 2, 2022, and December 7, 2022, as presented.

Board Member Sarver made a motion to approve the minutes for November 2, 2022, and December 7, 2022, as presented.

Board Vice Chair Curtis seconded. Motion passes.

IV. STAFF

- a. Review a Draft Ordinance to Establish Camping Regulations
- b. Creekside Park Memorial
- c. Arbor Day Tree Planting

Director Woodford stated that the action requested is to review and comment on the draft camping ordinance and campsite removal policy.

Kerry Prosser, City Recorder, and assistant to the City Manager stated that this is an ordinance that the City Council is considering and regulations concerning the time, place, and manner for camping on city owned property, or property controlled by the city. One of the things that we have done with this ordinance is by doing a backwards circulation. In most cases, things go to the Council for a workshop to get feedback and then push it out to the other groups. In this particular ordinance, we went to a group of stakeholders that work with the houseless in our community and passed it by them to get their feedback knowing that they would have the most day to day working knowledge. It has gone to staff twice and through several revisions. The City Parks Advisory Board is the next group to look at it and then the Public Works Advisory Board will look at it next week and then it will go to the City Council for their first workshop. We want to give this plenty of airtime, take questions and get feedback today. City Attorney, Jeremy Green, is here today to lead us through that process.

City Attorney, Jeremy Green stated that what is in front of the Board today are proposed camping regulations. These are regulations that are mandated by State Law to be adopted by municipalities that are interested in, or regulating the sitting, lying, sleeping, keeping warm or dry outdoors on public property. The legislation needs to be in place and effective no later than June 30, 2023. We have put in front of you some time, place, and manner regulations that we believe based on input from stakeholders to-date is likely conducive or works for the City of Sisters. We can approach this review talking in a discussion setting or walking through the ordinance in the various provisions contained within the ordinance.

City Attorney Green stated that in Exhibit A that is where the sustentative provisions of the ordinance commence. At the offset, there is a Purpose statement, and the purpose of the ordinance is to ensure that we can maintain streets, parks, and other public areas in a clean and sanitary and accessible condition.

Review a Draft Ordinance to Establish Camping Regulations

Summary Points/Background

The Sisters City Council is considering regulations concerning the time, place, and manner in which camping may occur on property owned or controlled by the City, including public rights-of-way. As part of this effort, the City has circulated a draft camping ordinance and campsite removal policy amongst various stakeholders for review and comment.

The intent of the camping ordinance is not to solve houselessness but rather comply with certain legal requirements imposed on local governments when regulating their public space. Pursuant to federal court rulings and recent Oregon legislation, a municipality cannot penalize a houseless person for resting or sleeping on public property unless adequate shelter space or available public property exists to satisfy those needs. State law requires that regulations concerning houseless camping on public property be “objectively reasonable” as to time, place, and manner.

Reasonableness is based on the totality of the circumstances. As a result, “reasonableness” will vary among Oregon’s various cities depending on their particular circumstances. Therefore, the City’s unique characteristics and the opinions of its residents help to inform what is “reasonable.”

The camping ordinance is intended to regulate the time, place, and manner in which persons may occupy public property to help make public rights-of-way accessible and safe to unhoused and housed individuals. For example:

- Time regulations concern the times of day when a person may camp on public property.
- Place regulations identify the public property where camping is not allowed such as on restricted utility facilities or parking lots.
- Manner regulations establish how an individual may camp on City property, such as the size of a camp, items in and around a camp, and prohibitions on open fires, unauthorized electrical hookups and sewage discharge onto streets.

The campsite removal policy concerns the removal and cleaning of campsites, as well as storage and disposition of personal property. The policy largely mirrors ORS 195.505 and should not be revised to provide less protection for the houseless. However, greater protections to the benefit of the houseless may be considered and implemented.

City staff would like you to review the draft camping ordinance and campsite removal policy and provide feedback to staff. This ordinance has been reviewed by houseless advocates and stakeholders and will also be reviewed by the Public Works Advisory Board before it goes to the Council at the April 12th workshop.

Purpose:

The purpose of this ordinance is to (a) maintain streets, parks, and other public areas within the City in a clean, sanitary, and accessible condition, and (b) adequately protect the health, safety, and public welfare of the community by addressing time, place, and manner regulations that identify when, where, and how camping on public property is allowed.

