



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

COMMITTEE FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT MEETING NOTES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

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

Present: Chair Thomas Tucker, Russ Axelrod, Bob Martin, Ken Pryor, Emily Smith, and Karie Oakes

Citizens Present: None

Staff Present: John Boyd

1. Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. Approval of the June 20, 2017 meeting notes

The minutes for June 20, 2017, were reviewed and members discussed changes related to de novo review. The changes were incorporated. Motion to approve the meeting notes by Member Axelrod and Seconded by Member Smith. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Citizen Comments

There were no citizens present to comment.

4. Planning Process Action Topics Summary

To assist in the discussion, staff prepared a summary of concerns or issues that were identified in each set of meeting notes. Staff Boyd noted this was only a draft to assist in the discussion and was provided for consideration by the members. The members reviewed the information and chose to work in the outline format. Member Martin discussed a potential future action to develop a progress update and present that information to the City Council. The goal was to discuss the training, consider the questions or proposals raised during that process, and discuss with Council the scope of the work and then ask for feedback. The members discussed the role of the CCI in this process and how recommendations could be made. Members discuss another potential concept that would consider the lessons learned from the training and express these issues as CCI priorities with the Council. Member Pryor discussed the need for

education of our citizens on the process, the difficulty with the complicated land use process and the best methods to pass along the lessons learned (beside using websites or email.) Members discussed the "Putting the People in Planning" brochure from the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) and utilizing more techniques provided in that brochure. Member Axelrod felt that they have learned about many issues and wants to create a "laundry list" and pass along those issues.

The group returned to the draft issues list and continued to walk through those topics. Some items members discussed included more involvement of with the Neighborhood Associations (NA) and potentially providing more meetings. Other topics discussed included the rights of citizens to be involved in the process, how to improve notification of the NA's, and how information provided by the applicant could be improved to provide more informative text and 3D graphics to illustrate the design and provide that information early in the process. Members understood there would be a cost concern and discussed boundaries that would limit the impact on smaller scale development. The premise is to give citizens a better view of what is proposed. Member Oakes spoke to a policy document to guide citizen involvement at the pre-application conference. Chair Tucker asked about an educational flyer for land use. Member Martin noted the CCI completed a similar flyer in 2010. Members suggested that the NA may have a flyer and would try to locate a copy for CCI review.

Member Pryor noted that metric's are needed to gauge how information is collected. In discussing the pre-application conference phase, he asked if it is the role for the public to become informed, to absorb information and when could they start providing feedback. Member Oakes reflected on past documents that noted the role of the NA is to obtain information at the pre application conference, provide that information to their association and provide the NA feedback on their issues or concerns. The role of the neighborhood and local citizens is to provide locally significant information, to give feedback on the relationship of the NA Plan concerns, and to consider any local resources (i.e. trees or waterways) that are impacted by the proposal.

Member Martin noted initially there was a process where members representing NA's were trained on the process. Over time, the focus of the pre application conference has shifted from providing information on the criteria to the applicant to providing information to the public. The concept was to create a paper on the role of the public in the process, provide training on the process and then work to refocus the role of a pre-application conference. There was an extended discussion on how that could occur without losing opportunities for people to comment. All agreed that having a proper focus and education was important.

On the issue related to informing the NA's, members discussed that the NA presidents should set the direction how information is filtered. If President's chose to set a land use representative, then that person could be trained. A second issue was as there is a change in leadership and membership; how should members coordinate with staff to maintain the list. All agreed the NA must take a lead role in this item. As NA officers change, they should notify the Citizen Involvement Coordinator. Also, if contact information changes, the city coordinator should be informed and filter that information. There were questions related to what happens after the pre-application conference. It was discussed that the applicant develops their application and when ready schedules a meeting with the NA. The next step after the NA meeting is the submittal of the

application. The City has 30 days to determine it is complete and when complete it is posted on the website.

If an application is deemed incomplete, the website is also posted and a letter is found on the website. A concern was raised about providing more area specific information. A final point was raised about aesthetic design standards. The concept was to get more information to guide the discussion and development of the project earlier in the process.

5. Member Comments

Member Oakes discussed "Putting People in Planning" and reviewed citizen participation. She noted people can express their views in a manner to impact a decision. Her point was based upon listening to citizen's experience in the local process. After talking with them and in this CCI process, there needs to be a discussion to develop an involvement policy. Member Axelrod noted these bullet points are a good beginning. She noted that the de novo process is important because, if citizens learn along the way, and they make a mistake, there is no place in the process for them to correct that mistake. She felt that change should occur now. There was a discussion on the de novo process; some wondered how the recent decisions would be different had de novo been in place. Member Martin noted he wanted the best of both worlds. He wanted a more informed citizen base to provide input at the Planning Commission, and have de novo to address those issues when necessary before council. He wondered if the information is available to the NA earlier if they would be better informed and provide informed feedback before the Planning Commission.

Member Axelrod wondered if this educational process would provide feedback and avoid any issues. He noted that a joint meeting would be helpful with the Planning Commission to consider this issue. Member Martin noted there is a new provision in the code that allows for information to be processed. He thought the process should be respected and more input from the public considered. Member Oakes noted in respecting the process it could consider either Council sending it to the Planning Commission or have it sent to a sub-committee.

She asked for consideration of a vote from the CCI to recommend the Council consider sending a de novo change to the Planning Commission. Member Martin spoke to a concern that the Council respect the process in the CDC and get citizen feedback before pushing through a change to the code.

The group discussed the history of de novo and changes that were made over time. The changes were discussed before the Planning Commission and some compromises made. It was discussed that the next meeting will review the quasi-judicial process and potentially the appeal process. It was generally agreed to listen to that process and have a discussion towards a motion, and to forward an action on the motion.

6. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.
