

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY SERVICES  
LAND USE PLANNING DIVISION  
MULTNOMAH COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

**MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 1, 2021**  
Virtual Meeting/Zoom

This is not a full transcript. Time indicators reference the meeting recording, which is accessible at the following Dropbox link:

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/2rfbi7o9qokg3ms/AAAOWamGeLTnTpbOBHp3JtzDa?dl=0&preview=November+1+2021+Planning+Commission+Zoom+Recording.mp4>

**1. Call to Order**

(00:02:13.950) **The meeting is called to order at 6:36 p.m. on Monday, November 1, 2021.**

**2. Roll Call**

(00:02:22.110) Chair Ingle conducts a roll call and declares a quorum present.

- Present - John Ingle, Chris Foster, Bill Kabeiseman, Stephanie Nystrom, Victoria Purvine, and Susan Silodor
- Absent – Alicia Denny, Kari Egger, Tim Wood

**3. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

(00:03:11.640) Minutes from the June 7, 2021 and October 4, 2021 meetings are presented for adoption. A motion to approve is made by Commissioner Purvine and seconded by Commissioner Nystrom. A roll call vote is held. The motion to approve minutes is passed unanimously.

**4. Opportunity for Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items**

(00:06:54.060) Susan Andrews, 13410 NW Springville Road Portland Oregon, indicates that she provided written testimony at the September meeting, but was unable to attend due to travel, and wants to provide a quick update on her written testimony and check in to see if there were any comments the Commissioners could share. She reports struggling with agricultural fill operations on her road for years. She's pleased to see updates that the County created in the Code to help address some of the issues; but, unfortunately, the ability to enforce that Code seems to be problematic and extremely slow. The Andrews have been registering complaints with Code Compliance since the end of June and they are now waiting until November 19, which is an update to her prior written testimony, for a Hearings Officer to review a violation against a neighbor's permit. She indicates that her neighborhood is hoping this particular permit will be revoked. She indicates that individuals subject to the permit continue to run loads of fill in violation of the conditions of that permit.

(00:10:56.160) Adam Barber, Deputy Planning Director, indicates that the County is reviewing the Code to determine if it could be amended in some way, and that there will be further details provided during the Work Program discussion on the agenda.

(00:11:53.580) Commissioner Nystrom thanks Susan Andrews for bringing the concern to the Commission's attention and asks that she keep them informed how the hearing and complaints progress.

(00:12:43.080) Klaus Heyne, 41101 SE Loudon Road Corbett, indicates that there is a total standstill of any solar installations in East County. No installer will touch it because of the County's requirements. He requests that the County use previous interpretation of current Code until the Planning Commission can craft a code amendment. He indicates that the Code has not changed, just the County's interpretation of the code. He points to paragraph 39.1515 subsection (A)(2), where there is already an extension provided, for public safety. He indicates that solar installation serves public safety by providing solar powered electric backup storage during wildfire outages and other emergencies and would reduce flammable use of kerosene and other things. He indicates that he was able to obtain a trade permit for his first installation in 2012, and that it only took three weeks. He requests that the County apply a similar process.

(00:17:12.600) Commissioner Foster suggests that Klaus Heyne approach the Board of County Commissioners with the issue, because the Planning Commission is an advisory board and the ultimate power to make a change, like recommended, rests with the Board of County Commissioners.

(00:18:40.770) Commissioner Purvine asks the County what change led to solar permitting becoming more difficult.

(00:18:50.070) Adam Barber indicates that the County has access to better resources, such as aerial photos and detailed site plans, that weren't previously available. The County has more information now about what development is existing on a property.

(00:19:41.400) Carol Johnson, Planning Director, adds that previously, the applicants were only providing a small portion of their property and didn't document the entire property. Prior to her arrival, the procedure had already been changed that staff are being more diligent about requiring the entire property to be documented on the site plan; and that's where the County started identifying structures where there was no permit history that can be found. She adds that there are structures that would have been exempt from a building code permit; therefore, there wouldn't be any documentation, but those thresholds changed over time, and there's not good documentation when each iteration of the building code was amended to change what that minimum square footage would be that would trigger permit. Additionally, previous directors and practices changed what level of detail was required with applications.

(00:21:25.950) Commissioner Nystrom asks the County if they have an estimate of how long it would take to change things so that solar could be fast-tracked.

(00:21:49.230) Adam Barber suggests that the Commission wait to address this question until the Work Program discussion later in the agenda. Commissioner Nystrom agrees.