- Section 2 is a Definition section and throughout this ordinance there are defined terms and legal terms of art, and all captured in one section.
- Section 3 is the beginning of the Time, Place, and Manner Regulations. Time meaning, the time period within which camping is either permitted or prohibited. Place meaning, the place where camping is either permitted or prohibited, and Manner is the manner in which folks experiencing houselessness or homelessness the manner in which they are permitted to camp on public property.
- Section 3.1 – Time Regulations, that camping is prohibited on public property from the hours between the hours of 7:00 am to 8:30 pm. In the reverse, camping would be permitted between 8:31 pm and 6:59 am.
- Section 3.2 – Place Regulations, this is identified in the negative because we have found that place and manner regulations, it is easier to identify them in the negative rather than in the affirmative. We have identified the areas in which camping would be prohibited and those areas consist of rights-of-way, parking lots, public parks, and school property. Or, for safety reasons, within 100 feet of any street in which it is lawful for vehicular travel.

Board Member Connolly asked about school property and if that would include preschools?

City Attorney Green stated yes, it would. In the definition of schools, Exhibit A page 1, a preschool would very likely be inclusive and specifically where it says, or other school attended primarily by children under 18 years of age.

City Recorder Prosser stated that on the Time Regulations, this came up with the stakeholders and a discussion around this. While 7:00 am to 8:30 pm is standard and maybe a little more lenient than some other cities, the park hours are technically 5:00 am to 11:00 pm.

City Attorney Green stated that relative to other cities, a consideration where there are cities that are contemplating having different hours based on a particular area, so that is something that the city could consider. In Park A – restrict the hours from 7:00 am to 8:30 pm, but in Park B – restrict those hours from 8:00 am to 9:00 pm. These are not fixed in stone and there is flexibility both as it relates to generally the time but want to go on a location-by-location basis, etc., that is something that could be considered as well.

City Recorder Prosser stated that on 3.2 the last section for clarity – it speaks to three (3) additional addresses and those are properties that the city owns, but not yet designated parks, but more than likely will be parks – the East Portal, Woodlands north property where the city owns 3 acres, and what has been known as the Pollinator Park and those are all called out individually.

Section 3.3 – Manner Regulations, this identifies the Manner in which an individual would be permitted to camp on public property. Subsection A – that camping in a manner that reduces the clear, continuous sidewalk with no less than three feet is prohibited. We want to allow folks and pedestrian traffic to be able to use the sidewalk. Subsection C identifies that individuals that are engaged in camping are allowed to use a sleeping bag, bedroll, and other materials for bedding purposes. It goes on to address things such as fires, dumping of gray water, and other prohibitions that would be considered common sense, but important to be included under the manner portions of the regulations.

Section 4 – 4.2 Fines and Enforcement and there have been some concerns expressed about the health and safety fees. It is included in Section 4.1 at least for now, and it would go in front of the Council for feedback and comments, but it is a fee that is imposed to ensure compliance with the regulations that are established under the Time, Place, and Manner ordinance. This ordinance by no means is intended to prohibit camping on public property. An outright prohibition of camping on public property would violate the Federal and State constitution and the State Law as well. Again, it is an attempt to control and minimize any potential adverse consequences associated with these situations. The fine of \$250 is relatively consistent with other municipalities.

Board Member Baumann asked for clarification on the last two sentences of 4.2.

City Attorney Green stated that if someone violates the Time, Place, Manner Regulations, the city has the ability to impose a fine. The fine amount is identified in Section 4.2 as being not more than \$250.00, it is a Class B violation under the code, and the city is permitted to impose a fine in the amount not to exceed \$250.00.

Board Member Baumann stated that she understands this part of Section 4.2 but wants clarification whether these people are homeless and that they are exempt.

City Attorney Green stated that it is in the reverse. If someone is not currently experiencing homelessness, if that person has the means to pay for and/or obtain free access to an indoor shelter. For example, if there was a situation where we had a shelter within the City of Sisters, and there were beds and space available for that individual, the expectation would be that the individual would take advantage of that opportunity.

