



Planning Commission Minutes  
Thursday, November 2, 2023 – 4:00 PM  
City Hall Council Chambers, 520 E. Cascade Avenue, Sisters, OR 97759

Chairman: Jeff Seymour  
Commissioners: Cris Converse, Art Blumenkron, Vikki Hickman, Tom Ries  
Absent: Jeremy Dickman, Sarah McDougall  
City Staff: Scott Woodford, Community Development Director, Matt Martin,  
Principal Planner, Emme Shoup, Associate Planner  
Recording Secretary: Carol Jenkins, Recording Secretary

I. CALL TO ORDER / DETERMINATION OF QUORUM / ADOPTION OF AGENDA

*Chairman Seymour* called the work session to order at 4:00 pm.

A quorum was established. Adoption of Agenda – November 2, 2023.

*Commissioner Blumenkron* made a motion to approve the Agenda November 2, 2023, as proposed.

*Vice Chairman Converse* seconded. Motion passes.

II. VISITOR COMMUNICATION - None

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – September 21, 2023

*Vice Chairman Converse* made a motion to approve the minutes for September 21, 2023.

*Commissioner Blumenkron* seconded. Motion passes.

IV: WORK SESSION

A. Community Involvement – Review of the City of Sisters Community Involvement Tools and Recommendations for Improvement.

*Director Woodford* stated that the Action Requested is for feedback from the Planning Commission on the Community Involvement tools the city uses to inform the public on land use applications and other city projects and its recommendations for improving the program.

Background: The City of Sisters values public input because it often results in better decisions and projects and, to that end, utilizes a variety of tools to inform the public about pending development applications and long-range planning projects such as updating the Comprehensive Plan to ensure that the input is considered in decision making that impacts the community. One of the underpinnings of the State of Oregon land use system is robust public involvement, as it is considered fundamental to good land planning. In fact, Citizen Involvement is the first goal of the Statewide Planning Goals for and is a concept that is required to be implemented in each Oregon community required Comprehensive Plan.

Goal 1 of the Statewide Planning Goals (Citizen Involvement) calls for the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process. Further, it requires each city and county to have a citizen involvement program that addresses the following themes:

- Opportunities for widespread public involvement.
- Effective two-way communication with the public.
- Making technical information easy to understand.
- Feedback mechanisms for policymakers to respond to public input.
- Adequate financial support for public involvement efforts.

Goal 1 also calls for local governments to have a committee for citizen involvement (CCI) to monitor and encourage public participation in planning, which is often the Planning Commission. In the Sisters Comprehensive Plan, Section 1 is the implementation of the Citizen Involvement statewide goal (we entitle it “Public Involvement”). This chapter contains a set of Goals, Objectives, and Policies specific to Sisters that are based on input the community provided during the update to the Comprehensive Plan in 2021.

Two of the policies require reviewing and recommending improvements of current tools for public involvement in Sisters.

- Policy 1.1.1 – The Community Involvement Program will be directed by the City’s Planning Commission, sitting as the Committee for Community Involvement. The Planning Commission shall seek multiple methods to support and cultivate additional, new, and ever-expanding community involvement opportunities including working directly with a diversity of organizations to amplify opportunities for involvement.
- Policy 1.1.2 – The Planning Commission shall annually evaluate the City’s public involvement tools and processes and report its findings in writing to the City Council along with recommendations as appropriate for improving the program.

The goal of this work session is to review the public involvement tools in place and for the Planning Commission, as the Committee for Community Involvement, to evaluate them and the processes and report its findings in writing to the City Council, along with recommendations as appropriate for improving the program.

*Planner Martin* stated that he wanted to cover the nuts and bolts and what is in the code that we prescribed in facilitating that opportunity for community and public involvement in our processes. Some of this comes down from the State level through State law that dictates how our process begins and ends ultimately with potential appeals through our processes. The Planning Commission is a branch of that review process through the Type III reviews and wanted to acknowledge what is in the code today to disseminate information and solicit public involvement in collaboration with the land use process.

