

December 9, 2021

MEMBERS: Virginia Dideum, Stephanie Dudley, Terry Graff, Sharon Kloepper, David Smith, Russ Taggard and Austin Tomlinson

STAFF: Carole Connell and Chad Sweet and Angoleana Brien

Minutes

The regular meeting of the Gearhart Planning Commission for Thursday, December 9, 2021 was called to order at 6:11 pm by President Virginia Dideum. Members and staff were present in person and by video conferencing.

On **MOTION** by Taggard 2nd by Smith by unanimous motion the consent agenda was approved. Said agenda approved minutes for September 9, 2021 and financial report of September 30, 2021. There was no correspondence.

STAFF REPORT

Chad Sweet – Reported City Council's goal setting session and that the goal setting by the Planning Commission was a topic. The City Council is looking forward to doing some future planning and they would like the Planning Commission to engage in some of those things. He reported on the Elk declaration of cooperation and that the Regional Solutions Agreement was signed, and those are some items that will be coming to the planning commission. He met with Noah of the Necanicum Water Shed Council. Noah is new to the organization and will be working in this area mostly with wildlife habitat and wetlands. The conversation they had are some of the things on the goals list for the planning commission, and that Noah has some good contacts that will be able to help. Sweet said the city has consolidated three positions into one for Angoleana Brien, including Building, Planning, and Municipal Court Clerk. This will benefit the Planning Commission by allowing someone to be available five days a week to answer questions, help with things that are needed and receive better customer service.

Dave Smith – Addressed the Commission with the question of typos and misspelled names on October meeting minutes, and the importance of the names needing to be right.

COMMISSIONERS REPORT

None

GOALS LIST

Discussion occurred on the ODOT/City Hwy 101 Safety Improvement plan, and the good feedback per the survey and workshop. The Planning Commission would like an update report as it gets closer to finalizing the details.

Discussion occurred on items 1 & 2 at the bottom. One, being the importance of the comp plan and taking additional steps to make sure that everyone is aware it exists, as well as maybe providing educational information to assist in understanding it clearly. These are suggested to be used as a reference guide to come up with specific goals within those criteria, and then maybe become part of the Goals action list.

Mentioned spelling correction.

VISITORS COMMENTS

None

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Dideum reopened Public Hearing #21-04CP.ZTA Gearhart Parks Master Plan at 6:33 pm and read the disclosure statement into the record to new Commissioner Frank, who stated he had no conflict of interest associated with the Draft Park Plan.

Dideum stated the Draft for the Master Parks Plan is an updated draft from the draft that was reviewed in October, it's shorter with fewer pages, however, there have been some pages added, as Carole has indicated in red. There are also some comments, and agency websites that are in the middle of nowhere, and I don't know what they are. She asked Carole if she would like to say something at this time?

Connell reviewed the documents in the packet. She reviewed the staff report, and the cross reference with the city's implementing ordinances. Went over the draft change highlights, as well as areas of interest for policy edits

Connell - She asked if item Number 2, A, 10, Is the 13th St access public or private?

Sweet - 13th St is an easement. But the particular area that the trail that goes up over the dune, I believe, is private. That I can check here in just a couple seconds for you.

Connell - She said the last item on page 11 is a description of the property that was formerly the school on eight and a half acres that was sold. That current owner has ideas about future development possibly including some parkland. But it's out of the public system now. It is zoned semi-public; she doesn't think it needs to be in there.

Graff - Said the section heading refers to it as other privately owned properties potentially relevant to parks planning. It seems like this is potentially relevant to park planning.

Connell - said that's a good point.

Tomlinson - And zoned public and semi-public. So, in reality, it's still able to be acquired or that public policy plan.

Connell - I appreciate the feedback. Now in section 3, where I was hoping we could focus tonight are the policies. There are 19 policies. There are some explanatory notes. I think some of the notes are redundant and can be shortened up. How would you like to approach this, does anybody have any preference on how we go about this?

Dideum - Personally I would like us to focus on those areas where we have concerns or specific questions.

Commissioners - All in agreement.

Dideum - Prefers it to be Connell to go back through it and respond to the input and then we have a cleaner document. She definitely thinks that the independent Parks Commission should not be a body that has financial control of anything, and not appropriate within our city's organizational chart. She had made the same comments in October that I did not understand why we have a parks committee that would have this financial wherewithal for spending money.

Graff - Had a question concerning the new number policy 19, C. What restrictions does that put on the property where the zone is? And why do we need it?

