

DECLARATION OF PAUL CONTE

*Regarding September 11, 2026 Design Committee Meeting
Type 3 Review - Updated Landscape Plan Application - 8 McKenzie Lane*

I, Paul Conte, declare as follows:

1. I am an owner and applicant with respect to the updated Landscape Plan application for 8 McKenzie Lane. I personally attended the Sunriver Design Committee meeting held on September 11, 2026, at which the Committee conducted a Type 3 review of that aforementioned application.

2. I am preparing and signing this declaration on September 11, 2026, the same day as the meeting, while the events described below are fresh in my memory. To my knowledge, the meeting was not audio-recorded. I submit this declaration to preserve a contemporaneous factual record of what occurred for the re-review record and any subsequent appeal.

Documents provided to the Committee

3. After a proposed motion to deny the application was read, I took the seat at the table to address the Committee and provided Committee members with copies of several documents, including:

- a photograph of yard ornamentation comprising multiple black metal trellises;
- a contemporaneous recap of an October 17, 2025 site visit by General Manager James Lewis and Enforcement staff member Scott Jackson;
- the SROA Appeals Board decision dated July 24, 2026, regarding my request for an Estoppel Certificate;
- the decision dated September 8, 2026, regarding my Form E application for 7 McKenzie Lane, signed by Design Committee Chair Charlie Meyers; and
- a copy of my opinion essay, "Can Sunriver Owners Trust the Design Committee's Official Meeting Records."

Events observed during the meeting

4. Early in the meeting, Chair Meyers stated that I was not allowed to ask the Design Committee any questions. He did not apply that ruling consistently, but he rejected my questions on multiple occasions. The SROA Community Development Department meeting notice stated: "The committee will carefully consider all comments and answer questions regarding the proposal."

5. I sought to address previously submitted concerns about whether one or more Committee members could hear my application fairly and in good faith. Chair Meyers said

that such questioning was not allowed and stated that the Design Committee procedures had no provision for “*voir dire*.” I was not seeking jury-style *voir dire*. I was attempting to determine whether members who were about to adjudicate my application could do so impartially and whether any member should recuse. Chair Meyers did not permit that inquiry and did not provide an alternative procedure for resolving those concerns.

6. During the proceeding, Committee member Richard Look loudly addressed me directly and stated, “You Prick!” (I had previously identified in writing to the committee that Mr. Look was one of the committee members about whom I had concern. Mr. Look thereafter continued to actively participate in the Committee’s discussion and deliberations and recused himself only when the motion was voted upon.

7. Chair Meyers did not caution Mr. Look, disavow the statement, or apologize to me. Shortly afterward, Chair Meyers stated that my online comments were in some manner related to comments by Committee members. I asked him to explain what he meant. He did not answer.

8. Later in the meeting, Mr. Look again loudly interjected, “Jesus!” in response to comments I made. Chair Meyers again took no action to caution or restrain Mr. Look, and Mr. Look continued to participate in the discussion and deliberations.

9. At one point, Mr. Look introduced a copy of a 2018 Design Committee decision and repeatedly asserted that I had never complied with that order. In response, I read from a November 6, 2018 email stating that then-General Manager Hugh Palcic had written: “The recent order by the Design Committee Chairman to remove all ‘enclosures’ is suspended indefinitely.” I also stated that I had provided that message to current General Manager James Lewis on October 7, 2021.

10. After I responded by citing the November 6, 2018 email, various Committee members objected that the 2018 matter was not related to the current review. I pointed out that Mr. Look had introduced the 2018 order to support his assertion that I had never complied with it. No Committee member directed that Mr. Look’s assertions be disregarded or otherwise excluded his use of the suspended 2018 order to challenge my argument.

11. I asked Chair Meyers whether the Committee was required to operate under applicable statutory and contract law. He did not answer.

12. I asked whether any Committee member would explain why the Committee had not responded to a set of written substantive clarifying questions that I had submitted on multiple occasions. No Committee member answered.

13. I stated that the recent Appeals Board decision had established that the Design Committee did not have authority to inspect or review “movable personal property.”

Committee member Theresa Youman responded by reciting sections of the Design Manual. I asked Ms. Youman whether she believed the Appeals Board decision was not determinative. She responded only that I had misinterpreted the Appeals Board decision. I was cut off when I attempted to quote the specific language of that decision.

14. Ultimately, the Committee voted to “recess” without allowing me to complete my presentation of evidence and arguments or obtain answers to the relevant substantive questions I had attempted to raise.

15. The statements above are based on my personal observations and recollection of the September 11, 2026 meeting, except where I have expressly identified the contents of a document that I read, quoted, or provided during the meeting.

I HEREBY DECLARE THAT THE ABOVE STATEMENT IS TRUE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF, AND THAT I UNDERSTAND IT IS MADE FOR USE AS EVIDENCE IN COURT AND IS SUBJECT TO PENALTY FOR PERJURY.

/s _____

Date: September 11, 2026

Paul T. Conte