City Recorder Prosser stated that what happened with the Boise decision was that there was not a space for people to stay, and they were still saying that you cannot camp in our parks. Again, we do not have a shelter, but if we had a cold weather shelter, and somebody chose not to stay and chose to set up a campsite in our right-of-way where they could, that is where that fine would potentially come into play. They have an option but are not using it.

City Attorney Green stated that in order for a fine to be imposed, the act must be willful. If someone was not aware of the regulations, and otherwise violating the TPM regulations, we would not impose a fine immediately. We would notify them of the regulations, ask them and request their voluntarily compliance. If they did not remove themselves and put themselves in a position where they were complying with the TPM's, that would be a situation where an individual was willfully violating the ordinance in which case a fine could be imposed. A fine is not imposed unless someone is willfully violating the TPM Regulations.

Board Member Baumann stated that it is more with the homelessness wording in that section. She asked why that would matter if a person is breaking the law or not if they are homeless or not. If they are breaking the law – they are breaking the law.

City Attorney Green stated that it matters because if someone who is not homeless, the reality is that they would be acting willfully. This applies regardless of whether you are experiencing homelessness or not. These regulations are not limited to someone who is experiencing homelessness.

Board Member Baumann stated that one should be very careful using that word because you do not have that in any of the definitions listed, and from her own personal experience dealing with homelessness on public land and having them camp on public land for over the two week minimum in the forest, it does not matter if they are homeless or not – you cannot define them and put them in a box. If you are going to define someone by homelessness, you are going to have to do a lot of homework to define whether they are or not.

City Attorney Green stated that the reality of trying to define homelessness within an ordinance is going to be extremely problematic. There needs to be latitude extended to the enforcing public agency – the city in this case. Trying to define that term in a regulation like this would be problematic. There has been no attempt to define it other than to refer to however State guidelines or regulations may define it. When it comes to the enforcement of these regulations, there is going to be education as it relates to these regulations, trying to find other solutions before fines and fees are imposed. It is because of the sensitivity and circumstances surrounding a regulation like this.

City Attorney Green stated that it sounds like the consensus is that we should consider removing the last sentence under Section 4.2. He stated that at this time, he has no legal objection to removing that last sentence.

Board Member Baumann stated that removing the homelessness part as well, etc.

City Attorney Green stated that we can do that as well. He stated that he will take it under advisement, look and see or determine whether there are any unintended consequences, but conceptually at this point in time, he does not have an objection to that.

Section 4.3 – Campsite Removal describes the terms and conditions under which a campsite would be removed. The language is under Oregon law specifically ORS195.500. We should not provide someone who is subject to removal with any less rights because we would be violating the State law. If anything, we can provide more rights with an advance 72-hour notice. Normally, the advice to the cities is to simply dovetail, or have language consistent with State law.

Board Member Baumann asked if it would be prudent to put in the OAR or the ORS within the documents for those sections in which they are referred to.

City Attorney Green stated yes and no. It depends upon what ultimately the policy of the city is because by way of example if you are going to dovetail what is required under State law, he has no objection with referencing the statute. If you are going to provide more rights than what is required under the statute, then clearly, he would not want to expressly, or explicitly reference the statute.

City Attorney Green stated that the Campsite Removal Policy is consistent with State law as of now and he is certainly open to suggestions or changes to that, but it does and should mirror State law.

Section 5 – City Manager Authority – identifies the City Manager as being the individual responsible for administering these rules and enforcing them as appropriate.

City Recorder Prosser discussed the feedback from the stakeholder’s group on this topic and it came from the Executive Director at the joint office on homelessness. One of the things that was told to the group is that these are big walls that are being put up and that need to be put up in a lot of cities. Her take on this is that these walls need to go up and there are parameters that these people work within and when talking about administrative rules, or administrative policies, that is a softer piece inside of those. Bend just put in a whole set of administrative rules about the how, when, and a little more work for the Sheriff’s or whoever in working with these folks. These are the big walls of a city, and we are a compassionate group, so there are a lot of things to look at as they come up. It really helps with the group that works with the homeless day in and day out to understand why we had to do this and what it was for.

