

# TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN 2020-2040 UPDATE

## Land use File No. 247-23-000507-PA, 508-TA

	Issue Area	Applicable Plan Provision	Support / Opposition	Staff Comment	PC Decision Points
1	Should the Planning Commission include a County-wide prohibition on multi-use pathways in the updated TSP when bordering or within resource-zoned lands or other lands used for farm and forest practices?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TSP Goal 5: Equity and Accessibility, Policy 5.6 (pg. 15)</li> <li>• TSP Section 5 (Transportation Investment Priorities - Bicycle Facilities pg. 51-56)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Support:</b> Citizen Comment</li> <li>• <b>Opposition:</b> BPAC, COTA, Bend Bikes, DTC, ODOT, BPRD, Citizen Comment</li> </ul>	Staff notes that most of the testimony opposing this recommendation is from regional trail-based non-profits and citizen groups. Staff further notes that, while there are clearly anticipated impacts related to multi-use pathways adjacent to farm and forest uses/properties, the benefits of maintaining an active transportation system in the County (including multi-use pathways) are significant.	<p>Should the Planning Commission include a County-wide prohibition on multi-use pathways in the updated TSP when bordering or within resource-zoned lands or other lands used for farm and forest practices?</p> <p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend language prohibiting multi-use pathways in the updated TSP document and move on to Issue Area #2.</p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend keeping the existing language in the updated TSP document related to multi-use pathways and move on to the next issue area.</p>
1a	Should the Planning Commission include a County-wide prohibition on multi-use pathways in the updated TSP based on potential wildlife habitat fragmentation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TSP Goal 5: Equity and Accessibility, Policy 5.6 (pg. 15)</li> <li>• TSP Section 5 (Transportation Investment Priorities - Bicycle Facilities pg. 51-56)</li> <li>• TSP Goal 2: Safety, Policy 2.8 (pg. 12)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Support:</b> Citizen Comment</li> <li>• <b>Opposition:</b> BPAC, COTA, Bend Bikes, DTC, ODOT, BPRD, Citizen Comment</li> </ul>	Similar to Issue Area #1, staff notes that most of the testimony opposing this recommendation is from regional trail-based non-profits and citizen groups. Staff further notes that, while there are clearly anticipated impacts related to the interface of multi-use pathways with wildlife habitat, the benefits of maintaining an active transportation system in the County (including multi-use pathways) are significant.	<p>Should the Planning Commission include a County-wide prohibition on multi-use pathways in the updated TSP based on potential wildlife habitat fragmentation?</p> <p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend language prohibiting multi-use pathways in the updated TSP document based on wildlife concerns and move on to Issue Area #2.</p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend keeping the existing language in the updated TSP document related to multi-use pathways and move on to the next issue area.</p>

# TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN 2020-2040 UPDATE

## Land use File No. 247-23-000507-PA, 508-TA

	Issue Area	Applicable Plan Provision	Support / Opposition	Staff Comment	PC Decision Points
1b	Should the Planning Commission include a conceptual Community Connection multi-use pathway in the updated TSP between the City of Sisters and the Black Butte Ranch Resort Community?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TSP Goal 5: Equity and Accessibility, Policy 5.6 (pg. 15)</li> <li>TSP Section 5 (Transportation Investment Priorities - Bicycle Facilities pg. 51-56)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Support:</b> Citizen Comment, BPAC</li> <li><b>Opposition:</b> Citizen Comment</li> </ul>	<p>This decision point is at the discretion of the PC, but staff notes that there are no specific design or alignment proposals associated with this conceptual connection at this time. The conceptual connections are reflective of public input related to a desire for connectivity between certain locations. Public input from certain residents of Black Butte Ranch expresses concern around potential trespassing, traffic congestion, and degradation of infrastructure from overuse related to this proposed connection.</p>	<p>Should the Planning Commission include a conceptual Community Connection multi-use pathway in the updated TSP between the City of Sisters and the Black Butte Ranch Resort Community?</p> <p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend keeping the existing language in the updated TSP document related to a conceptual multi-use pathway Community Connection between the City of Sisters and the Black Butte Ranch Resort Community and move on to the next issue area.</p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend language prohibiting a conceptual multi-use pathway Community Connection between the City of Sisters and the Black Butte Ranch Resort Community and move on to the next issue area.</p>
1c	Should the Planning Commission include a conceptual Community Connection multi-use pathway in the updated TSP between Baker Road and Lava Butte?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TSP Goal 5: Equity and Accessibility, Policy 5.6 (pg. 15)</li> <li>TSP Section 5 (Transportation Investment Priorities - Bicycle Facilities pg. 51-56)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Support:</b> BPAC, COTA, DTC, Bend Bikes, ODOT</li> <li><b>Opposition:</b> Citizen Comment</li> </ul>	<p>This decision point is at the discretion of the PC, but staff notes that there are no specific design or alignment proposals associated with this conceptual connection at this time. The conceptual connections are reflective of public input related to a desire for connectivity between certain locations. Public input from certain residents of Black Butte Ranch expresses concern around potential trespassing, traffic congestion, and degradation of infrastructure from overuse related to this proposed connection.</p>	<p>Should the Planning Commission include a conceptual Community Connection multi-use pathway in the updated TSP between Baker Road and Lava Butte?</p> <p>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend keeping the existing language in the updated TSP document related to a conceptual multi-use pathway Community Connection between the City of Sisters and the Black Butte Ranch Resort Community and move on to the next issue area.</p> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend language prohibiting a conceptual multi-use pathway Community Connection between the City of Sisters and the Black Butte Ranch Resort Community and move on to the next issue area.</p>

# TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN 2020-2040 UPDATE

## Land use File No. 247-23-000507-PA, 508-TA

	Issue Area	Applicable Plan Provision	Support / Opposition	Staff Comment	PC Decision Points
2	Should the Planning Commission include additional goals and policies related to wildlife crossings on ODOT facilities other than what is currently included in the draft TSP?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TSP Goal 2: Safety, Policy 2.8 (pg. 12)</li> <li>TSP Section 5 - Transportation Investment Priorities - ODOT Intersections and Roadways (pg. 44-47)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Support:</b> Central Oregon LandWatch (COLW)</li> <li><b>Opposition:</b> N/A</li> </ul>	<p>This issue area originated with a comment from COLW encouraging the PC to incorporate language in the updated TSP that would accommodate future wildlife crossings, including a specific request for a wildlife crossing along Highway 20. The draft TSP update currently includes Policy 2.8 related to wildlife crossing coordination on state highways. Staff respectfully suggests that the existing language of Policy 2.8 appears to address future coordination around state highway wildlife crossings, but this decision point is ultimately at the discretion of the PC.</p>	<p>Should the Planning Commission include additional goals and policies related to wildlife crossings on ODOT facilities other than what is currently included in the draft TSP?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend additional language related to wildlife crossings on ODOT facilities and move on to the next issue area.</li> <li>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend keeping the existing language in the updated TSP document related to wildlife crossings on ODOT facilities and move on to the next issue area.</li> </ul>
3	Should the Planning Commission incorporate changes to the proposed TSP update responsive to airport-related concerns referenced in Citizen Comment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TSP Goal 3: Mobility and Connectivity, Policy 3.12 (pg. 13)</li> <li>TSP Goal 4: Economic Development, Policy 4.1 (pg. 14)</li> <li>TSP Goal 7: Strategic Investments, Policy 7.9 (pg. 16)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Support:</b> Citizen Comment</li> <li><b>Opposition:</b> N/A</li> </ul>	<p>Staff notes that land loss due to road construction is significantly limited through the County's Road moratorium prohibiting the acceptance of new roadways into the County Road system. Most new roads are typically associated with land division approvals issued through Deschutes County and those approvals are increasingly rare as many large-acreage properties in the County have already been divided to their lowest minimum sizes. Lastly, staff notes that there is no known connection between the Bend Municipal Airport's aviation operational funding and the County Road Department's construction and maintenance activities.</p>	<p>Public comments related to potential impacts from the Bend Municipal Airport operations focus on: land loss from road construction/maintenance; air pollution from air traffic; and funding concerns with road maintenance related to airport operations.</p> <p>Should the Planning Commission incorporate changes to the proposed TSP update responsive to these airport-related concerns?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend language responsive to the aforementioned airport-related concerns and move on to the next issue area.</li> <li>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend keeping the existing language in the updated TSP document and move on to the next issue area.</li> </ul>

# TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN 2020-2040 UPDATE

Land use File No. 247-23-000507-PA, 508-TA

	Issue Area	Applicable Plan Provision	Support / Opposition	Staff Comment	PC Decision Points
4a	Should the Planning Commission recommend adoption of ODOT's proposed language related to ODOT Intersection Changes outlined in <u>S-9</u> and <u>S-11</u> ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TSP Section 5 - Transportation Investment Priorities – Table 5.4 ODOT Intersection Changes and Associated Cost Estimates – ID S-9, S-11 (pg. 47)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Support:</b> ODOT</li> <li><b>Opposition:</b> N/A</li> </ul>	<p>This decision point is at the discretion of the PC, but staff notes that the effect of increasing a priority status for a given project or action item may place those projects before or after other identified projects with relatively similar scope and impacts.</p>	<p>ODOT recommends the following changes to the updated TSP document:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>S-9: Recommend changing the priority level from Low to High</li> <li>S-11: Recommend changing the priority level from Low to High and noting that the project, with contributions from Deschutes County, City of Sisters, and ODOT, is funded for construction in 2024.</li> </ol> <p>Should the Planning Commission recommend adoption of ODOT's proposed language related to <u>ODOT Intersection Changes outlined in S-9 (US 20/Powell Butte Highway Roundabout) and S-11 (US 20 / Locust St Roundabout)</u>?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend adopting ODOT's proposed language related to ODOT Intersection Changes outlined in S-9 and S-11 and move on to the next issue area.</li> <li>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining the existing language included in the updated TSP document and move on to the next issue area.</li> </ul>
4b	Should the Planning Commission recommend adoption of SLED's proposed language related to Intersection Changes outlined in <u>ID CI-12</u> ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TSP Section 5 - Transportation Investment Priorities – Table 5.1 Intersection Changes and Associated Cost Estimates – ID CI-12 (pg. 34)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Support:</b> SLED</li> <li><b>Opposition:</b> N/A</li> </ul>	<p>This decision point is at the discretion of the PC, but staff notes that the effect of increasing a priority status for a given project or action item may place those projects before or after other identified projects with relatively similar scope and impacts.</p>	<p>SLED recommends changing the priority from Medium to High for <u>proposed intersection change ID CI-12 (Venture Lane/S Century Drive Roundabout or Realignment)</u>.</p> <p>Should the Planning Commission recommend adoption of SLED's proposed language related to Intersection Changes outlined in ID CI-12?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend changing the CI-12 priority from Medium to High and move on to the next issue area.</li> <li>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining the existing language included in the updated TSP document and move on to the next issue area.</li> </ul>

# TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN 2020-2040 UPDATE

## Land use File No. 247-23-000507-PA, 508-TA

	Issue Area	Applicable Plan Provision	Support / Opposition	Staff Comment	PC Decision Points
5	Should the Planning Commission recommend adoption of the citizen comment's recommendation to include a High priority category associated with <u>Table 5.5 ID BP-3</u> ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TSP Section 5 - Transportation Investment Priorities – Table 5.5 Pedestrian Facilities and Associated Cost Estimates – ID BP-3 (pg. 51)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Support:</b> Citizen Comment</li> <li><b>Opposition:</b> N/A</li> </ul>	<p>This decision point is at the discretion of the PC, but staff notes that the effect of increasing a priority status for a given project or action item may place those projects before or after other identified projects with relatively similar scope and impacts.</p>	<p>One public comment includes a recommendation to change the priority from Medium to High related to <u>Table 5.5 ID BP-3 related to 2<sup>nd</sup> Street / Cook Ave sidewalks in Tumalo</u>.</p> <p>Should the Planning Commission recommend adoption of the citizen comment's recommendation to include a High priority category associated with Table 5.5 ID BP-3?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend changing the BP-3 priority from Medium to High and move on to the next issue area.</li> <li>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining the existing language included in the updated TSP document and move on to the next issue area.</li> </ul>
6	Should the Planning Commission recommend adoption of the citizen comment's recommendation to designate a bicycle route associated with the Buckhorn Road FLAP improvements outlined in <u>Table 5.9 ID F-2</u> of the draft TSP document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TSP Section 5 - Transportation Investment Priorities – Table 5.9 FLAP Roadways and Associated Cost Estimates – ID F-2 (pg. 60)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Support:</b> Citizen Comment</li> <li><b>Opposition:</b> N/A</li> </ul>	<p>Staff notes it is unclear the specific effects that may occur should a bicycle route be designated along Buckhorn Rd north of Highway 126, but the process would potentially involve thorough interagency coordination and some level of construction requirements to accommodate any bicycle-related infrastructure required because of a bicycle route designation. Staff suggests as one option, that language related to bicycle route designation on Buckhorn Rd could be worded to reflect an inquiry process where feasibility of a bicycle route designation is explored by County staff in conjunction with agency partners. Despite that suggestion, staff notes that this decision point is at the discretion of the PC.</p>	<p>One public comment includes a recommendation to designate Buckhorn Road, north of Highway 126, as a bicycle route, related to <u>Table 5.9 ID F-2 related to Buckhorn Road FLAP improvements</u>.</p> <p>Should the Planning Commission recommend adoption of the citizen comment's recommendation to designate a bicycle route associated with the Buckhorn Road FLAP improvements outlined in Table 5.9 ID F-2 of the draft TSP document?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend designating a bicycle route associated with the Buckhorn Road FLAP improvements outlined in Table 5.9 ID F-2 and move on to the next issue area.</li> <li>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining the existing language included in the updated TSP document and move on to the next issue area.</li> </ul>

# TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN 2020-2040 UPDATE

## Land use File No. 247-23-000507-PA, 508-TA

	Issue Area	Applicable Plan Provision	Support / Opposition	Staff Comment	PC Decision Points
7	Should the Planning Commission recommend adoption of the citizen comment's recommendation to change the project description of the Sisemore Road Bridge Project (ID BR-11) from "Replacement" to "Preserve"?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TSP Section 5 - Transportation Investment Priorities – Table 5.8 Bridge Projects and Associated Cost Estimates – ID BR-11 (pg. 58)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Support:</b> Citizen Comment</li> <li><b>Opposition:</b> N/A</li> </ul>	<p>This decision point is at the discretion of the PC, but staff notes that, of the "Description" statuses included in Table 5-8 of the drafted TSP related to Bridge Projects, there is no specific Description category to "Preserve" a listed bridge. Of the listed Description categories, staff notes that "Rehabilitation" is used for several identified bridge projects and has a very similar definition to the archaeological/historical term "Preservation<sup>1</sup>".</p>	<p>One public comment includes a recommendation to change the project description of the Sisemore Road Bridge Project (ID BR-11) from "Replacement" to "Preserve".</p> <p>Should the Planning Commission recommend adoption of the citizen comment's recommendation to change the project description of the Sisemore Road Bridge Project (ID BR-11) from "Replacement" to "Preserve"?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend changing the project description of the Sisemore Road Bridge Project (ID BR-11) from "Replacement" to "Preserve" and move on to the next issue area.</li> <li>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining the existing language included in the updated TSP document and move on to the next issue area.</li> </ul>
8	Should the Planning Commission recommend adoption of the citizen comment's recommendation to include a County-wide "complete transit map", "park and ride map", and information related to County funding in support of transit within the Transit section of the drafted TSP document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TSP Section 4 – Providing Multimodal Systems – Transit Services (pg. 29)</li> <li>TSP Section 5 - Transportation Investment Priorities – Transit (pg. 61)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Support:</b> Citizen Comment</li> <li><b>Opposition:</b> N/A</li> </ul>	<p>Staff notes the information on pg. 29 (Transit Services) of the draft TSP document explains that Cascade East Transit (CET) provides regional public transit services, including in Deschutes County. This section of the draft TSP highlights the incorporation of CET's 2020 Master Plan by reference into the updated TSP document and outlines seven (7) high-level aspirational goals and policies for transit service in unincorporate Deschutes County. While this decision point is at the discretion of the PC, staff further notes that the County largely relies on CET for their public transit expertise (including mapping and funding information) under the management of the Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council (COIC).</p>	<p>One public comment includes a recommendation to provide a "complete transit map" and "park and ride map" for the County and to identify the role of County funding in support of transit.</p> <p>Should the Planning Commission recommend adoption of the citizen comment's recommendation to include a County-wide "complete transit map", "park and ride map", and information related to County funding in support of transit within the Transit section of the drafted TSP document?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend that the Transit section of the drafted TSP document include a County-wide "complete transit map", "park and ride map", and information related to County funding in support of transit and move on to the next issue area.</li> <li>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining the existing language included in the updated TSP document and move on to the next issue area.</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> **Preservation (treatment)**— [Current definition of this treatment standard, as revised in The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, 1995:

