



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

COMMITTEE FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT MEETING NOTES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

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

Present: Karie Oakes, Russ Axelrod, Bob Martin, Ken Pryor, Ramiah Ramasubramanian and Gary Walvatne

Citizens Present: None

Staff Present: John Boyd

1) Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 5:40 p.m. Gary Walvatne Arrived at 5:50 p.m. **Approval of the November 7, 2017 meeting notes as revised: Moved to approve by Member Martin and Seconded by Member Pryor. Motion passed unanimously. Approval of the November 14, 2017 meeting notes: Moved to approve by Member Axelrod and second by Member Martin. Motion passed unanimously.**

2) Citizen Comments

No citizens were present.

3) Planning Process: Continuation of Problem Identification and Topics Review – continued discussion from November 7, 2017 meeting

Member Axelrod introduced CCI Changes to Application Documents Draft version No. 1 changes provided at the prior meeting with his comments and edits. Discussion considered how to reference documents and determined that it should be referenced as the Comprehensive Plan and support documents for the item listed on Page 2. On the first page, the committee discussed the Section on “Changes before Application deemed complete” – a correction was proposed to retain the “meeting with the” on the second line, to assure the reference correctly addressed the required meeting with the Neighborhood Association. Member Martin discussed the major topics that require discussion. His thought was not all will be addressed tonight but it would be important to refresh memories on the major points and seek volunteers to do a detailed review of those sub sections.

Under the Education Section Member Axelrod suggested additional language to provide education for core staff and neighborhood representatives. This education will benefit the larger project to assure that all

members understand the information. Chair Oakes noted that NA Presidents would be able to assign individuals to receive training and participate as the land use representative in pre-application meetings. Member Walvatne suggested recording the training material to allow all members access to the training opportunity. Member Pryor asked if there is existing training brochures that could be provided on the website for all to access.

The Committee discussed differing audio and visual options that could be used to present information. Member Martin thought that training would be beneficial and suggested the background material used should be created by the CCI. This will assure the material will address all aspects of the city.

Member Ramasubramanian suggested a certification process could be created to document how citizens advance through the training process. The Committee agreed that having the web as a training tool provides great flexibility in the training process. Member Axelrod volunteered to review the comments and add additional sentences to this section. The goal is to have an updated version by the next meeting.

Member Axelrod continued with proposed edits to “Administrative Changes” on the fourth page. His thought was not all of the considered changes were optional. The item needed additional discussion to evaluate items and consider changing some items from optional to a classification considered for required actions. One consideration discussed by the Committee was to provide incentives, fee reductions or consider incentives used by other cities. Another consideration provided encouraging concurrent reviews instead of linear reviews. The time savings in staging the reviews was considered important.

Member Axelrod expressed issues focused on Chapter 99. He introduced issues raised related to Planning Director waivers of required pre-application conferences. The question was should there be more notification of that waiver and all agreed additional discussion would be helpful. Member Axelrod asked the committee if the written notification was adequate. Staff Boyd noted that the waiver of pre-application conferences does not happen often. The process question focused on who is notified of those decisions. Member Pryor felt there should be options for property owners making small scale changes to their sites. He supported the option of reduction of unnecessary steps. Member Axelrod thought additional discussion and review would benefit this item.

Member Axelrod discussed a second item under CDC 99.033 Fees. For the fee schedule options, the committee considered how potential changes could impact the budget versus consideration of supported reduced fees to provide additional flexibility for citizens.

Member Walvatne had a concern about the pre-application conference. The role of the pre-application conference is to provide the applicant an opportunity to meet with staff and review the criteria. Those meetings are also used to educate the public on the project and those differing goals at times conflict with the applicant’s function to become educated on the criteria. In addition Member Walvatne had a concern with the applicant’s right to ask an application be deemed complete. Member Pryor supported providing alternatives for consideration by the subcommittee. Those options will allow for a robust discussion as the process moves into the work group setting and potentially considers needed code changes.

Member Axelrod discussed CDC 99.038 and felt the 500’ notice should be expanded. He thought the notification area could be expanded to 1000’. The goal is to reach out to the greatest number of people. Chair Oakes supported a broader notice and explained the 300’ notice was for director’s decision and the 500’ notice was for PC actions. She also noted to the committee the site must be posted with a placard. There was a general discussion on the options to provide information and what options are available to educate the public. Member Martin noted some items have a Measure 56 notice, and suggested that the discussion was moving to solution focus rather than a problem identification comment he introduced. Member Ramasubramanian supported a broader notice because the construction phase often disrupts

neighborhoods and giving those properties input for a short term impact to the area is an important outreach. Member Martin considered this discussion and proposed changes could be listed under many categories and additional comments are needed to consider the most appropriate category. He continued with his comments to note that when the working group receives this information care should be taken to avoid providing a problem that clearly was complex and potentially unsolvable versus outlining an issue so clear that the problem was already resolved for them.

Member Martin stated the changes proposed must have a cutoff date for all parties. He noted the working group must have clear direction on this issue. They must be provided guidance on receiving changes to the file. How to achieve outreach for information early enough for all parties to respond to by the cutoff date for file comments versus having too restrictive of a deadline that limits adequate time to consider positive changes. After that cutoff point, no changes are allowed and the decision maker is restricted to addressing change via the conditions of approval. Overall, the goal is to establish a timeline that guides when changes can occur and limits changes from occurring later in the process. Chair Oakes suggested the goal should be to provide opportunity and education for citizens. She expressed a concern about being too rigid and limiting citizen's options to speak on issues throughout the process.

Member Axelrod asked Committee members to send him comments as they continue their review of the document. His goal was to work on the next revision and have a draft ready for the next meeting.

Member Martin noted he will work on one of the categories and asked Member Axelrod to work on the revision matrix. He then noted there were seven areas requiring review. The seven areas were: early involvement, variable NA meeting schedules, consistency in community vision, availability timing and scope of staff reports (satisfy CDC, meet Comprehensive Plan and neighborhood vision), cost and complexity of applications, denovo versus on the record (the required follow up review of the process), and application withdrawal prior to the decision.

Member Walvatne volunteered for cost and complexity of applications and the application withdrawal prior to decision topics. Member Oakes volunteered for variable NA meetings schedules. Member Axelrod volunteered for consistency with neighborhood vision. Member Martin suggested he could volunteer for availability, timing and scope of staff reports. This item has two targets proposed; when the application is deemed complete and when the project review is deemed complete. The Committee agreed there must be more discussion and feedback from department heads on this issue.

He noted that at the last meeting the PC chose to back off the issue related to withdrawal of applications prior to the decision and after a detailed discussion had a change of position. Member Walvatne will review his notes and provide a briefing for the CCI at the next meeting.

Member Martin volunteered to review denovo. Member Pryor volunteered for consistency with community vision topic. It was suggested that Member Smith may be assigned the complexity and cost of application topics. Member Smith may have the option to work with Member Walvatne on this issue. Members were asked to review their topic and the minutes discussing those topics. The goal is to start developing concise summary points for the committee to consider.

4) Member Comments

There were none.

5) Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 7:15. The next meeting is December 5, 2017 at 5:30 p.m. and will be held in the Rosemont Room located in City Hall.