Connell - Riparian is basically associated with fish, wildlife, and vegetation on our waterways where they adjoin the Neacoxie and Mill creeks. And in the estuary area, we have plenty of comp plan discussion and policies about riparian areas also covered by zoning code protection, primarily the vegetation, and so on.

Kloepfer - Sure, I think that it's important to look through the comp plan and to see all the references to riparian zones, wildlife, and vegetation protection, especially in the riparian zone. It seems like as a city, we have fallen down on the estuary riparian zone references in the comp

plan. We've been mostly good about the Neacoxie riparian zone, and we do have that specifically stated in our ordinances. We don't have a specific statement that's a very clear statement in our ordinances about the estuary riparian zone. There is an illusion to it, but there are numerous references in the comp plan. And I think that that needs to be rectified.

Connell - Sharon, please clarify, you're still talking about city owned Park public park lands or are you talking about all riparian areas, in addition to all riparian areas in the city owned land.

Kloepfer - I'm talking about primarily city owned where the city of Gearhart Park meets the estuary there is, and I know that the little beach residents are not going to be happy about this, there already is riparian zone references in the R1 zone, that have not been enforced, basically. And I don't know what to do about that, that I don't even think I have the wherewithal to weigh in again about what should be done about that. I don't know if we would grandfather in something, or I don't even know how that would be handled. I'm just not that experienced in that. But I'm, I'm mainly referring to where the city owned park meets the estuary.

Connell - The city park stops at Wellington Street.

Kloepfer - Correct.

Connell - Right and, and so now I'm going to segue into the public comments we received regarding policy 3 because these correlates. Policy 3 is that beaches, dunes, and the estuary are to be preserved in an undeveloped state. John Dudley, Brian Fennerty, Jeff Strange, and Claire McIntyre agreed that the wording in policy three is okay for the city owned land, but it's not intended to cover the private properties. Now coming back to policy 19, the city will manage all city owned property within the dunes west of Ocean Avenue and along the Nechanicum River Estuary so as to maintain such property in its undeveloped state. The private property owners, as compared to what Kloepfer just said, say it should stop at the city park lands, at the easternmost boundary at Wellington. And here it goes on to say also to the maximum extent permissible under applicable law, the city will resist any effort by any other public or private property owner. I think that's the key that these comments were focusing on. John can tell us if that's right, to further develop any property not owned by the city that is located west of the ocean front building line. Now, this is more confusing, every time I read it, I read something different here. Because that's west of the ocean front building line and would not affect the Nechanicum Estuary, as described in the zoning ordinance or along the shoreline of the Nechanicum River Estuary, that's what I've got underlined three times. I think it's one thing to be talking about what goes on west of the dunes and west of the ocean front building line in the dunes on the beach, compared to all along the shoreline and the Nechanicum River Estuary where it says it will resist any effort by any public or private property owner to further develop any property. I don't know if that's what this committee intended, or if George intended that, but it seems to impinge on private property rights. Any comments from anybody?

Graff - Look at policy number 4, that says while considering and balancing various sometimes competing public interests, including C preservation of scenic views from within the dunes and from neighboring properties now is this riparian zone in conflict with number policy 4 C? What restrictions are being put on by declaring this a riparian zone? And why is that necessary?

Connell - There's no reference to our riparian zone and policy 3. It says the estuary and then you go to the back to the other policy, where it says riparian in #19. Riparian is defined and we don't have any zoning called riparian except we have a lot of policies in the comp plan about the

estuary and reference to riparian which is primarily the estuary and the Neacoxie Creek and Mill Creek.

Graff - Okay, if you have a person on Little Beach and he has a house and then in front of his house, on a city property are pine trees, would he be able to cut those pine trees to protect his view?

Sweet - So currently Yes, somebody could ask the city for a permit to access those trees and thin them out, cut them down depending on what type of tree it is through our current ordinance for vegetation management, and they can thin those trees and can top certain trees, you know for vertical trimming so that the pine trees themselves are low enough so people can see. Spruce trees are different, we can't top or vertically trim those, we can thin them out a little bit. In a riparian zone removal of trees that are currently in our riparian zone on the Neacoxie, you're not able to do that so I think that would apply to the A2 zone. You are able to trim vegetation in the riparian zone, you just can't rip it out necessarily. You can try to remove noxious weeds to replant some native things, to keep the Neacoxie healthy. Dead or dangerous trees can be removed from those areas as well. I think that there could be trimming done. People are allowed to trim their trees in a riparian zone next to the Neacoxie, so that would kind of go along here. The riparian zone is spelled out in zone code, I was just looking it up to read through it, but that's the gist of it.