Board Member Buell stated that, being new to this process and he is not familiar with any problems that the city has had before, has this been an issue, a problem, or is this just the June 30th State guidelines.

City Recorder Prosser stated not within the city, but we have forest service land very close to us and for not having forest service land that it probably would be, or that it could be at any

point, but not necessarily, but this was an ORS 20/21 when it came into play with the legislature and is now coming up to that deadline of where we have to put something in place and/or rely completely on the State rules. We have park rules, we have camping rules, but we do not have anything that goes to this extent.

Board Member Buell asked about the enforcement of this and if it would be the Deschutes County Police.

City Recorder Prosser stated that more than likely, if we got to the point of camps and having to remove camps that it would be in partnership with the Deschutes County Sheriff's Office (DCSO) Officers that work in the city who are out working with the houseless population quite frequently and do a great job with that right now. We have a contract with the Deschutes County Sheriff's to work within our city. We have a lieutenant and three officers that work for the City of Sisters, and it would be that group working with us.

Board Member Connolly stated that for historical reference as a City Council member in 2021, this came to City Council, and we said that we are going to kick it down the road to see what the State comes up with, what other municipalities come up with to save us time since we had other issues happening. It was not a big issue with camping in the city limits, and it saved taxpayer money because City Attorney Green has done the groundwork in other cities for this. That is why it is coming up now because there is a deadline and Council needs to take action. We tentatively addressed it in 2021 and pushed it down the road.

Board Member Coonrod asked for clarification on the language about the City Manager having the authority to administer the rules, what does that look like operationally, and is the City Manager aware of any problem, etc. Then, it is not necessarily the City Manager that would be giving the fines the individuals.

City Recorder Prosser stated that it could look a couple different ways. On the Administrative Rules, we put a lot into play during COVID, where there were things that we had to put into play fast and we did. It could be Administrative Rules where we are expecting ten (10) days of negative 10 degrees weather and we are not going to enforce this policy. If people are coming in and running extension cords, we are going to let them do that. An example of that would be where they take the Administrative Policy and say that we are going to do something different right now. When it comes down to the fines of the individuals, they would most likely be cited by Code Enforcement. One of the reasons there was some pushback on that \$35 dollar fine which is 4.1 versus 4.2 which is the \$250. The 4.1 to the stakeholder group felt punitive for folks that did not already have funds, and that was for the cleanup costs, and covering the city for someone that we could contract with to clean. They felt that this should be removed and is now just in a discussion with all the groups.

Director Bertagna stated that this is necessary and what we have in the books today is a right-of-way camping ordinance which does well because we do allow camping in the right-of-way, but you need to have a permit. There are a lot of Time, Manner, and Place restrictions there. This ties into all the other public property and see this as long-term as well as the State requirements.

City Recorder Prosser stated that the \$35 dollars is under discussion. It was initially in there, we had the stakeholder group that did not like it, and thought it was punitive. The cleanup of a camp where folks do not have the money to clean it up. This version is going to be passed through the Public Works Board and the City Council. It will be the determination of all those groups whether they want it in there or not, etc.

Board Member Baumann asked if there was not a monetary amount associated with this fine, what would be the alternative to show a consequence by not doing this again type of action.

City Recorder Prosser stated that would be the \$250 dollar fine – the 4.2. That is the consequence of moving through that process.

City Attorney Green stated that is the reason why the term “willful” has been expressed and included in Section 4.2.

City Recorder Prosser stated to the Board if there is anything that you want to send to her via email, maybe read through it a little more, and if you have questions for clarity, feel free to do that. We would like to have that feedback by April 14, 2023, since she will have worked with the rest of the groups at that point.

Creekside Park Memorial

Director Bertagna stated that we received a request to put a memorial in the campground side of Creekside Park. We are in the process of drafting an agreement with the family for maintenance and ownership which legal is working on as we speak. Mr. Knight is here to update us on the family’s progress and the actual project process with the memorial.

Kris Knight, Executive Director with the Upper Deschutes Watershed Council presented an update on the Creekside Park project and that they are very pleased with how it is performing. We repaired the fish passage issue where the sewer line went under the creek and the eroding bank. He discussed the split rail fencing that is now up fencing off the stream, and the four access points of the stairsteps down to the creek. We had almost 400 students and community members out for planting native plants along the stream banks last fall, and so the only remaining thing to do is interpretive signs, and we have three of those signs already planned.