(00:22:33.570) Commissioner Foster inquires if this kind of change in the code would require a Measure 56 notice.

(00:22:43.980) Adam Barber indicates that is a possibility, but would require further analysis.

(00:23:02.040) Commissioner Foster inquires about the reality of Klaus Heyne's proposal to simply make an interpretation and act quickly on it, with a recommendation to the Board if it legitimately falls under the safety person provision.

(00:23:27.810) Adam Barber indicates that issues of interpretation are something that he's learned take research and thought, so he would not be prepared to provide any initial response on a question of interpretation.

(00:23:41.760) Commissioner Foster inquires if the County could get back to this next meeting on whether or not this route could be taken.

(00:23:57.690) Adam Barber indicates that the County can have a group discussion to see what it would take to find out more information; and then when we have that, we can relay it to the Commission. Barber is not certain of the date of the next meeting, but indicates the County will relay back as soon as possible.

(00:25:00.060) Chair Ingle inquires if there is anyone else who would like to provide public comment on non-agenda items tonight.

(00:25:10.140) Heidi Konopnicki, Recording Secretary, indicates that David Mann has a hand raised, and confirms that Mr. Mann is also pre-registered to provide testimony on an agenda item. Mr. Mann indicates that he will wait to provide testimony until the registered time.

**5. Continued Hearing – Amendments to Multnomah County Chapter 38 Zoning Code and the Multnomah County Comprehensive Plan in response to federally mandated revisions to the Management Plan for the Columbia River National Scenic Area approved by the Columbia River Gorge Commission and other amendments to Chapter 38 Code and the Comprehensive Plan not related to the Management Plan revisions (PC-2021-14505)**

(00:25:46.140) Chair Ingle reads into the record the Legislative Hearing Process for the Planning Commission for a public hearing, and the process to present public testimony.

(00:29:43.290) Adam Barber introduces attendees Carol Johnson, Planning Director; Joanna Kaiserman, Senior Land Use Planner Columbia River Gorge Commission; and Dave Flood, Fire Chief Corbett Fire District #14, and notes they are available to answer questions.

Adam Barber provides the Staff Report, which includes a summary of content discussed at the October 4, 2021 hearing that was continued to the current date. During the October hearing, Staff heard decision point resolution from the Planning Commission on several policy questions, including:

(00:33:29.400) Provide an additional seven days for public comments on type 2 NSA applications;

(00:33:49.920) Retain the owner occupancy requirement for overnight accommodation use, and

(00:34:02.460) Recommend a fire protection setback of all buildings from steep slopes in forest zones.

Barber reports back on several questions Staff were asked to consider, including:

(00:34:29.490) Determine if the type 2 appeal period could also be extended from 14 to 21 days. Staff do not recommend this change due to anticipated increase in average processing time to 142 days.

(00:35:41.790) Explore adding a standard for overnight accommodation uses that would require access from publicly maintained roads.

Staff do not recommend this change as more time and study are needed given other similar home-based business use categories in the code, such as home occupations.

(00:36:58.800) Determine if the definition of “dwelling unit” could be amended to replace the term bedroom with sleep area.

Staff support this change and added it to the proposed Chapter 38 amendments.

(00:37:45.240) Determine if the definition of “suitability (suitable)” could be amended to clarify land must be committed “by development” when considered committed to another use.

Staff support this change and added it to the proposed Chapter 38 amendments.

(00:38:14.580) Determine if county can add a savings clause stating the management plan should be applied directly if the plan provision is more restrictive than county code.

Staff do not feel this change is needed because the County is not allowed to have code that is less restrictive than the management plan.

(00:39:53.850) Determine whether a path should be provided for an alternative requirement for slope setbacks and fire break requirements in the forest zones.

The County has built into the code additional flexibility where an alternative setback from the slope can be granted if the local fire department or the building official recommends that some other alternative is sufficient to minimize wildfire risks. Adam Barber invites Chief Flood to discuss how he envisions that process might work coordinating between our offices.

(00:43:26.460) Chief Dave Flood voices concern over a one size fits all approach to setback requirements. He discusses alternate means and methods in both the fire code and the building code, and notes using fire resistant materials, particularly on the downhill side of a structure, can meet a lot of the criteria without the spacing requirements that a wood or vinyl-sided structure would require. He indicates a desire not to see vegetation cut down if fire resistive building materials can be used instead. Chief Flood further states that what gets approved, and what the situation is 20 and 30 years down the road, can vary for any given homeowner depending on how well they take care of their property and then commit to their agreements. Fire resistant construction would remain the duration and can make a huge difference as a wildfire passes by a structure.