Taggard - But the city only owns from Wellington around through the mouth of the river to the beach front, correct? Everything east of Wellington there's no city park.

Sweet - Correct.

Tomlinson - Does not think the Little Beach people have a concern about number 19. He believes they're possibly talking about number 3's specific references. In the R1 zone, which a majority of their property is on, has a riparian setback of 50 feet. And that's based on the mean high-water line. A lot of the property does not meet that specification currently, he does not know what we can do to remediate that, but that's currently the policy. Anything that they do now is based on that current 50-foot setback in the R1. He thinks what policy number 3 was to address, was the A2, anything that could happen inside the estuary. There's Clatsop County property, there's city property, there's random Sunset LLC property in the middle of the estuary. And that would just give the city the ability to put effort against any public or private property wishes or anything that goes on the estuary, that can detrimentally affect the estuary. He thinks that it's a good policy to have. Maybe the owners are a little bit skeptical of this because it might seem like it impedes on the property rights because it does go into the A2 zone. However, he thinks a majority of them wouldn't want to see any development go on in the Estuary. Also, this policy helps conserve that. Because if they do decide to sell, who knows what the next person's going to do.

Smith - We had plenty to talk about king tides, and that brings the question, what do you think about describing a chronological condition of such consequence that it moves or removes riprap? Couldn't that be an extraordinary condition? And impacting a lot of the other portions of the city besides just that river.

Connell - I can bring this home. I think Jeff Strange is on the video tonight. It is a perfect example of your code right now, without anything to do with this park plan requires anybody in that A2 zone on the waterfront, if they need riprap, they have to come to the planning commission and get a conditional use permit. They have to get a biologist to determine high

water, high mean watermark. And a structural change. It's really pretty restrictive compared to other places. It's just that we haven't ever used it. It's been in the code since the 70's. But either wasn't enforced, or maybe that certain situation hasn't happened yet. I don't know. We haven't now.

Dideum - We've gone through, we've talked specifically about policy 3, and that we have problems with policy and 19 that we have problems with, and policy 12 with the Parks Commission, whether or not to hire landscapers. Are there other sections specifically, Connell, that you would like to address before we go to public comment?

Carole - Let me give you a couple more highlights that I think will bring some more conversation. Policy 3.4 vegetation in the dunes to be managed as allowed under the zoning ordinance Item B environmental protection and preservation of the snowy plover and other wildlife habitat. I was informed by Chad that the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife removed protection of the snowy plover in the Gearhart area and mitigated that area elsewhere, because there's just too much human activity out there with the public to manage it. Technically speaking, we could take that out of the snowy plover. Another one is 3.6. Tennis pickleball basketball courts to be maintained as presently operated. Presently, anytime there's a time and date it bugs me because what is presently going to mean 10 years from now. Anyway, it says on the third line maintaining the pickleball ball tennis as currently arranged. There's already interest by pickleball players to add more pickleball courts and thus generate the debate about how many there should be for tennis, and how many there should be for pickleball. And this would limit that discussion by saying you have to leave it as currently arranged. And then one more I've got I think jumping out at me and that's the page 15 in the middle of the page right above the word note. It says in light of the intended uses for this park, this park being Trails End, the city will require that pet owners keep their dogs leashed at all times while in this park. And Chad informed me that the prior city manager in his era, there was a referendum that there will not and still stands there's a no leash law. So, we would have to talk about or deal with that.

Sweet - So what happened, are current law is that their dog must be under command. Yeah, and the dog must not be just loose and wandering around just like dogs do around here. There was a period of time, and I think it was actually maybe in the 90s, where the City Council or the Planning Commission decided to try to implement a leash law and put it in an ordinance. That ordinance then was brought to a vote with the city and failed miserably. However, they repealed that and kept the leash law the way it was. So, at that time, people in Gearhart, we're very much wanting to keep the leash laws as it was.

Austin - How does that stop you from? I mean, I don't want a leash law at all. That's why it's just this one little spot. And a lot of people in the Parks Commission feel the same way. So, you can't just designate an area that's just legislated.

Sweet - I think that through policy, the city can probably, you know, in a specific area, not allow dogs to be off leash for a specific reason. Yeah. And that's part of the policy. I think that the point was that this was saying, in this particular area, that's what we're going to do. There has been feedback of course, but with the general public feedback. Frank - Is that because there is potentially going to be playground equipment there and children running around.