Andrew Dutterer Memorial

Mr. Knight stated that Andrew Dutterer worked for the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board over in Salem. He was an advocate for Whychus Creek, and was the partnerships coordinator for our Watershed Council, and for a group of partners called the Deschutes Partnership. He brought a lot of grant funding to Whychus Creek for various projects being involved in including Creekside Park. He has been working with the family on a way to do a memorial for the family, and they have funding they want to use. We were trying to think of a good place in the Deschutes Basin to put a memorial, and Creekside Park rose as a good option. It is a place where people can visit easily. He gave a visual of where they wanted to locate this memorial.

Mr. Knight stated that the Creekside Park Memorial would be in honor of Andrew Dutterer. He stated that the Creekside Park Memorial would include a wooden bench carved from a ponderosa log by a local artist, Skip Armstrong. The bench would also include carvings of fish, streams, wildlife, animals, landscapes, etc. The memorial would also include a boulder like the rocks used for stone steps, with a plaque on rock that memorializes Andrew. An interpretive sign is also proposed but not part of the memorial, but rather another sign in addition to the two planned interpretive signs. The family is currently reviewing the agreement proposed by the City of Sisters with a couple outstanding items to discuss. The family has a foundation, or a memorial fund that will be the signatory to the agreement. He has been working with the family, as well as Director Bertagna, and working with the City Attorney to finalize that hopefully soon and get that finalized.

Mr. Knight stated that the last piece of this is an interpretive sign, but this component is already part of the larger Creekside Park Project. It is something that the Watershed Council will be leading – one of three signs. One sign will be about the history of Whychus Creek, one sign will be about the restoration work that happened by the city and the Watershed Council, and the third sign that would go near the memorial is going to be about partnerships and collaboration that Andrew was all about. We will talk about the partnerships between the Watershed Council and the City. We will talk about all the other groups such as the Forest Service, the Deschutes River Conservancy, the Deschutes Land Trust, Three Sisters Irrigation District with all the work that has been done to restore Whychus Creek.

Mr. Knight stated that there has been a change in policy, the city wanted an agreement, and the family is willing to do that. We are working through some additional comments with the City Attorney, etc. The next step would be getting the memorial approved by the City Council.

Director Bertagna stated that the good thing about this is that we are establishing the correct precedence and is a lot more formalized which is just a part of a small city growing up.

Board Vice Chair Curtis stated that she felt it necessary to have a screening criteria in place for a policy going forward because there is the potential for more requests, and to have a consistent and fair way to get these processed.

Director Bertagna stated that this falls under the Public Art policy – memorials are described in there, and the actual approval goes through the City Council. This Board will make a recommendation to the City Council, and they will act on it.

Board Member Connolly stated that as a parent that has a memorial bench at the School District property at the High School, she really appreciates formalizing the agreement because for 14 years it has been an uneasy feeling knowing that that bench was being moved from one intended spot to another spot to another depending on what the school was doing at any given time. The maintenance of the bench, we have always taken upon ourselves, but there are other benches on the school property that have fallen into disrepair. This alleviates concerns for parents, family members, City employees, School District employees going forward. Maybe this is something that we should thoughtfully share with the School District as it is approved, and we have a framework to help them with the decisions they are making, or not making.

Mr. Knight stated that part of the reason that this could work is because there are the benches at Creekside Park that the Kiwanis Club have donated that has the memorial plaque. In talking with Director Bertagna, talking with the family, and others that may be involved, we were looking for a spot that might not have a bench and this could be an additive to the park. It is along the trail by the Campground, the trail goes down to the access point, and this is a place not only for the family, but people will be able to sit there on that bench and look out over the project and just enjoy Whychus Creek.

Board Vice Chair Curtis made a motion to recommend the placement and design of the proposed memorial to the City Council. The Board agreed. Motion passes.