(00:45:44.310) Commissioner Foster inquires if Staff would recommend reducing the size of a proposed structure in order the meet the setback requirement.

(00:46:50.700) Adam Barber recalls working on a few different projects that called for minimizing the footprint, to try to minimize the amount of disturbance in a riparian area. He suggests the same thought process here. He adds that going up rather than spreading out could be a way to preserve the square footage but in a different way and could potentially provide for moving a structure back away from a slope.

(00:48:20.730) Chief Flood adds that riparian areas, particularly along the Sandy River, are inherently fire resistant nearly year round. The steep slope areas along the river are very wet and green most all year round. He advocates for flexibility to the setback requirements to reduce unnecessary damage to the riparian area.

(00:49:20.760) Adam Barber states that the way the County interacts with applicants when a standard is not being met, is to talk about options. In the scenario described, one option might be to utilize a smaller footprint, whether that is reducing the size of the structure or by building up and maybe having two stories rather than one, but with the same total amount of square footage. This would retain their proposal, but in a different way. It could also be looking at this alternative standard and investigating whether these

alternative means and methods might work for them. It might make the structure more expensive and it might be outside of their budget. That could be one consideration that they would need to explore and contemplate. So it is really not staff dictating the outcome as much as pursuing options available in the code.

(00:50:39.660) Commissioner Nystrom asks Chief Flood about the 50 foot setback for dwellings in addition to other buildings.

(00:51:13.620) Chief Flood indicates that he supports 50 feet from other buildings. Buildings create their own inherent fire hazards, so it is preferable that they are 50 feet away from each other. He adds that the Insurance Service Office (ISO), which determines fire insurance rates, will add water supply requirements if there is not 50 feet of distance from one building to the next. However, they don't have a 50 foot rule regarding vegetation and slope. He adds that there is a likelihood of multiple building to be one fire at the same time when they are not 50 feet apart.

(00:52:46.290) Adam Barber concludes the staff report.

(00:52:52.860) Chair Ingle invites public testimony, beginning with those who have pre-registered.

(00:53:20.730) David Mann, 4110 SE Hawthorne Blvd Portland OR 97214, provides material Exhibit H2 which is introduced to the record and displayed for the Commission. He also provides oral testimony, indicating that he received a notice of proposed changes that might devalue the property he purchased 30 years ago. He references a photo of his property, stating the lot is only 205 feet long plus the buffer zone, and couldn't accommodate the setbacks being moved to 200 feet. He is concerned he won't be able to build a home on the property. He indicated that the setback requirement has increased several times since he purchased the property. He asks the Commission to reject 38.7053 changing a buffer to 200 feet and reject 38.0065 that would prohibit any possibility of a setback variance.

(00:56:32.040) Chair Ingle asks Staff to explain the concern as it relates to the Gorge plan.

(00:56:39.660) Adam Barber indicates the provision that is being referenced is within the general management area water resources criteria that protect various water resources in the scenic area. The provision is mandated by the Management Plan, so the County does not have the authority to reject the provision or draft it in a way that is less protective. It requires the existing 100 foot buffer zone from the Sandy River to be expanded to 200 feet. Barber indicates that he spoke to David Mann prior to the meeting and pointed to Multnomah County Code section 38.0065(B), which states that a setback or buffer that is specified for protection of the scenic, cultural, natural, recreation... resources, may be varied in order to allow a residence to be built on a parcel of land upon a demonstration that four provisions are met. The fourth is the only new provision being added. The findings that would need to be made is that (1) the land use designation otherwise authorizes a residence on the track, meaning that there is a path to review a dwelling in that base zone; that there's no site that exists on the track on which a residence could be placed practicably in full compliance with a setback or buffer. In the hypothetical scenario just described, Barber indicates it could be possible there is not room for a dwelling that is outside of the buffer. The variance from the specified buffer would need to be the minimum necessary to allow the residence. Barber further states that the County may not be able to authorize any sized residence proposed, such as one with a large footprint. Barber indicates that the provision being added relates to additions to buildings that are in the setback, which is not relevant to vacant property.