Tomlinson - The idea behind it was to get a Central Park for the city and their kids to run around, in one place, because there was a comment about it in the public surveyor. And so, we

thought it would be a little bit like a compromise to have this one designated area as a leash area, because of your dog and your kids being in the same area, for safety reasons.

Connell - One more thing right under that is the note about the Trails End Park because in this case, we're still in the trails End Park. And it says that the name should be decided upon either Trails End Park, Central City Park, which is referenced in the comp plan, and Centennial Park, which was a recent naming of the park. And it goes on to say in the last sentence, to reduce confusion, the new public. Here our Parks Commission should formally adopt an official and definitive name. This is minutia, but really the city council should do that, particularly if there is not going to be a Parks Commission formed from this plan. And right under there 3.8. Plate ridge path to be restored and made usable. I thought that these words promptly and diligently were a little excessive, you know, like the city wasn't maintaining it very well, and they need to do it right now. But then also, we had a question about D to place signage at key points to advise the public regarding the history of the path, and restrictions on its use. Quotation foot traffic only. There are questions about bicycles, which have really always been able to go back and forth on the rich path. And I know some people have had problems with that. But generally, I think there's some sense that maybe it's too restrictive to say no bicycles on a rich path.

Smith - Things to consider that there are now bicycles with motors on them. Electric motors, people won't hear them coming. And I would think that typical motorized bicycle would declare themselves having a right-of-way on an improved path. There's a lot of conflict there with foot traffic. And it's probably going to get worse. Probably motorized skateboards.

Dideum - On 19, PAGE 22, the second sentence up. It says the only the only... The only what?.

Kloepfer - I think it's supposed to be "and only".

Connell - And only to allow pass to remain passable.

Dideum - It's Still an incomplete sentence.

Austin - had a couple things in 19 needing clarification for the public for the public comment is from the way I read it; it sounds like it refers to city owned parks. But then the note about it says only applies to constitutes and estuaries?

Connell - I think my note was wrong. Sharon, I think that was intended to be for all city parks, not just in the oceanfront dunes and estuary or as subject to beaches and dunes overlay zone. I think that was the error there.

Austin - Because in the policy it says a maintain environmental integrity in city owned, on public parks. Nobody says this only applies to city parks and ocean views, but the note says this only applies to city owned parks and ocean views. And then the first paragraph says there are three areas in the oceanfront dunes that are zone Park and open space.

Connell - Lets just remove the note.

Dideum Opened testimony for proponents.
There were no proponents or any natural comments.

Dideum Opened testimony for opponents.

John Dudley, PO Box 2373, Gearhart, Oregon 97138 - Home address is 924 Little Beach Dr. - He wrote a letter that he believes has not been addressed, which is that this is a parks plan addressing everything within the parks zone. To his understanding, there's language in the parks plan, which gives the impression that the shoreline outside of the parks plan that is west of the park zone near Hagar to the near Neacoxie Creek is under the jurisdictional management of the park policy. It is not clear to him that the commission has made any resolution of that issue that is removing that specific language. In section three, policy number three (3.3), also referred to in section four under existing parks capital improvement plan, and the existing park is specified as the Dunes West of Ocean Avenue connecting to Necanicum estuary and near Neacoxie Creek. He believes this to be incorrect.

Connell - That is incorrect. Neacoxie Creek in section four that capital improvement plan was not intended to be connected to the ocean dunes, in this specific place. It's not an existing park.

John Dudley - That's correct. As the primary thrust of my object objection, I have some other concerns. But I don't elect to voice them at this moment.

Dideum - Asked Carole to restate what was just said.

Connell - In section 4 page 24, there are three tables back there that talk about park planning, capital planning, and proposed parks. The existing parks have a number of categories there and the first one says existing park dunes. This is the dunes, the parkland is out in the dunes zone park, west of Ocean Avenue connecting to the Necanicum estuary and erroneously as and Neacoxie Creek. She clarified that it doesn't connect all the way to the creek. It just stops at Wellington. So, I would agree to remove those last three words in that table for clarity.