Land Use Review: To be able to evaluate the program, one needs to know what the current regimen is. In terms of land use review, the Sisters Development Code (SDC) prescribes in detail the requirements for notification of the public.

Type I (Final plats, short-term rentals, home occupations permit, lot line adjustments, ADU’s, sign permits, etc.). These are Mineserial Reviews done by staff that do not require discretion.

- Mail Notice \* (No); Published Notice \*\* (No); Posted Notice \*\*\* (No).
- Appeals: LUBA of staff decision.

Type II (Site plan review, minor variance, partitions, minor conditional use, etc.).

An administrative review done by staff. Written comments in the record are encouraged.

- Mailed Notice \* (Yes); Published Notice \*\* (No); Posted Notice \*\*\* (Yes).
- Appeals: Planning Commission or staff decision.

Type III (Subdivision, conditional use, master plan, cottage development, etc.).

The Planning Commission is the review body.

- Mailed Notice \* (Yes); Published Notice \*\* (Yes); Posted Notice \*\*\* (Yes).
- Appeals: City Council of Planning Commission Decision.

Type IV (Comprehensive Plan, zone map or development code text amendments, etc.).

This is a Legislative Review and those are changes to code, zoning, etc., that have a citywide impact. A requirement of State Law is to send notice to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD).

- Mailed Notice \* (Yes); Published Notice \*\* (Yes); Posted Notice \*\*\* (Yes).
- Appeals: LUBA of Council decision (based on Planning Commission recommendation).

\* Required to be sent to all property owners within 250 feet of the subject property.

\*\* Published in the classifieds section of the Sisters Nugget Newspaper.

\*\*\* Posted Notice is a yellow, real estate sized sign on a subject site that includes pertinent information about a proposed land use action.

*Commissioner Blumenkron* asked if there could be something else in the newspaper other than the Classified Ads section. Maybe a short article or a bigger ad space where people would notice what is going on and help to get people involved in certain hearings.

*Planner Martin* stated that is valuable input and is identifying if we need to consider changing the prescribed code or using the Nugget Newspaper and other media outlets as an opportunity to broaden that and elevate that to administration if we need to, etc. We have a good relationship with the Nugget and a chance to either send more information if it is through a press release or a direct contact, etc. and describing the information and process in a clear way so that everybody understands the rules of engagement – where we are at and where we are headed.

*Chairman Seymour* asked how much input the applicant has with respect to the information that is published and formatted before it is published. For example, if someone comes in with a Type III Master Plan application, can the applicant say what they want in the article, or do you just post it like all the other ones, etc.

*Planner Martin* stated that is the tricky relationship with any kind of written or press publication related to an application. On our side on the notices, we have the requirements within our code of what the information that is required within the notices – how it is presented on the notices, we do have some discretion. With respect to our formal notices, there is no specific input from the applicant – we use a standardized format with the information that is required to be provided.

*Director Woodford* stated that we do not initiate the articles, they are initiated by the press, and we hope that they get a balanced view on things by asking the city what is going on but getting in touch with the applicant as well. They do not always get both perspectives, but it is not something that we use as a tool. There are some exceptions such as long-range planning

projects where we would go out of our way to alert the Nugget to get the word out when it is more of a community wide kind of policy. We do not do that generally with land use applications.

*Planner Martin* stated that in the procedure's ordinance is an opportunity, or a discussion of Neighborhood Meetings. The city encourages the applicants to meet with the abutting property owners or neighborhood representatives to introduce a project in advance of making the application. He stated that in his experience, it has been an incredibly effective tool for an applicant outside of any formal city process to sit down and reach out to those neighbors to get the layout and specifics of the proposal and provide an opportunity for that conversation and input in advance of that application formally being submitted to the city. That is a chance for concerns, issues, or support regarding an application so that an applicant can either make some revisions to be more accommodating to the community – and if not, they will understand those concerns that the community may have moving into the formal process. While it is encouraged, it is not a formal requirement at this point of requiring those neighborhood meetings.