(01:00:57.270) Katherine Thomas, Assistant County Attorney, clarifies that Adam Barber is speaking in generalities about some of the options that might still exist in the Code, but any particular piece of property or any particular proposal would have to be examined on its merits through its own land use process.

(01:02:13.200) David Mann adds that he is also concerned about the decks and stairs setbacks and would like to know if there is a possibility of relief for that.

(01:02:29.370) Adam Barber reads to the Commission the provision that David Mann is referring to from the Management Plan. The variance shall not be used to permit, in addition to a building, including but not limited to decks and stairs when the addition would be within a setback, except where the building is wholly within setback, in which case the addition may only be permitted on the portion of the building that does not encroach any further into the required setback. The provision comes straight from the management plan, so the County does not have flexibility to remove these provisions related to decks and stairs.

(01:05:01.980) Commissioner Purvine asks Staff for clarification regarding setbacks and the variances for 200 feet. Specifically, she asks if the County allow him a 30 foot setback from the road with a variance into that 30 feet for a deck.

01:05:37.680 Adam Barber indicates that he cannot make any statements on David Mann's property. In general, Barber relates this experience to prior applications for dwellings between the Historic Columbia River Highway and the Sandy River. He recalls there being a buffer coming off the River to protect riparian areas, in addition to setbacks from the highway for setback reasons from property lines, etc. Often, there will be an overlapping effect and there will be two different sets of standards that need to be balanced. Hypothetically, if relief could be granted from one buffer but not the other, it might drive the development towards one buffer. If relief can be granted from both buffers, the answer might be somewhere in the middle. It really is case specific. He further recalls involvement in applications where relief must be sought from multiple sets of standards. One set of standards may call that relief a variance; another may call it an alternative. Along that stretch of the river, the County has reviewed a number of applications proposing a dwelling, but it did take quite a bit of balancing because there were multiple resources being protected from both directions and not a lot of property width to work with. He states he is hesitant to get into specifics about setbacks that are not related to the present testimony.

(01:07:55.290) Chair Ingle confirms that there is no additional public testimony and invites Planning Commission questions and deliberation.

(01:08:46.080) Commissioner Foster inquires of Staff and Chief Flood whether there is a need to add a provision to the exception of the 50 foot setback, that there would still need to be fire access to that side of the building.

(01:10:02.160) Chief Flood indicates that the additional provision would not be recommended because the fire department is not guaranteed foresight access for fires. He references properties in steep areas, particularly in the Portland west hills, that are on stilts up to 90 feet high, so firefighters can only access the front of those properties. He states that it is not ideal, but it is well within the Fire and Oregon Building Code. He adds that there wouldn't be need for access of that side, if it's a fire resistive as opposed to a combustible surface.

(01:11:23.040) Adam Barber defers all comment to Chief Flood, indicating that Land Use Planning looks to the local fire districts as the expert in these areas.

(01:12:39.900) Commissioner Silodor asks Staff if changing bedroom to sleeping areas raises any concern that sleeping area could be turned into dormitories and result in buildings that are like hostels.

(01:13:13.200) Adam Barber indicates that it would not be okay if the zoning district didn't allow that type of use. However, it would be easier for the County to regulate and enforce that situation if it was inconsistent with the Code, then if the code said bedroom. He adds that the idea was to provide more ability to regulate when a structure is functioning as a dwelling unit but not permitted for that use.

(01:14:15.540) Chair Ingle closes the public testimony portion of the hearing and also closes the record. He states that he could entertain a motion to either deny or recommend approval of the proposed resolution.

(01:14:57.690) Commissioner Silodor moves the motion; Commissioner Nystrom seconds.

(01:15:11.400) Chair Ingle calls for a roll call vote on the proposed resolution.

(01:15:53.280) The motion passes unanimously.

## **6. Worksession – Proposed 2022 Planning Commission Work Program**

(01:16:53.400) Chair Ingle states it is his understanding that some individuals have indicated a desire to provide insight to the work program, and due to time constraints, he will allow five minutes to be given to each for public testimony. He asks that the Staff Report be given prior to testimony.

(01:17:07.830) Kevin Cook, Senior Planner, states that in addition to individuals who have indicated a desire to speak on the Work Program, the County has received written comments that have already been posted to the Planning Commission website [Public Comment 1-13], as well as a late submittal from Jim Cathcart, West Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District, that has been forwarded to the Planning Commission [Public Comment 14].