Jeff Strange, 2125 NE 48th Street, Portland, Oregon 97213 - In relation to their lodge at 715 H St, Gearhart, Oregon 97138 He agrees with the Dudley's, and believes to be seeing the same aspect of this plan as being problematic. He believes the parks plan is being used to change policy in zones outside of the parks, particularly A2 and R1. That if they want to do anything, or if there are concerns, that the A2 and somehow is not rigorous enough of a process to develop anything in that zone. That the best response would be to amend the A2 zone or the R1 zone to speak to those particular concerns, that we shouldn't be using a parks plan, to legislate activities in these other zones. He doesn't see a different way to address this readily without the recommendation that I'm making here, that all referenced to, within policy number three, and that's been explicitly to new restrictions on privately held property along the shoreline of the Necanicum be deleted from the parks plan, He believes there's just a few clauses that seem to have been sprinkled in there at the end, where concerns about the parks plan itself, or extrapolated to deal with these other zones. His proposal was provided at the end of his written letter.

Stephanie Dudley, 924 Little Beach Dr, Gearhart, Oregon 97138, PO Box 2373 - In section 3.3, the very first sentence, I would like to see the words and along the Necanicum River estuary, modified or eliminated, and at the very end, where it says, described in the city's zoning ordinance or along the shoreline at the Necanicum River estuary, because the shoreline and the Necanicum River estuary from Wellington or Hager to Neacoxie Creek is not part of the park zone.

Dideum Closed the public hearing for 21-04CP.ZTA Parks Master Plan at 7:35 p.m.

Dideum polled commissioners for their comments:

Dideum – There are still grammatical errors, and the radical errors change the meaning; therefore commas, periods, and syntax, and will let Carole continue to work on that. She mentioned to Connell, the park in the reserve is privately owned by the Reserve at Gearhart HOA and Gearhart Investments LLC is no longer, to please correct that on page ten, under Private Parks, Reserve at Gearhart. She has no problem with Policy 13. Pertaining to Policy 12 Gearhart Parks Commission, she believes commission is a little too strong of a word but has no problem with there being a parks committee; however, it does not make sense or sit well with her.

Smith - Agreed

Austin - Agreed to some degree, but his thoughts are that the council or the commission would have the ability to set the bylaws and structure of this in the long run. He thinks that it can be shaped later on with the discretion of the city council. He says there's obviously a lot of things that are concerning but thinks that it could be worked out later on.

Dideum - Thinks that the plan could include into it, and that the formation of a parks committee to help carry out these policies, and to be aware that there may need to be adjusted. She doesn't have any problem with that; however, it seems to be very specific here about what their duties will be. The question, this is not really a city council thing, was directed to Chad.

Sweet - Anything that has to do with the budget, which it looks like this kind of commission would be. He believes that even the establishment of a commission is laid out in the city council charter, and how to do that.

Dideum - She thinks that part of it, is not only advisory it's advising, and is concerned about the wording that is stated.

Smith - Says when you see the executive approach to the commission or advisory panel, it would seem to be from the advisory panel to the City Council, handle all parks in their origination to the executive Chad. That way the responsibility is left to an elected official, for money spent and short resources permitted. They would be responsible and answerable for what was done, advised by a group that we all approve of.

Dideum - Asked Chad if there was a city staff person that actually has responsibility for the parks, or is it done just by the City Maintenance Department?

Sweet - Says it's a combination of things. He thinks that this piece in here is trying to force this, or to move this plan forward, and to have a body of people responsible for it. Currently, city staff maintains the parks and the status that they are in right now, and that over the years has been what the city of Gearhart wanted. There was a period of time where the city started talking, many years ago about adding parks and adding more things to it, but then the Planning Commission and the city council said no, because if we do that, we are inviting visitors and that sort of thing. So, the parks have developed the way that they are because of that. Moving forward, He thinks that what the city was really waiting for was this Parks Master Plan. So, this is a plan. He thinks that with the Planning Commission and the City Council monitoring what is in this plan, and then with us filtering any changes that we do make to parks through it. He thinks we'll see an improvement in the parks, although with the budget allowing, because there's a lot of items in here that are going to cost a lot of money. He also believes that it is changing

Gearhart, and that people want to see some of these things now, whereas before they didn't. He doesn't know that there needs to be a commission to make sure that happens. He believes as a community we're going to move forward if this plan is adopted.

Smith – Does not agree with spending money on a committee, and that the commission should help them to make the best decisions, help them get through to this document that is as complete and comprehensive as we can and that's what we're doing now.

Taggard – On page 39, you have a long-range goal. This is where you kind of put down commentary or bring information from your survey. And basically, it says leave it alone. Don't mess around with success. There's several from 39 to 40, and that is his thinking about their work. His other comment has to do with policy 15, vehicles on the beach, page 19. Where it says in the first paragraph "However, the city will", he says to get rid of however to make it, "The City will", read item number one, and get rid of the rest of the verbiage.