*Vice Chairman Converse* stated that it says 'it may be required' and has anybody ever done that.

*Planner Martin* stated that as noted and highlighted, the Community Development Director or designee could require an applicant to go through that process and hold a formal neighborhood meeting.

*Director Woodford* stated that some applicants have done it on their accord, but we have not done that yet, but something we are reconsidering and understanding is an effective tool that we should be utilizing more. It may be just a matter of what is the policy in terms of what types of applications would require it to be consistent, etc. It is in the code, and a tool we can use, but we want to hear more from the Planning Commission and how we would utilize it. We did do an outreach for Heavenly Acres from UAR to Multi-Family or Public Facilities, but the city reached out to the property owners directly and informed them of this process. Certainly, Master Plans would immediately jump to mind because those are the largest development that we see.

*Planner Martin* stated that we have not identified the magic application type or size, but Master Plans, land division of acreage, number of lots over five acres in size, or 50 lots, etc. With a site plan review that is square footage more than 4,000-5,000 square feet of footprint, etc. For Conditional Uses, those are uses that have either unique conditions that are applied to those or criteria, or compatibility associated with those uses. That kind of use may warrant some kind of initial engagement with neighbors to understand more of the project and have a chance to answer questions in a more informal pre-application form rather than the public forum that we have here at public hearings.

*Commissioner Hickman* stated that she can see that process working well if the city evolves to having neighborhood committees. It would make it that much easier to know who the meeting is going to be with and could turn into being a standard process.

*Planner Martin* stated that with this standard and not being detailed, it gives us a chance to establish internal policies, or adopt specific criteria to apply this encouraged type of standard with flexibility and have a general framework instead of trying to avoid an arbitrary application, etc.

*Director Woodford* stated that since we do not have Neighborhood Associations here in Sisters – we could establish a 250 ft. or 500 ft. buffer to get people who could be affected by this property or development to get them involved early on. The developer would be responsible for sending out the notice of the date of the meeting, etc.

*Vice Chairman Converse* stated that it is important for the people having the meeting that they do not get to tell the person that has the property what they need to do. It would be the applicant hearing it because they require the applicant to meet with them, and it may lead people to think that the applicants need to do what they are telling them.

*Chairman Seymour* stated that everything we do is technical, and this is a totally subjective thing. It is either required, or not, and is it the city's place to tell a property owner that they need to engage with the public with respect to doing something on their property that they have the right to do.

*Planner Martin* stated that this is excellent feedback and looks to the director to elevate it and prioritize some type of amendment, standardize it, and establish – when, how, what way we would be requiring this kind of meeting. What kind of information is presented, what kind of documentation of what is presented and who was contacted, etc.

*Chairman Seymour* stated that it is great to have the flexibility to be able to do this and totally see the value there, but there is a flip side to it as well.

*Commissioner Ries* stated that with his limited experience on this Planning Commission has been where we take a lot of comments about staff, the City Council, and the Planning Commission cramming stuff down people's throats. It is like here is another project and we are okaying, or rubber stamping it, and given that kind of a meeting where neighbors in that area by development would be able to meet with the developer and would explain what he is going to do. In the case of Sunset Meadows behind Bi-Mart, they were concerned because there was no buffer between them and this new development. It looks like they got a little bit of a buffer, but that stuff can be solved way ahead of time. People do not choose to get informed, look on the website, or look for the notices in the paper that there is an upcoming hearing.

*Commissioner Hickman* stated that once neighborhoods seem to be more organized into zones or areas, the group will become more educated in how the process functions. For the applicant, this could be very helpful.