(01:18:20.670) Kevin Cook states that the 2022 PC Work Program includes five projects ranked by four priorities:

1. Projects with a health-life safety component;
2. Required projects (New State laws, Metro, Gorge Commission, FEMA, etc.);
3. Required projects that implement the Comprehensive Plan; and
4. Amendments which result in efficiencies (procedural or otherwise).

(01:19:12.660) Attachment 1 – to the 2022 PC Work Program is a list of ‘on-deck’ potential future Planning Commission Work Program Projects. Items B57 through B60 are new this year and primarily due to newly passed State laws. Staff is also recommending removal of projects B61 and B62.

(01:20:02.670) Attachment 2 – to the 2022 PC Work Program is a list of mandated amendments related to EFU-CFU zones. The County would like to treat this as a single project, represented by A2 in the Work Program.

(01:20:38.340) There are a number of submitted comments relating to the installation of solar energy systems. MCC 39.1515 requires compliance for any new projects. Staff have heard those concerns regarding solar and other minor types of installations and have added project A5 to analyze the problem and bring it to the Commission for discussion.

(01:21:48.120) The County has received a letter asking for some flexibility on the current requirement for equal area exchange between property line adjustments in the EFU zone. Staff placed that in the on-deck projects list as item B33.

(01:22:16.170) Kevin Cook adds that the numbering of these projects does not correlate to importance.

(01:23:00.870) Kevin Cook thanks the Commissioners and community members for their engagement, particularly those who submitted written comment, and reminds Chair Ingle it is at his discretion to open the work session to public comment.

(01:23:59.490) Chair Ingle recalls a discussion in a prior meeting about housing opportunity/solutions for new or young farmers, and inquires if that was added to the Work Program.

(01:24:36.120) Kevin Cook indicates that there is not a specific project addressing that question on the list, but it can be brought back for a future work session.

(01:25:22.530) Chair Ingle states that Peter Fry introduced a letter that talks about equal area provisions, and he sees B32 and B33 regarding equal area exchange, and wants to know if these relate to the same terms.

(01:25:48.480) Kevin Cook confirms.

(01:26:53.490) Chair Ingle also inquires if the concerns Peter Fry addresses are also going to be incorporated into the EFU-CFU legislation, particularly C4.

(01:27:11.730) Kevin Cook indicates that could be a possibility if the Omnibus is taken through, to bring along things that are related to the EFU provisions. It's not a state-required project, so it's currently on-deck, but if there is a desire to look at this issue along with the other EFU provisions, it can be examined further

(01:28:41.190) Commissioner Purvine inquires how many projects that were lined up last year were completed.

(01:28:53.130) Kevin Cook indicates the County was only able to complete two or three projects, including the recently passed Gorge 2020 provisions. The County's ability to get these done is dependent on the size of the projects and the resources on hand.

(01:29:50.040) Carol Johnson adds that the intergovernmental agreement with the City of Portland requires the County to process an amendment anytime they have an amendment, even if not directly applicable. The City of Portland has been producing a lot of legislation over the past two years, and these changes have limited the County's capacity in other areas. She adds that the County is expecting an overview of where the County is financially on Thursday November 4, 2021, and it's anticipated that because some redevelopment areas have expired and that increment of property tax values will be coming back to the County, that the County may be in a better financial picture than it has been for over a decade.

She adds that Land Use is looking to position ourselves to take advantage of that and ask for some additional resources to help us out. We're looking at some additional assistance to help us move a more aggressive work program with the Planning Commission forward. We won't know until June timeline whether or not we are successful.

(01:32:00.600) Chair Ingle invites unsolicited public comment on the Work Program.

(01:32:41.520) Jim Cathcart, West Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District, 2701 NW Vaughn St, Suite 450 Portland, OR, would like the Planning Commission to add developing the necessary ordinances and or changes to the Multnomah County Comprehensive Plan to make the open space land divisions as authorized in State statutes ORS 215263, section 10, for exclusive farm use lands and ORS 215783, for commercial forest use in mixed farm used lands, to the 2022 Planning Commission Work Program, preferably under the EFU-CFU Omnibus. He notes securing conservation efforts over time as a strategic direction, through changes in land ownership.

(01:38:48.300) Chair Ingle inquires asks for Staff input on how this can be incorporated.

(01:39:07.500) Kevin Cook indicates that the preference is to keep the mandated projects on the Omnibus lists while looking for opportunities to bring other related project along if possible. The equal area exchange provision and Jim Cathcart's letter regarding open space land division have been noted, and could be brought together as one project, even if it's on the on-deck project list.