Preservation is defined as the act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of an historic property. Work, including preliminary measures to protect and stabilize the property, generally focuses upon the ongoing maintenance and repair of historic materials and features rather than extensive replacement and new construction. New exterior additions are not within the scope of this treatment; however, the limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make properties functional is appropriate within a preservation project.] – [nps.gov/articles/sec-stds-pres-terminology.htm](https://nps.gov/articles/sec-stds-pres-terminology.htm)

# TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN 2020-2040 UPDATE

## Land use File No. 247-23-000507-PA, 508-TA

	Issue Area	Applicable Plan Provision	Support / Opposition	Staff Comment	PC Decision Points
9	Should the Planning Commission recommend adoption of the citizen comment's recommendation to prohibit the expenditure of County funds on the "Cline Falls Rd / Coopers Hawk Dr / Falcon Crest Dr" TSAP project outlined in Table 5.10 of the draft TSP document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TSP Section 5 - Transportation Investment Priorities – Table 5.10 TSAP Priority Locations &amp; Status – Intersection "Cline Falls Rd / Coopers Hawk Dr / Falcon Crest Dr" (pg. 61)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Support:</b> Citizen Comment</li> <li><b>Opposition:</b> N/A</li> </ul>	<p>Staff notes that, while Coopers Hawk Dr and Falcon Crest Dr are designated as private roads within the Eagle Crest Destination Resort, Cline Falls Road (including the portion that abuts Coopers Hawk Dr and Falcon Crest Dr) is designated as a Rural Arterial Road which is owned and maintained by Deschutes County. The subject intersection is also not within the boundaries of an independent Road District. As the County Road Department is responsible for expending dedicated road maintenance funds on County Roads (as funded through state motor vehicle revenue and federal forest receipts from timber sales in Deschutes National Forest), it is unclear whether the PC has the authority to prohibit the expenditure of such dedicated funds.</p>	<p>One public comment includes a recommendation that no funds be expended on improvements to this intersection based on its potential connection to a nearby Destination Resort. The intersection is identified as a TSAP project labeled "Cline Falls Rd / Coopers Hawk Dr / Falcon Crest Dr" on pg. 61 of the drafted TSP document.</p> <p>Should the Planning Commission recommend adoption of the citizen comment's recommendation to prohibit the expenditure of County funds on the "Cline Falls Rd / Coopers Hawk Dr / Falcon Crest Dr" TSAP project outlined in Table 5.10 of the draft TSP document?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend language prohibiting the expenditure of funds on the "Cline Falls Rd / Coopers Hawk Dr / Falcon Crest Dr" TSAP project and move on to the next issue area.</li> <li>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining the existing language included in the updated TSP document and move on to the next issue area.</li> </ul>
10	Should the Planning Commission recommend adoption of the citizen comment's recommendation for the County Road Department to utilize low bunch grass plantings instead of herbicide for vegetation management and to identify beautification projects and funding sources?