*Chairman Seymour* stated that yes, they should engage in community involvement before the application is submitted. We have seen the difference between developments that have done that like the Woodlands – they did a great job of getting people on board before the application was submitted and by the time the Planning Commission heard the application and made the decision, everyone was on board. Clear Pine was like that, but the developer

spent two years getting people in Trapper Point on board and it was a process. There were a lot of concessions made and a lot of haggling during the hearings. We have experienced a few different ones like Hayden Homes where there has been less community outreach.

*Commissioner Blumenkron* stated that then the people feel like they have been blindsided by the developer.

*Planner Martin* stated that the Commission has touched on many of the issues that come to the staff's mind and how to facilitate a good robust constructive process throughout.

*Planner Martin* stated that in closing comments what he has highlighted is what is in the code. There are modest additional notices that we try and offer posting Notice of Application and Decisions on the bulletin board, at the Post Office, and on the City's website for tracking purposes.

#### Notices:

Type II permit requires 14 calendar days to submit written comments before a decision is made. Once a decision has been made, it is mailed to the anyone who submitted written comments with information on how to appeal a decision (which must be done within 14 days of mailing). Example of a Public Notice is attached in Attachment B.

Type III notices are sent 14 calendar days prior to the hearing date, published in the newspaper, and posted on the site. Public testimony is taken at the hearing and decisions are mailed to participants of record. Appeals are to the City Council and must be made within 14 days of the notice of decision.

Type IV notification is not less than 20 days goes to property owners whose property would be rezoned to implement a comprehensive plan amendment and any affected governmental agency, among others, and are published in the newspaper for 14 calendar days. Public testimony is taken at public hearings and written correspondence is included in staff reports.

Neighborhood Meetings: The SDC "encourages" applicants to meet with the neighborhood prior to submittal of a land use application to solicit input and exchange information about the proposed development and, in some cases, the Community Development Director may "require" the applicant to meet with adjacent property owners or neighborhood representatives prior to accepting an application as complete.

#### Other Planning Outreach:

Long range planning projects include the various master plans guiding land use and growth (the Comprehensive Plan), utilities (Water and Wastewater Master Plans), traffic (Transportation System Plan and parks (Parks Master Plan). We also do projects like the Housing Plan update and the Efficiency Measures. Amending the SDC is a long-range planning project where we are changing policy through the code. While these are often processed as Type IV applications and therefore have required noticing, we also use other tools to create awareness, such as:

- Comprehensive Plan
- Project Website
- Online Open Houses
- In person open houses
- Community Conversations
- Direct Mailers
- Nugget Articles
- Citizen Advisory Committees & Stakeholder Advisory Committee
- Park Pop Up Events, Community Tabling Events
- City website
- Announcements Page
- Notable Active Project page
  - Project web pages for larger land use applications/text amendments with review schedule, staff reports, project record, and staff contact.
- Land Use Notices/Decisions on website
  - Facebook
  - E-Notifications
- Sign up on the city website for automatic emails on all city related boards and committee packets, City Announcements, community meetings, etc.
  - Sisters Nugget.
  - Agendas posted at post office, city hall lobby, city website.
  - All City board and committee packets posted on the city website.

Looking to the Future:

In terms of new tools or efforts we could implement we again look the Public Involvement chapter of the Sisters Comprehensive Plan and its overall goal:

Offer a wide variety of traditional and contemporary tools and opportunities that enable and empower a diverse population of residents, business owners, private organizations, and partner agencies located inside and outside City limits to participate in all land use processes.

Underneath the overall goal of this chapter are policies to help guide future outreach efforts, including the following (paraphrased for brevity – the full policies:

- Provide funding for outreach efforts.
- Report regularly on implementation of Sisters Vision action items.
- Educate community members on municipal operations and encourage civic engagement.
- Identify barriers to community engagement.
- Seek opportunities to present planning process or specific project info to community organizations, especially ones that reach historically lesser involved residents.
- Reach out to lesser involved residents and encourage them to apply to be on city volunteer boards.
- Provide information to reach policy decisions on the city website and use minimal technical jargon.
- Document the public assessment recommendations of CCI (Committee for Community Involvement).