Connell - B, C, D & E take out?

Taggard - Replied yes, it's the current policy, we're not changing it. The rest of the language is just taking up space. You've already said what you can say, the policy you can't drive on the beach or maintain the policy. You can't drive on the beach.

Tomlinson – Agreed

Commissioners - Everyone agreed to move them to the appendix. They may be clarified, and redundancy can be edited.

Smith - Clarifying the notes and condense them, would be good.

Sweet - Policy 15 Note two, at the very end says, use of heavy equipment or tools complete fire personnel conducting non-emergency activities in the dunes should access the beams on the foot leaving all vehicles on a public right away, located east of the dune. The only conflict that I see with that is our fire department does go out there and drill, using for wildland grass fires training, this would prevent that because it would be a non-emergency event, so it wouldn't enable them to practice out there. It is a very dynamic situation.

Commissioners - Was already decided that everything but A would be taken out.

Tomlinson - Policy number eight, 3.8 page fifteen. The title is factory restored and gate usable, giving the wrong impression, it needs to be completely redone so I would say getting ridge path, to be maintained and usable. Also, Policy n19 section A. Pesticides herbicides fungicides, I read it no overtime should be used when not necessary. The vinegar would work on some minor weeds like dandelions, but if you have nox-invasive weeds like knotweed, yellow flag Iris, purple blue stripe, those are specific things that you need to use herbicides on. They can be selectively applied and with a license herbicide applicator. I feel like we're pigeonhole ourselves, if we get a situation where something like that shows up, we want to address it.

Kloepfer - Policy number 3, page 13. I understand the Little Beach homeowners' concerns about being dictated about what can happen on their private property. I absolutely understand that. But I think that Stephanie's suggestion to take out that along them the Nechanicum and

River Estuary in the first sentence does not need to happen, because the first sentence says the city will manage all city owned property.

Commissioners - Agreed to eliminate the whole second sentence starting with also.

Kloepfer - Letter C, preservation of scenic views. I have no problem whatsoever with that wording. I do have a problem with the city agreeing to help maintain ocean and beach views. Because I don't think in all practicality that the city can agree to do that. And I also don't think that a lot of the taxpayers in the city would be very happy about using their taxes to help preserve ocean and beach views. For a handful of people. I'm just going to go on record saying that I think that wording should be taken out of there.

Graff - Disagrees, He doesn't think that wording should be taken out if you want to put something in that says the city doesn't have to pay for it. I think preservation of scenic views is important. And if it's on city property, then the city should pay for it to be done because it's their property. If it's on private property, then the private property owners should pay for it.

Dideum - It doesn't say that the city is going to pay for this. It just says manage.

Sweet - See's two different things here. He can't think of a time where the city has ever paid to have somebody view maintained either on city park property. Were the city does is if there's trimming that's able to be done. The individual homeowner or a group of homeowners pays for that and based on our ordinance we allow more appealing and allow them to do it. The only place we will be interested in maintaining views is such as the park, Leslie Miller, that is owned by the city and there are times to pay to have those trees taken care of so that the view does remain from that park.

Taggard - why don't we simplify it and use the first line policy number four when you get to city zoning ordinance section 3.1240 D period.

Graff - Disagreed.

Kloepfer - Policy number nineteen, on page 22. My concerns about the pesticide, herbicide fungicide applications are not only for the people who use the parks, but for the dogs that use the parks.

Austin - Agreed; however, he just wants to make sure that we didn't pigeonhole ourselves, and not be able to address something that can become a concern later on, such as an alligator yellow flag Iris that just shows up, and we don't have the ability to treat it, and it spreads wild.

Dideum Agreed, she also stated that it would be in conflict with, 3.45, F removal and control of noxious weeds.

Graff - Policy 19. 10 B, to maintain the environmental integrity of city owned parks. And then you look at the trimming and pruning will be limited to hazards of section limbs, and so no more than a quarter of a limb growth every three years. Some of those trees grow to feed in a sense. Why would you have such restrictive language? And then this next sentence makes no sense. The only two allow paths to remain passable. What does that sentence mean?

Sweet - Said that this is in conflict with the city's ordinance plan.

On **MOTION** by Graff, 2nd by Taggard, by unanimous motion the public hearing is to be brought back with the revisions for one final look in January.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

None


CONCERNS OF THE COMMISSION

None

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.



Angoleana R Brien, secretary



Approved