(01:40:04.860) Commissioner Foster asks Staff if the Planning Commission has had any prior discussion about this provision.

(01:40:26.970) Kevin Cook does not recall any prior discussion.

(01:41:30.510) Chair Ingle clarifies that Staff are seeking agreement from the Planning Commission on what is laid out for the Work Program and that individual Commissioners many advocate for the removal or addition of items.

(01:42:34.980) Chair Ingle recalls a lengthy discussion from the June meeting regarding making it easier for young farmers and a recommendation from Commissioner Kabeiseman that this item should be put on the Work Program. Ingle indicates that this is appropriate to at least add to the on-deck projects.

(01:42:56.940) Kevin Cook indicates that can be done.

(01:43:23.160) Chair Ingle asks the Commission if there is any opposition to dropping B61 and B62 based on Staff's recommendation.

(01:43:47.160) Commissioner Foster indicates that he is not opposed to dropping these items. He also recalls, on the topic of young farmers, that Commissioner Kabeiseman may have recommended a brainstorming session or writing a letter to our legislators. Foster indicates that, based on State law, we are unable to create opportunities for housing for young farmers at the local level. He recommends a brainstorming session and drafting a letter to legislators.

(01:45:09.540) Commissioner Kabeiseman indicates that his recommendation was a response to a specific request, but he does not see a Staff project where we come up with changes to our Code.

(01:45:52.530) Kevin Cooks suggests a work session where the challenges to young farmers may be discussed.

(01:47:04.890) Chair Ingle clarifies that he recommended the project as a placeholder.

(01:47:17.580) Carol Johnson states that there was a conversation amongst Staff following the June Planning Commission meeting because there was a lot of interest in trying to help people that are really committed to farming as opposed to people going through the motions in order to qualify for a custom farm dwelling. Staff quickly ran into the similar issues to those referenced, in that between the statewide planning goals and the statutes and administrative rules, we have a very limited room within which we can work and it appears that some new legislation would be necessary to enable this. We haven't really done this in the past, but it is a potential if the Commission feels it appropriate to work within the County and put forth new legislation at the state level or take it to the Association of County Planning Directors.

(01:49:05.880) Commissioner Kabeiseman supports this approach and notes that other counties are likely facing this issue.

(01:49:50.340) Commissioner Foster states that he supports the program of maintaining farmland. He indicates there are pitfalls and mistakes that can be made when trying to craft rules like this, and he doesn't want to make a request to loosen the rules without having ideas to put forward.

(01:51:28.530) Chair Ingle states that he thinks the work session concept is a workable solution for a starting point.

(01:51:42.330) Chair Ingle asks Commissioners to voice any objections to dropping B61 and B62 from the work program. There are none.

(01:52:17.550) Chair Ingles asks if there is any dissatisfaction with the way the program has been laid out, and if anyone wants to lobby for reordering or adding something new to the Work Program.

(01:52:37.620) Commissioner Foster confirms that we are adding Jim Cathcart's idea to the on-deck list, and that we have included solar and equal area exchanges.

(01:52:50.310) Kevin Cook confirms.

(01:53:25.140) Adam Barber revisits the topic of how many legislative actions were brought to the Board during the calendar year, confirming there were five, which were all related to City of Portland code amendments.

(01:54:36.900) Commissioner Ingle confirms there is no additional input.

## **7. Director's Comments**

(01:55:10.140) Carol Johnson indicates this is the first opportunity in quite some time that Land Use Planning might get some additional resources. There is an unmet need in terms of long range planning, including addressing ideas for making the county better, moving forward with equity work, and even stronger compliance with statewide planning goals. Staff are carrying out higher workloads than in the past. Land Use has reopened to the public and is proving in-person meetings. We've reach a critical point where most don't feel like we're doing our jobs very well and have to disappoint a lot of people. We've

asked John Morgan to perform a targeted review of the Land Use Planning Program, to help us understand where we stand in comparison with other similar counties in terms of work that falls within land use and providing a frame of reference. He'll be providing his findings in mid-December, which may influence the budget proposals for the coming year.

**(01:57:55.110) The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for December 6, 2021.**

(01:58:20.850) Commissioner Foster requests that staff prepare an update regarding the zoning violation hearing scheduled for November 19, 2021 for the next meeting.

**(01:59:07.440) The meeting is adjourned at 8:33 p.m.**

Recording Secretary,

Heidi Konopnicki