- Respond to community members who have participated in community engagement activities.
- Consider appointing a designated staff member who can help community members understand and interpret city plans and regulations.

In addition, one of the City Council goals this year is to “develop and implement a community outreach plan” that will also provide recommendations.

Again, the goal of this work session is for the Planning Commission, as the Committee for Community Involvement, to evaluate the City’s public involvement tools and processes and report its findings in writing to the City Council along with recommendations as appropriate for improving the program. Recommendations could also include ideas not represented here, so bring your ideas to the work session for discussion.

*Planner Shoup* stated that she was going to discuss Community Engagement Tools for Long-Range Planning Projects.

Long Range Planning – Long-range planning projects have a city-wide impact and are an opportunity for the community to get involved and provide guidance.

- Sisters Country Vision (2018-2019).
- Comprehensive Plan (2020-2021).
- Housing & Land Efficiency Measures (2022-2023).
- Dark Skies Standards (2022 – ongoing).

#### Communication Tools

- City Website with announcements and project specified webpages.
- E- Notifications.
- Paper Outreach (direct mailers, Nugget articles, press-releases, posting agendas, project flyers in English and Spanish.
- Social Media (City Facebook).

#### Gathering Public Input

- Open Houses (in-person and virtual).
- Surveys.
- Public Comments, Letters and Written Record.
- Passive Engagement: “Community Web” Art Installation.

#### Direct Engagement

- Community and Stakeholder Advisory Committees (via Zoom).
- Community Engagement Tabling Sessions (In-Person).
- Community Conversations (via Zoom).

#### Community Conversations – 130 Participants

- C4C Let’s Talk (October 19, 2020).
- Urban Forestry Board (November 9, 2020).
- Planning Commission (November 19, 2020).
- Sisters Folk Festival (November 30, 2020).



- Sisters Historical Society (December 1, 2020).
- Sisters Chamber of Commerce (December 1, 2020).
- City Park Advisory Board (December 2, 2020).
- Seed to Table (December 4, 2020).
- Traded Sector (December 9, 2020).
- Sisters Trail Association (January 6, 2021).
- Sisters Lions Club (January 7, 2021).
- Habitat for Humanity (January 14, 2021).
- Sisters Middle School Leadership Class (January 20, 2021).
- Sisters Rotary (January 21, 2021).
- Age Friendly Sisters Country (January 22, 2021).
- Central Oregon Area Realtors (January 29, 2021).
- Sisters Fight for Social Justice (February 17, 2021).
- Sisters Houseless Networking Group (March 2, 2021).

In-Person Tabling Events – 125+ Participants

Livability – Policy Goal: Maintain and enhance the livability of Sisters as a welcoming community with a high quality of life and strong community identity. What makes a neighborhood great (livable):

- Townhomes
- Multi-Family
- Dark Skies
- Bike Ability
- Sidewalks
- Single-Family
- Trees
- Quality Design
- Vista Views
- Nature
- Sustainability
- Trails
- Parks and Community Spaces

Discussion: Examples:

- Utilize the “Neighborhood Meeting” code provision more often.
- Using social media outreach tools to disseminate information about City projects and operations (e.g., short informative videos).
- Staff implement outreach opportunities that “meet people where they are at”.

*Director Woodford* stated that this was an overview of what we do, our practices, and we think it works well for the most part but does not mean that we cannot be better with the Commissions creative thoughts, some things that you would like to see us pursue, and things that we can report back to Council on.

*Commissioner Ries* stated that he wanted to talk about the neighborhood meetings idea and has lived in Sisters for six years now and came into the Saddlestone community HOA, and out of the 83 lots there were only 10 homes built at the time. In the last two years, we have done a complete buildout, and now the HOA is their own board, and no longer the developer’s board. In that short

period of time, we have so many people that have moved into the neighborhood, and it seems like a lot of them are upset with the HOA because we do not have the meetings. He stated that he does not know any of the neighbors in this development and plans on having a neighborhood meeting, and not an HOA meeting just to explain the history of Saddlestone's existence since 2007 when it first started. The neighborhood concept is a great idea and getting the information out related to people coming to Sisters and the growth that is happening.

