



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

# COMMITTEE FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT MEETING NOTES

Tuesday, August 15, 2017

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

Present: Chair Thomas Tucker, Russ Axelrod, Bob Martin, Ken Pryor, Jim Farrell, and Karie Oakes.

Citizens Present: Pam Yokubaitis, Carrie Pellett

Staff Present: John Boyd

---

## 1) Call to Order

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

## 2) Approval of the August 1, 2017 meeting notes

The minutes for August 1, 2017, were reviewed and members discussed changes. ***Motion to approve the meeting notes as amended by Member Axelrod and Seconded by Member Martin. Motion passed with two abstentions (Members Oakes & Farrell).***

## 3) Citizen Comments

Pam Yokubaitis spoke on citizen involvement. She noted that citizen's struggle with understanding a complex planning process. She commented citizens need to be able to express their concerns and the staff should be responsible to address those concerns, by complete research and identifying applicable criteria. The best way to hear citizens concerns is to listen without requiring them to provide complex submittals. Her proposal is to relieve the citizens from a research burden. She thinks it asks too much for citizens to have to complete this complicated research.

Member Axelrod noted the CCI has been listening and considering the process and will have several process suggestions. He asked for some clarifications on her comments regarding what citizens need. It was discussed that citizens need assistance to understand the issues and provide guidance. Member Oakes discussed committee activities under consideration to educate citizens on the planning process.

## 4) Planning Process Review: Continuation of Action Topics Summary discussion

Chair Tucker noted he would compile his six points and provide them for distribution to the group tomorrow. Member Oakes requested Chair Tucker's email with draft points for the meeting notes. Member Martin noted the list consists of solutions; the list should identify the problems identified in the planning process. The Council will consider this information as part of their discussion. As an example, he noted there is an issue with early engagement of citizens, a second was the need to control changes to the application.

Citizens have a hard time keeping up with a dynamic process. Member Axelrod introduced two potential problem points: assisting citizens earlier in the process to understand issues, and engaging citizens earlier in the process. The committee agreed to continue discussing problem identification and then recommend potential solutions.

Member Farrell raised the issue of outreach. He noted that only five hundred feet was noticed. He felt that was inadequate. The Committee also discussed that the notification of NA members should be enhanced.

Returning to problem identification, the issue of changes to applications and the issue of material misrepresentation were discussed. The Committee clarified the need for to create a definition for material misrepresentations, when it occurs and how it should be addressed. The goal being limiting the ability to make changes (by the applicant and by the city.) This creates a complex application that from the public perspective is confusing. The committee discussed the land use process and the difficulties with the flow of information. Member Axelrod noted his problem areas: 1) misunderstanding of the pre-application process and citizen rights. 2) Problem in tracking the project changes after it is deemed complete. 3) The timing of the staff report. The discussion was on the moving target of data and a cutoff date for submittal of material. The issue in question would then be who raises those questions and when could they be raised.

The discussion continued regarding the nature of the hearing process. Member Martin clarified that this material misrepresentation must be changed to redefine how the application is deemed complete (after the submittal and before the hearing process began). Staff Boyd discussed CDC 99.038 as a review before the application can be deemed complete, it is not during the hearing process. The Committee discussed review is a complex process, the application is lengthy with many pieces, and the technical review of plans are underway on the engineering section. The committee noted the Oregon statute defines when an application can be deemed complete.

Member Oakes raised the problem of changes to the application information after publication of the notice. How can citizens track those changes? Additional discussion was needed on this problem as raised.

Citizen Yokubaitis noted the timing is a concern for citizens. She agreed the Planning Commission is the review body, but thought the citizens should be involved in the process earlier. Under her concept, all the work should be in final form at the pre-application process. The Committee discussed the land use process and how the pre-application meeting was an educational format and not a review process.

Member Axelrod offered a solution is to identify issues earlier and return the concept to the Neighborhood Association earlier in the process.

#### Problem Draft

- The need for early engagement and understanding by citizens
- Need to improve the notification process throughout all phases of planning
- The lack of understanding of the pre-application process along with citizen and applicant rights
- Material misrepresentation is not defined
- Problem in tracking changes after the application is deemed complete
- Denovo versus on-the record appeals
- Time line for review of material. (Who gets notice and what information is made available)
- Staff Reports are limited reviews.

- Who is responsible for the quality of the review?
- Does the Staff Report thoroughly evaluate a proposal against the criteria?
- What role does the Comprehensive Plan and Neighborhood Plans play in this role?

The members spoke about continuing this discussion in September on a more frequent meeting schedule. The goal expressed was to start weekly meetings on August 29<sup>th</sup>. Other future meeting topics are the creation of the work group for commercial code updates, a review of CCI Committee goals to see how the Committee is doing, and what else must be addressed.

Chair Tucker asked members to review the list of problem statements. If members have suggestions for changes or additions bring them to the next meeting or email him with comments if you cannot attend.

#### 5) Member Comments:

Member Oakes referred to a letter she submitted at the last meeting. She asked for clarification on the process that is underway and the suggestions in her letter. She asked if Council made a motion to make the CCI a working group for DeNovo. Member Martin noted that the DeNovo changes will be sent to the Planning Commission. The interim changes were outlined in a memo provided by Community Development Director Williams. Member Martin also noted that a workgroup will be formed for the longer review of Chapter 98. This has not been placed on the docket. It will require more review by the Council and when the problem statements are better understood, more guidance will be provided on the next steps of a Chapter 98 review. Member Oakes reminded the group that she outlined problems and paths for solutions in her letter. It was clarified that the restoration of DeNovo was not placed on the docket and instead a decision was made to send it to the Planning Commission for action.

#### 6) Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m. The next meeting is August 29<sup>th</sup>.