



22500 Salamo Road
West Linn, Oregon 97068
<http://westlinnoregon.gov>

COMMITTEE FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT MEETING NOTES

Tuesday, May 2, 2017

5:30 p.m. - Meeting –Bolton Conference Room

Present: Chair Thomas Tucker, Russ Axelrod, Bob Martin, Ken Pryor, Karie Oakes, Gary Walvatne.

Citizens Present: Pam Yokubaitis

Staff Present: John Boyd

1. Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 5:35 p.m.

2. Approval of the April 4 and April 18, 2017 minutes

The minutes for April 4, 2017 and April 18, 2017 were reviewed and minor grammatical changes were incorporated. Motion to approve April 4, 2017 by Chair Tucker and Seconded by Member Pryor. Motion passed with one abstention (Martin). Motion to approve April 18, 2017 by Chair Tucker and Seconded by member Pryor. Motion passed with one abstention (Oakes).

3. Citizen Comments

There were none.

4. Review of accomplishments and consideration of next steps: Councilor Martin

Member Martin noted the prior CCI meetings conducted land use presentations that provided significant information. The purpose of tonight's meeting was to consider how the Committee was capturing needed changes or core concerns. Chair Tucker noted a discussion he recollected was on how citizens become engaged in the process.

Questions were raised by Guest Pam Yokubaitis asking how citizens were advised on becoming involved. Member Martin spoke on two documents: one from the City on how

to testify at land use hearings and a second from Department of Land Conservation and Development entitled "Putting the People in Planning". He provided a summary of how citizens can be educated on the land use application (from the pre-application conference, to the neighborhood meeting, and then the land use application.) There was a round table discussion on the process from the legal and the citizen's perspective. The following are the major issues that require follow up – those sections are entitled "Discussion Item" and minor issues that require discussion are entitled "sub-item"

Discussion Item (1): The land use process information is distributed using multiple methods. The distribution often starts at the counter, information continues as the project evolves, is discussed with the neighborhood association, and when the application is deemed complete. During the review process, the project information attached to the application may change as the reviewer requires more information to consider the request. They discussed how the focus is both on the customer (the developer or property owners) and the adjacent neighborhood who are interested or potentially impacted by the project.

Members continued to ask questions regarding how the evolution of the application can be measured. The goal was to get more information clarified earlier in the process.

Discussion Item (2): Member Walvatne asked if the Pre-application conference was serving the applicant's need. If this became a public involvement meeting, the goal to provide the applicant information on the project criteria might not be met. Member Oakes noted this should also be a time for the citizens to provide input or concerns about the applicant's project. She felt it was an important time to educate the NA's on the information provided. She noted that the project should not be so fixed that it cannot adapt to citizen information. She is aware it can change at the Planning Commission and thought that was a positive outcome. Member Martin noted that in 2006 a training was provided to educate the NA's on the pre application process with a key point that the meeting was to educate the applicant on the criteria. At that time the pre-application conference was not considered the time for collecting information from the public.

Member Axelrod asked for information on the pre-application process. He wondered if some time could be provided to collect public information. Staff discussed how the process has evolved and has accommodated collecting public information.

Discussion Item (3): The application process and the evolution of the information. Information is distributed beginning at the pre-application conference. At the Neighborhood meeting there is additional communication on the process. The application is completed and the product is submitted to the city. The group discussed options to educate the citizens on when the application is submitted and when it is completed. Also discussed were opportunities for citizens to meet following the meeting to get answers to their questions.

Sub Item – the Neighborhood Association is notified of the pre-application conference. The committee is considering a request is to make sure an additional officer is notified. The second issue under consideration was to assure adequate notification for the Neighborhood Association (NA) meeting. That notification can include multiple NA's. Member Martin noted a concern that the quality of the application was not under discussion by staff. He thought the review of the application details should go beyond "the required submittals." The committee agreed and discussed the possibility of this discussion or new information being considered by the NA prior to the hearing.

Sub Issue – The committee considered whether land use reviews are meeting the intent of the Comprehensive Plan when applying the CDC. The group felt there was a gap in how the character of the Plan and sub documents were addressed in the CDC.

Sub Issue – The committee asked if the application should be subject to the Comprehensive Plan and plan sub documents (i.e. NA Plans.) If not, a follow up question asked if this option could be addressed in the outreach process.

Sub Issue – The committee asked if it was possible to have an application screened prior to submittal to assure there is consistency between the Comprehensive Plan and NA plans. The committee discussion considered having this outreach would provide a service to those applicants. If this was considered a land use decision, then the group hoped that the pre-application conference could serve to complete this function.

Sub Issue – The committee considered in lieu of screening, could the process be used to provide advice to guide the applicant? The question depends upon how that would be enforced. Could the approval of the process be questioned if the advice given at the screen was not followed? All agreed the concept was to address compatibility of the project to the area. This was a core issue for the CCI: how to provide opportunities to educate people early to simplify the process. There was some concern that early information does not guarantee success. It may not be possible to iron out all issues. The hearing process allows people to express objections even later in the process. The overall goal is to educate as many interested parties earlier in the process.

Sub Issue – The committee considered that NA groups meet at differing intervals and differing frequencies. The land use process has defined time lines. These defined time lines require the NA to consider setting special meetings. The request was for earlier notification to allow time to complete outreach within the NA and to set a meeting.

5. Member Comments

There were none

6. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.