*Planner Martin* asked Commission Ries where they might be having the neighborhood meeting.

*Commissioner Ries* stated at the Three Creeks Conference Center. The library is not taking any reservations, and the Fire Department is full. The neighborhood meeting will be at 3:00 pm and the annual board meeting will be at 4:00 pm. Only one board member will be attending this, and it will only be regarding historical questions.

*Chairman Seymour* stated that having more informal neighborhood meetings with Council, Planning Commission, and staff in a less formal atmosphere where there are questions and answers for opportunities for the public to be able to ask 'why does it work like this'? Kind of like a fireside chat. That is the feedback that he has received from the community members because there is a lot of misunderstanding and curiosity out there that with instant gratification and social media world things get spun and people do not know what is right and what is wrong, and this would be a good opportunity to set the record straight – what the limitations are and what the history is over the last 20 years from a development standpoint.

*Commissioner Hickman* asked if would be helpful or valuable to look at the city map and make districts so that it shows the different community groups that are being represented, and they could come with their grievances, questions, or ideas in that format. Then, when they come to the Planning Commission, they have consolidation in what they want to say instead of having 10 people saying the exact same thing and have a more organized approach with guidelines, etc.

*Commissioner Ries* stated that nobody is stopping people from doing that and people could do it now.

*Chairman Seymour* stated that he is surprised that the City Council has not taken it upon themselves to do this as elected officials. It would behoove them to initiate this on their own and talk with their constituents and get support, listen to what they want, etc. On an on-going basis, they should be talking to the public about what is going on because that is what we have hired them to do.

*Commissioner Hickman* asked if this is the goal of this work session as the Committee for Community Involvement to evaluate them, and the process and report the findings in writing to the City Council along with recommendations, etc.

*Planner Martin* stated that this discussion is talking about two different themes – one being the neighborhood associations or districts, and the other is general townhall meetings getting out to the public informally.

*Commissioner Ries* stated that this meeting was advertised, and we have one visitor here so that is part of the disconnect currently because people do not want to do those kinds of things.

A discussion was held regarding the neighborhood meetings, where they would be held, would people attend, roles of the Planning Commission and City Council, and have it be a casual dialogue with the public.

Kathy Russell, 1006 W. Collier Glacier Dr., Sisters, OR 97759

*Ms. Russell* stated that there are two things that come to mind because it is frustrating to come up here and stand and give ideas and points of view and get no feedback. Then, you feel and wonder if anyone was listening. With that conversation to use as an example – the UGB, it would be helpful to hear a conversation between the Commissioners or the Council about their vision of adding land without any thought or vision of what it could look like. She said that she comes to the workshops to hear what the Planning Commission is thinking, and then understands what happens in the formal meetings. It seems like there is better community input with long-range projects, but there is a disconnect and people do not understand when developments come in. Somehow, with a conversation with the community to understand we have a vision, but the codes are the key – the people can come and give all kinds of input, but if it does not fit the code – then you need to pass it. There needs to be a way out of a code so that there are rules, but you need to be flexible somehow to make it adapt to the situation – not strictly about numbers – it is about the people living here, how that is going to impact their lives, and the code does not reflect that.

*Vice Chairman Converse* asked for clarification that Ms. Russell wants more informal conversations to help people understand the process, etc.

*Commissioner Blumenkron* stated that the Commission and staff have tried to get the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code to match better because that is a big issue – if the Development Code does not match the Comprehensive Plan.

*Planner Martin* stated that we have our Development Code, and any new or current applications are reviewed against that. The Comprehensive Plan was adopted two years ago – we are at the forefront of that process of implementing that plan with any of our long-range planning or legislative processes are working towards implementing those policies. It is an evolution and codifying those policies that are in the Comprehensive Plan – a 20-year document. Those are the priorities that either the staff has identified or what the City Council noted in a goal that you shall do this to bring a portion of the code into conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.