Arbor Day 2023 Tree Planting

Planner Shoup stated that the Tree City USA Program has been a designated Tree City since 2007 – 16 years! To maintain the Tree City USA designation the following steps are needed:

- The community must have a tree board or department (Urban Forestry Board).
- The community must have established a community ordinance for tree care.
- There must be a community forestry program with an annual budget of at least \$2 per capita.
- The community must have an Arbor Day observance and proclamation.

Planner Shoup stated that the Benefits of a Tree include:

- Trees help clean our air and reduce the effects of climate change. Roadside trees reduce nearby indoor air pollution by more than 50 percent.
- Trees provide much-needed cooling and help us save energy. Trees lower surface and air temperature by providing shade. Shaded surfaces may be 20-45 degrees cooler than the peak temperatures of unshaded materials.
- Trees help reduce crime. In Baltimore, a 10 percent increase in tree canopy corresponded to a 12 percent decrease in crime.
- Trees are a good investment in our public dollars. Every dollar spent on planting and caring for a community tree yield benefits that are two to five times that investment – benefits that include cleaner air, lower energy costs, improved water quality and storm water control and increased property values.
- Trees contribute to our health.

Planner Shoup stated that the Arbor Day Celebration for 2022 included the Mayor’s Arbor Day Proclamation at City Council. An article in the Nugget Newspaper about Arbor Day, and a Tree Planting event with the Montessori Preschool students.

Planner Shoup stated that the Arbor Day for 2023 Event Planning will be held at Clemens Park on Friday, April 28, 2023, at 10:00 am. The objective for this event is to educate the community about the importance of trees in our urban environment, and host local students to help plant the six (6) new trees with City Staff and Public Works Crew. There is not a lot of shade, and this park is due for some more trees. Cliff Clemens Park is surrounded by residential districts – it is along Larch Street and goes up to the Post Office as well as the Sheriff’s Office. In recent years there have been Arbor Day planting celebrations events at

Cliff Clemens and how some of the trees along the west side of the playground were planted as well as along the street. Looking at this year, we are thinking of planting those (6) trees around the playground areas as well as the seating or sitting areas. She stated that she would defer to Director Bertagna on where the best spot is to place them regarding shade and where it is needed most as well as irrigation availability.

Director Bertagna stated that they are looking at some maple trees and a few oak trees and trying to get some diversity in that area. He said that when the trees are planted, they are about 2-inch calibers, 10-12 feet tall and they are good size trees.

Planner Shoup asked the Board if they knew of any classes or teachers that might be good to reach out and invite them to the tree planting event. In recent years, she has had a hard time connecting with the teachers because they are so busy, but it is always helpful to get some perspective from all of you. She gave examples of the different parks where future tree plantings could take place – Sun Ranch, East Portal, etc.

Board Members Madrone and Sarver said that they would reach out to the schools and teachers to see if they can get children to participate.

V. UPDATE FROM SISTERS PARKS AND RECREATION DISTRICT

Jennifer Holland, SPRD Representative, was not in attendance at this meeting.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS / OPEN DISCUSSION

A brief discussion took place regarding the Barclay Park area and if there is anything planned in that area.

Director Bertagna stated that they did rehab the grass and got the irrigation all put back together and reseeded it. It is going to stay that way until in the Parks Master Plan there is a project to repurpose and go through a design process for that entire south end of the park.

Director Woodford stated that he did forward to the Board the final draft of the Parks Master Plan. It did get approved by the City Council in February, but they did not adopt the ordinance that night in case there were some changes. There were a few changes that did need to be made so we delayed it to give the consultants a little more time to put a final/final draft together. They have done that and will go back to the City Council for final adoption of the ordinance. If they do that, then the plan will be valid 30 days after that.

Director Bertagna stated that the biggest next step is a System Development Charges (SDC) update, we will have a new Capitol Improvement Plan (CIP), and we will hire a consultant and do a SDC study and with that decide which projects are SDC eligible that developers pay when they development in town. That starts setting the prioritization of that CIP and this Board will be a big part of it because we want as many people as possible walking side by side with us through that fun of updating the SDC's. When saying "updating" that means increasing SDC's, etc. with the Council goals for 2023/2024 is to update those fees.

VII. ADJOURN

Board Chair Madrone adjourned the meeting at 5:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Jenkins, Recording Secretary