



CITY OF
West Linn

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

COMMITTEE FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT MEETING NOTES

Thursday, October 26, 2017

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

Present: Emily Smith, Bob Martin, Ken Pryor and Gary Walvatne

Citizens Present: None

Staff Present: John Boyd

1) Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 5:45 p.m. The Rosemont meeting room had a computer problem and the meeting was moved to Bolton Room (signs were posted to make citizens aware of the room change.)

2) Approval of the October 17, 2017 meeting notes:

The meeting notes were reviewed and approved. **Member Pryor moved to approve the meeting notes for October 17, 2017, Member Martin seconded. Motion passed unanimously.**

3) Citizen Comments

There were none

4) Working group composition to update commercial/mixed use code - report on outreach letter responses

Planning Manager John Boyd summarized the outreach efforts requested by the CCI at the last meeting. An updated packet of handouts was provided to the members. This packet was a series of emails to and from stakeholder groups. The groups were reminded to provide names for the CCI to consider in the recommendation to Council. Staff clarified that each stakeholder group was asked to propose names for consideration in the recommendation of working group members. In addition, staff introduced a draft transmittal memo as a concept of one approach for sending the information to Council. It summarized the process Council asked the CCI to use in 99.035 to consider a working group recommendation. Next the memo outlined the goals required by city code and ended with the stakeholder groups and each group's recommendation. The outreach was completed but recommendations have not been submitted by all stakeholder groups. After

reviewing the information the Committee suggested allowing time for the non-responding groups to provide suggested names. Member Walvatne noted that Jim Farrell requested consideration to be appointed to the working group. Member Walvatne noted he should also be assigned to assist in the transition. The committee decided to give those groups more time and revisit this issue at the November 7, 2017, meeting. Member Martin noted that if recommendations arrive as expected a transmittal letter could be completed at the November 7th meeting and Council could consider taking action at their November 13th meeting date.

5) Planning Process: Continuation of Problem Identification and Topics Review – continued discussion from October 17, 2017

Member Martin summarized the progress at the last meeting. There was a discussion of the land use process steps and how citizens work to track the review process. The committee discussed the project review process generally and how it flowed through differing departments. The committee focused on the need for additional information when public works raises issues for projects in certain areas of the city. The purpose of the discussion attempted to assure adequate information remains available to allow citizens to become educated on identified concerns, and to assure that decision makers are adequately educated on the process and facts of the case.

Member Martin clarified his goal is to simplify the process by limiting the changes requested by the City. The applicant has time to consider how to address those concerns. Controlling changes initiated by the city, especially just before the hearing, will create a cleaner process. The review by the city should occur earlier in the process. It will require staff to request information or anticipate the questions decision makers may ask or information they may need for the hearing generally. Overall, the control of change was discussed with a consideration of reducing confusion for those interested in reviewing and commenting on the process.

Staff reviewed the land use process training and noted that the applicant is responsible to defend their application. Limiting changes could be a challenge because the Oregon land use process is an iterative process that allows for the free flow of information. Member Martin concurred and also clarified that more order in the process can be obtained. That clarity requires a more detailed review of land use processes earlier in the process. Staff Boyd noted it is a delicate balance early in the process. The questions are: is the information complete to be considered as a submitted plan versus is it adequate to successfully review and approve the project. Those are two separate items. The process review was discussed recognizing that information evolves and improves throughout the hearing process. That the completeness review is not a quality check. It is a verification that the information needed exists in the plans.

Member Martin noted the concern was is all the information needed to analyze the proposal available, allowing or accepting the plan as complete. The questions focused on how the flow of information was reviewed. The detailed review should be conducted at the completeness check. Otherwise the scenarios we had with recent land use actions occur with multiple changes and confusion for the public. The goal was to control the changes and have a consistent flow of information.

For the most part, the questions are focused in the area of public works and the engineering of plans. The committee expressed concern about when that review happens. The preference of the committee is to keep the best information available before the hearings process begins. Member Martin suggested in moving forward, to consider draft language in the area of completeness, timeliness and limitations of changes. The thought was the draft would be a starting point allowing members to review, comment or raise questions. A central point remained was when the material was made available to the City engineers and then how that material was provided in a final form prior to the public hearing. Staff suggested that Public Works could be invited to the CCI meeting to address questions. The committee preferred to get a draft of potential code changes available

for review and when those changes were ready, invite public works in for comments. The core concept remains: having a clear path for review of information, response to issues raised, provide information prior to the hearing and start the process with the same information available for all to review. There was consensus on that item.

The committee then discussed who should address this issue once the concept draft was developed; the CCI or the proposed working group. One thought was to produce the draft and get feedback from Public Works. Member Martin proposed to draft land use code for the sections identified in the matrix provided by Member Axelrod. His goal was to make progress on the issues raised in the matrix instead of growing a large list that was too challenging to consider all at one time. Then the annotated draft could be moved forward as an interim draft that would be better understood by the working group. The committee agreed on that path as a method to educate the working group and start them on solid ground.

Member Pryor stated further that most developers are well aware of the physical constraints in the City. He supported getting public works involved in the CCI review. His expectation was they should be doing higher level project submittals earlier in the process. The committee discussed standard information that could be used as a checklist to be provided to developers to quickly make them aware of local issues to address. Member Pryor noted that the public and private engineering professionals should know all the problem areas in West Linn and should anticipate engineering design issues very early in the process. There should not be surprises in what is found in the preparation of plans or studies.

6) Member Comments

Member Martin discussed the transfer of knowledge to the working group. One concept not previously reviewed was a working group that contained the CCI plus the working group members. The larger group could meet more at the start to pass along information and then the sub working group continue on after the core information was passed along. Member Martin proposed that the checklists and other milestones should not be a CCI or work group process. It should be administrative procedures developed outside of this process.

The CCI members would attend less as the working group gains experience. The CCI members could guide the working group on how the code concepts were considered and once they understand, they will be able to progress on their own.

The Committee concurred and asked to discuss this concept again at future meetings.

7) Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m. The October 31 meeting is cancelled. The next meeting is November 7, 2017 at 5:30 p.m. and location will be the Rosemont Room.