*Vice Chairman Converse* stated that what she heard is more informal communication between the people, Planning Commission and City Council.

*Director Woodford* stated that he wanted to address Ms. Russell's comments and he can understand when making a public comment at a meeting and it is like 'silence'. It is like they did not hear me, did they not agree with me, and that is not the case when at a Council meeting. The public comments at the beginning of the meeting are not designed to stop the meeting and have a conversation about that topic. They do hear the people and often, when sticking around until the end of the meeting is when the Council starts and can bring those topics up and have that discussion and direction on public comment that comes up. That is something that we will bring up to the Council.

*Planner Martin* stated that with the Planning Commission and City Council to have more informal opportunities and what are those opportunities, techniques, or suggestions for staff to get the word out outside of the formal processes that we are limited to. He asked if there are other tools or things that we could or should be thinking about and where can we as staff provide that input.

*Planner Shoup* stated that our social media is underutilized but also not well received and there is not a lot of engagement on the social media. We considered Instagram a couple years ago and did a pilot project with C4C and collaborated with them on posting City content, their content – and we received some content but not much better than Facebook already has. She shared a video that talks about what city projects and operations are, but building those relationships that people are wanting to know who that person is and what projects they are directly working on, etc. Building those relationships helps facilitate those more informal conversations, bring some awareness, and get people talking to each other.

*Planner Martin* stated that the city is actively recruiting a Deputy Recorder and Communications Coordinator for just these topics. We will have a dedicated professional to that outreach with some of those new techniques and tools, a more structured outreach program and a point person.

*Commissioner Hickman* stated that something she came across called ‘Thought Exchange’ is great for the public sector and a way for people to do surveys, get information, data can be compiled and could be very useful for the city. We want to do something beneficial for the city and for everybody that lives here.

*Director Woodford* stated that we are starting to do more with the city website expanding the capabilities of it with individual project websites that we maintain to provide information to folks and keeping people updated on the meetings, packets, and hopefully people find that useful. We are talking about a Growth Management page in advance of the Urban Growth Boundary amendment discussion to explain some of the background and educate people on why this process is even being considered in the first place. We hope to continue to make that a better and more useful tool for people as a ‘go-to’ to help with education, etc.

*Director Woodford* stated that this input has been interesting, and he will summarize and share it with the City Council, but maybe share it with the Commission first to make sure that we heard what was said correctly. There is good stuff here, stuff that the Council needs to hear, and stuff that we heard that we could take away. Hopefully, everyone found this exercise fruitful and is always a good idea to talk about this.

*Director Woodford* stated at the next hearing, we will talk about the Dark Sky Ordinance for adoption. The packet will come out next week, there has been a lot of work done on it, and a lot of feedback from the Commission, the City Council, and community and hopefully, we got it this time.

*Chairman Seymour* asked if the Public Works Department determined the cost of making the public and private lighting coming into conformance.

*Director Woodford* stated that they did get cost estimates for changing out the fixtures for all the lights – there are 26 of them, and the estimate was about \$100,000 to change them out. We were hopeful that we could make low-cost adjustments to those lights to make them conform. Public

Works has gone out and put some tape along the outside of those fixtures to cut down on the glare and has worked well. Unfortunately, to get the Dark Sky's certification, they have to be fully shielded.

*Director Woodford* stated that on November 8, 2023, the City Council will be discussing the Urban Growth Boundary and if they want to direct staff to go forward with the UGB amendment or not.

*Director Woodford* discussed the Appeal for Brunchies and Council upheld the Commissions Decision which upheld staff's decision. It is past the timeline for an appeal to LUBA which we were concerned about.

V. STAFF AND COMMISSIONER UPDATES - None.

VI. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Jenkins, Recording Secretary

