

SISTERS COMP PLAN MEETING MINUTES  
COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
VIA ZOOM  
19 MAY 2021

<b>COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:</b> Dixie Eckford Spencer Hamiga Katie Roberts Rachel Ruppel Adrian Shaw Sharlene Weed Art Blumenkron Kevin Cramer Julianne Horner Greg Willitts	<b>STAFF PRESENT:</b> Scott Woodford      CDD Director Nicole Mardell      Principal Planner Matt Hastie      APG Proj. Manager Andrew Parish      APG Planner Kyra Haggart      APG Planner Emme Shoup      Asst. Community Engagement Coor.  <b>ABSENT:</b> Brian Harris      CAC Member Audrey Tehan      CAC Member Lisa Geis      CAC Member Michael Blesius      CAC Member  <b>PUBLIC:</b> Mandee Seeley Carey Tosello John Tehan
--	--

**DATE: May 19, 2021**  
**TIME: 4:00 pm to 6:00pm**

**Agenda with Meeting Summary Notes:**

**1. Welcome, Agenda Overview, and Introductions (15 minutes)**

Scott Woodford, Sisters Community Development Director

- Scott highlighted the upcoming Open House #2 community engagement opportunities.
- City staff, consultant team, committee members, and public introduced themselves.

**2. Revised Policy Review (2 hours 30 minutes)**

Matt Hastie, Angelo Planning Group

- Matt reviewed policy language considerations, and introduced the Mentimeter virtual tool that was used for polling committee members level of support for the policy. Committee members were asked to rank policy chapters on a spectrum from “Strongly do not support” to “Strongly support”), which then informed a discussion around why the committee members supported or did not support the set of policies.

**Public Involvement**

- Committee members were in general support of this set of policies (4.4 out of 5).

- Policy 1.1.1 – Questioned whether the Planning Commission is the appropriate body to be the Committee for Citizen Involvement (it should be a committee more focused on improving citizen involvement rather than mostly hearing land use cases); also recommended changing “private” to “a diversity”.
  - o Need for more public friendly language in the Agendas (ex: items labeled by their code title OAR...)
- Policy 1.2.2 – The examples of non-traditional tools does not relate well to types of tools available to “underrepresented” members – either add tools that do or remove specific examples of non-traditional engagement methods.
- Policy 1.3.1 – Be mindful that we don’t use jargon or abbreviations in documents.
- Policy 1.3.4 – Generic statement, may be hard to reinforce, may be difficult for policymakers to commit to responding to every comment from the public.

#### Land Use Planning

- Committee members were in general support of this set of policies (4.3 out of 5).
- Policy 2.1.3 – Add a quantifier to the periodic review timeframe, such as no less than 5 years.
- Policy 2.1.5 – Change “shall consider” to “hereto”
- Policy 2.1.7 – Explore/research other towns, cities examples of new regulatory approaches and/or state and national level resources and best practices from other data sources to provide context in future explorations.
- Policy 2.1.8 – What does open space refer to and does it include green space?
  - o Clarification of this verbiage and where in the policies it is used. Provide examples.
  - o Scott – Open space is a term used in development code. They can’t build on it, but amenities and landscaping are required to be on the space (can include tree preservation). Open space is a term than applies to greenspace, but the greenspace term does not necessarily apply to Open Space, clarify definition for Comp Plan).
- Policy 2.1.8 – What does “alternative discretionary path” mean?
  - o Matt explained that a project must either meet the clear and objective requirements for the zoning code, or there is a more discretionary path that requires applicants to meet more extensive guidelines if they don’t want to or can’t meet the objective standards.

#### Growth Management

- Committee members were in general support of this set of policies (4.6 out of 5).
- Policy 3.1.2 – Should “Efficiency Measures” be specifically referenced in this policy language to acknowledge the work that is to come?

- Nicole: Took out duplication – the policy language leads to efficiency measures, no foul without including the specific term.
- Policy 3.2.3 – What does this policy language mean? Complex policy language.
  - Scott: applies to land in the UGB but not yet in city limits. We'll reword to make this clearer.
- Policy 3.2.4 – Felt the term "fair" is subjective verbiage. "Appropriate share" may be more appropriate.
- Policy 3.3.1 – Group felt the language in the policy makes it hard to understand the intent.
  - Clarify that the UGB and annexation of land into city limits are two different things. Policy language needs rework to make clearer.