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TSP Section 6 - Funding—Figure 6-1: Hierarchy of Expenditures and Investment (Item #1 "Maintain the System" and "Vegetation Management" (pg. 65)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Support:</b> Citizen Comment</li> <li><b>Opposition:</b> N/A</li> </ul>	<p>This decision point is at the discretion of the PC, but staff notes that no proposed or existing "beautification" projects or associated funding have been identified in the record. Acknowledging the potential difficulty in setting a blanket prohibition on herbicide application processes historically utilized by Deschutes County Road Department and numerous other County Road Departments in the state, staff suggests that one option for refined language could include a recommendation to explore the inclusion of low bunch grass plantings along roadways in the County Road Department's process for vegetation management.</p>	<p>One public comment includes a recommendation requiring the County Road Department to plant low bunch grasses along roadways instead of utilizing herbicides for vegetation management. The recommendation also asks for beautification projects and funding sources to be identified in the drafted TSP document.</p> <p>Should the Planning Commission recommend adoption of the citizen comment's recommendation for the County Road Department to utilize low bunch grass plantings instead of herbicide for vegetation management and to identify beautification projects and funding sources?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend: 1) language requiring the County Road Department to utilize low bunch grass plantings instead of herbicides for vegetation management; and 2) a list of beautification projects and funding sources and move on to the next issue area.</li> </ul> <p>If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining the existing language included in the updated TSP document and move on to the next issue area.</p>

# TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN 2020-2040 UPDATE

## Land use File No. 247-23-000507-PA, 508-TA

	Issue Area	Applicable Plan Provision	Support / Opposition	Staff Comment	PC Decision Points
11	Should the Planning Commission recommend adoption of the citizen comment's recommendation to incorporate the five (5) Dark Skies Outdoor Lighting Principles into the draft TSP document?	• N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Support:</b> Citizen Comment</li> <li>• <b>Opposition:</b> N/A</li> </ul>	<p>This decision point is at the discretion of the PC, but staff notes that the Community Development Department, under the guidance of the Board of County Commissioners, is currently undergoing a revisit of the County's Outdoor Lighting Ordinance (DCC 15.10) that will likely result in an amendment of the Outdoor Lighting code provisions. Pursuing inclusion of dark skies outdoor lighting standards within the standalone TSP document may have the effect of misaligning the County's Title 15 (DCC 15.10) outdoor lighting code provisions. Staff further notes the effect of including the five (5) Dark Skies Outdoor Lighting Principles in the draft TSP document ahead of the DCC 15.10 update may result in additional process/costs associated with transportation projects involving outdoor lighting.</p>	<p>One public comment includes a recommendation to incorporate the five (5) principles of Dark Skies Outdoor Lighting into the drafted TSP document: 1) Useful, 2) Targeted (downward), 3) Low Level (brightness), 4) Controlled (timers/sensors), 5) Warm-Colored (as opposed to "blue-violet" light). There is currently no inclusion of Dark Skies Outdoor Lighting principles in the drafted TSP document.</p> <p>Should the Planning Commission recommend adoption of the citizen comment's recommendation to incorporate the five (5) Dark Skies Outdoor Lighting Principles into the draft TSP document?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If yes, the Planning Commission may recommend which section of the drafted TSP should contain the Dark Skies information, any specific language to be utilized in that section, and move on to the next issue area.</li> <li>• If no, the Planning Commission may recommend retaining the existing language included in the updated TSP document and move on to the next issue area.</li> </ul>