### Livability

- Committee members were in general support of this set of policies (4.2 out of 5).
- Policy 4.1.1 – "Open spaces...", incorporate language around natural landscapes.
- Policy 4.1.3 – Add language to include "reduce barriers to basic services" for all populations as this can be a major impediment to homeless folks (or others with limited resources) to participating in the community (housing, food, etc.)
  - Some thought this policy should be combined with Policy 4.1.5, but others thought they should be kept separate to draw a distinction between the unique needs of underserved populations such as the houseless population and others.
- Policy 4.1.5 – Too open-ended – needs some type of follow up action plan to assess. Suggest adding "and implement." In comparison, 4.1.3 has a specific goal.
  - Combining the language of these policies would resolve the concern. Small group wanted an action plan to identify and address barriers to ensure t
- Policy 4.4.6 – Group didn't understand the intent of this policy, so may need to rework.
  - Nicole: This policy acknowledges the desire to integrate wildlife protection as part of development. Identify wildlife you want to protect through an inventory process and perhaps create certain development requirements that supports their habitat needs.
  - Katie: add "development" to "noise and light pollution"
    - Nicole: At this time, we don't need to focus on specifics of what the protection would be. The main question is: would an evaluation of habitat impact be an important project for the city to undertake?
  - Rachel: Perhaps move all Sustainability and Environment policies into Livability and/or Natural Resources policy chapter as they may be out of context in the Livability chapter. Same with policy 4.4.5 – move to natural resources/environment chapter.
- Policy 4.4.7 Appreciates the verbiage around supporting retrofitting of existing developments to support the Dark Skies Ordinance.

- Policy 4.4 section on Sustainability and Environment has a lot of overlap with the Natural Resources chapter policies. #6 of the policy items in the Sustainability and Environment seem more relevant to the environment/natural resources section – shift over. The last policy alluding to the Dark Skies Ordinance seems more relevant to the Neighborhood Design section of the Livability Chapter.
- General question: how were the Livability Objectives chosen?
  - o Kyra: Language pulled from the Sisters Country Vision and Action Plan. Also, some language is pulled from other Comprehensive Plans (City of Milwaukee).
- Gap Identified: Health services should be integrated into policy language because it impacts “livability”.
  - o Matt: The City doesn’t have a direct role in health services, only in land use, but that concept is incorporated into other chapters, such as Economic Development (encouraging more health service businesses) and Transportation (more walking and biking) and Parks as part of overall plan for healthy lifestyles.
  - o Dixie: Desire for the Comprehensive Plan document to have direct hyperlinks to referenced documents in the policies.
- General concern over the Dark Skies Ordinance and also encouraging more lighting for paths, but also discussed need for safety too that might not comply with the ordinance and which one trumps the other. Reinforce language for “Dark Skies compliant lighting”.

### Housing

- Committee members were in general support of this set of policies (4 out of 5).
- Policy 5.1.4 – What does “changing market conditions” refer to?
  - o Matt: Demand for certain size homes, lots, types of housing. Clarifying language can be added.
  - o Scott: Accessory Dwelling Units and reducing barriers to this type of affordable housing is an example of changing codes to respond to the market demand.
- Policy 5.2.3 – Do we need to include “small” as a requirement to utilize alternative building materials or should it be non-size dependent?
- Policy 5.3.1 – Shouldn’t call out specific providers (i.e., Habitat for Humanity) in case there are new entities doing affordable housing or the specifically mentioned ones leave. Generalize this language.
  - o House Bill 2001 – should City take this into account? Matt: This bill does not apply to cities under 10,000 (which Sisters is far under). City can still consider some of these elements – may be more appropriate for housing action plan with a greater level of detail.
- Policy 5.3.3 – Group wanted to add additional strategies for offsetting development costs, such as fee reductions and deferrals for System Development Charges. Want more beyond just subsidies.

- Policy 5.3.3 – Concern about not wanting these subsidies to go to large production builders and wanting to “level the playing field” by encouraging these to go smaller developers/builders.
  - o Matt: That level of specificity may not be appropriate here – these are specifically for affordable housing that targets a certain income. Beneficial to keep this open to allow for diversity of builders.
- In this chapter or another – wanted to acknowledge the need for greenspace within walking distance of housing as lots get smaller and smaller. Balancing denser housing with open space and trees.
  - o Matt: Housing may not be the right place to address this topic, but it is addressed in other chapters, such as Recreation or Livability.
- Policy 5.3.5 – There was a concern about the qualifier in the last sentence that one felt would provide too much latitude to deter locating a transitional shelter, so the suggestion was to remove the verbiage after “transitional housing”.

#### Environment

- Committee members were in general support of this set of policies (4.5 out of 5).
- Policy 6.2.1.3 – Questioned who is responsible for preparing a wildfire mitigation plan – is it the developer or the City?
  - o Kevin: there are great examples coming from California where it expected, needed and becoming more standard
  - o Nicole: Also have local examples from City of Bend and Deschutes County; would specify criteria and outline during development code process.
  - o Sharlene: prefer City provide examples of wildlife mitigation plan that developers can use as a framework so affordable housing developers don’t have to hire another consultant and will help reduce the cost and timeline of new developments.
- Policy 6.2.3.3 – Align with other communication policy in reducing communication barriers.
- Policy 6.3.3 – one committee member asked whether the policy should say “environmentally-friendly criteria” versus “climate change” to not offend and be more inclusive. Others felt strongly that the climate change should stay as it is established science and we need to accept it. Others felt that we should be in alignment with the verbiage the state uses and it was explained they use term climate change. It was further clarified that the State was strongly considering adding Climate Change as a required Statewide Planning Goal.
- Policy 6.3.7 – Add language to specify sources of greenhouse gas emissions, such as buildings.
- Policy 6.3.9 – Include “outdoor lighting” to list of city facilities.

### Parks, Recreation, & Open Space

- Committee members were in general support of this set of policies (4.3 out of 5).
- How does the Parks Master Plan interface with the Comprehensive Plan?
  - o The Parks Master Plan doesn't have a lot of policy language like the Transportation System Plan does. It serves more as an inventory with some specific goals and objectives. The Comp Plan is more general.
- Policy 7.3.5. Add the Chamber. Develop a network of wayfinding signage in conjunction with the Chamber that maintains a consistent branding and highlights small local businesses.
- Policy 7.5.9 – Wanted to explore the concept of park stewardship by the public (allow space for community gardens, etc.) assuming they accept responsibility for maintenance.
  - o Matt: may be more fitting for Parks Master Plan.
- Goal 7.4 – look closer at “environmentally sensitive” ... not sure if it's the best wording. Perhaps something like: “park and recreation facilities that minimize the impacts to natural areas and habits, particularly those that are environmentally sensitive.”

### Economy

- Committee members were in general support of this set of policies (4.3 out of 5).
- Policy 8.3 – Says drive up windows are “discouraged” – thought they were prohibited. Need to change from limits/discourage to prohibit downtown.
  - o Matt: Because this policy coincides with existing code, perhaps it is not necessary to have as a Comp Plan policy.
- Policy 8.12 – Calls out point person from the City for all economic development items. Does this point to EDCO's position in Sisters?
  - o This references Capi's role with the City as the Economic Development Director
- Policy 8.14 – Break out the childcare piece of this policy to be a separate point. A lot seems to be going on in one policy.
- Policy 8.17 remove reference to name “Artisanal Center of Oregon” as city already has enough names. Like the second sentence of the policy – keep.
- Policy 8.16 – Appreciated this policy of supporting the tourism and destination economy.

### Public Facilities

- Committee members were in general support of this set of policies (4.4 out of 5).
- Policy 9.6 – Someone thought the city already had plenty of water rights – do we need more?
  - o Matt: This came directly from the 2005 Wastewater Management Plan
  - o Scott: We will reconfirm this with Paul on the SAC.

- Policy 9.10 – feels like it is in the wrong place or it needs different language.
  - o Matt: this ties in with facilities associated with public services (library, school district, park district, etc.). There's not a perfect location for these items, so this is typically where it is found. Could take another look to see if we can find a better place for it.
- Policy 9.12 – Darks Skies Ordinance exceptions for safety. Thought there was too much wiggle room.
  - o Scott: this is more related to the need for safety at vehicle intersections where safety may trump the Dark Skies Ordinances. And we don't have jurisdiction over ODOT right-of-way regulations for lighting. We'll confirm the need for that caveat with Paul and the SAC.
- Policy 9.2 – Acknowledge what is being done with biosolids in the policy language.

#### Transportation

- Committee members were in general support of this set of policies (4 out of 5).
- Matt acknowledged the out-of-place numbering for the Transportation section, this is due to these policies being directly pulled from the Transportation Systems Plan. The Comp Plan Team may maintain this formatting style to remain consistent with TSP
- Policy 8.c – Way too much detail. Change?
  - o We'll bring forward to Public Works for evaluation during TSP work. It is common to see mobility standard detail in TSP policies- this does get amended over time if it becomes out of date.
- No mention of public transportation in this transportation section, other than CET and their transportation plan. We should support CET and securing funding through outlining specific programs and strategies in the Comp Plan (i.e., vanpooling, inter-city bus service, etc.).
- Create a policy that reduces barriers to other carpooling and transportation services like Uber, Lyft, etc.
- Policies A, F, H under Goal 1. They are all very similar - combine into one policy addressing transportation connectivity from east, west, north, and south. Pursue easements from property owners for bicycle and ped connection.
  - o Nicole: Greenway is referenced in Parks and Rec chapter – this gets at the idea for connections through town on that are more friendly – working with property owners to get easements.

#### 3. **Public Comment (10 minutes)**

- None.

#### 4. **Next Steps (10 minutes)**

Matt Hastie, Angelo Planning Group

SISTERS COMP PLAN MEETING MINUTES  
COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
VIA ZOOM  
19 MAY 2021

**ADJOURN:** 7:15 pm.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Emme Shoup". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

---

Emme Shoup, Assistant Community Engagement Coordinator

19 May 2021

Date: