



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

COMMITTEE FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT MEETING NOTES

Tuesday, January 9, 2018

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

Present: Gary Walvatne, Russ Axelrod, Ken Pryor and Ramiah Ramasubramanian.

Citizens Present: David Baker

Staff Present: Jennifer Arnold

1) Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 5:45p.m. The Chair and Vice Chair were not present. **Member Pryor moved to recommend Member Walvatne as Interim Chair. Member Ramasubramanian seconded. Motion passed unanimously.** Chair Walvatne considered approval of the December 19, 2017, meeting notes and considered deferring the action to the next meeting. **The motion to defer action on the notes was made by Member Walvatne and Seconded by Member Pryor. Motion passed unanimously.**

2) Citizen Comments

David Baker spoke about issues before the Rosemont Summit Neighborhood Association. He expressed concern with a seven lot PUD that required a lot line adjustment to take access, and how access would be reached if the agreement could not be achieved. He continued to note that the LLA process does not require a NA meeting and wanted to express this concern to the CCI. The members discussed the upcoming process changes and encouraged the NA to work with the developer. Mr. Baker noted the developer was good to work with and open to discussing issues. They encouraged the developer to consider a second meeting with the NA if there were significant changes to the project.

The committee discussed the current code requirement for one meeting, the standard for material misrepresentation and the benefits of having more than one meeting with the applicant. They noted the process worked better when the applicant was open to discuss the project and make changes. Mr. Baker concluded that having a supportive developer assisted in conversations with the NA and having code provisions that had clear standards to have additional meetings with an NA would also be beneficial. The Committee also discussed that for now it should be made clear to the applicant (by the NA and by staff) that the issues should be discussed, the best outcome would be to have an application that provided the

best information on those issues and that staff should encourage the applicant not just meet all the criteria but should also address the local issues. Mayor Axelrod and Chair Walvatne noted this was an active application and discussed the process they must follow to note this ex parte contact. The Committee decided to not discuss the application further. There were no other citizen comments.

3) Planning Process: Continuation of Problem Identification and Topics Review – continued discussion from December 19, 2017 meeting

Chair Walvatne opened the discussion and turned the topic over to Member Axelrod. He noted that today he met with Member Martin and they reviewed the submittal from Member Oakes. He suggested two goals. One would be to complete the write ups to City Council by the end of February 2018. He asked how much time would be needed to meet this deadline. They reviewed the differing topics and the status of each pending submittal. They discussed what the best next steps would be: to have a meeting on January 16th or to cancel that meeting and give members time to submit their written material. Member Axelrod referred to the memo attached to the agenda that discussed meeting conflicts (one on January 16 – due to a holiday and one in February). In considering the next meeting discussion, they thought this would be another reason to not have a meeting on January 16th and give members more time to review material.

He also discussed the first draft of a quasi-judicial time line and introduced the product provided by Member Boyd. They asked about other options for enhancing the finished product. The first review identified decision points and the process flow. Chair Walvatne pointed out the state mandated functions that would benefit discussion on what can be changed locally versus what is required by the state.

Member Axelrod asked about the review focus being on the standard process. He wondered the benefit of contrasting this standard process to the expedited review process. That could be an interesting review of the process differences. The Committee questioned how staff reviews the submitted material in the shorter timeline. Member Pryor asked about specific benchmarks and considered how citizens could be made aware of those review points; especially in the expedited review process. Member Axelrod agreed with that comment and noted that a concurrent review provides timely responses. Member Ramasubramanian thought that having specific details and deadlines to provide that information should be specified. He suggested the first column specify that the 180 days were limited to the “prior to approved application” phase. Member Axelrod considered having a separate table that provided time lines, date sequences and review type requirements. The committee discussed updates that considered graphical versus tabular changes to provide more data. Having two forms (tabular versus graphical) will be a challenge to meeting the primary goal of being simple for the lay person. Chair Walvatne explained the difference in the pre-application phase versus the application phase.

Member Ramasubramanian noted providing information in an understandable form is a challenge in all fields. He suggested color provides assistance for some people to guide them through differing phases. For others, having numbered time sequences could be more understandable, or having references to tabular data with more information would also be beneficial. The bottom line is how differing people learn and finding a commonality to provide the information.

Member Axelrod suggested sending comments to staff to assist in clarifying the background information. He urged members to consider that changes to the process need to be discussed in more detail and should be reviewed with the Committee first.

Member Walvatne considered the final document could be modified to provide dates for each of the major steps and post it on the website. This information would allow the public to understand the project in visual terms. The committee thought it would be a very helpful tool for the NA discussions and the PC use in public presentations to help communicate issues.

The Committee considered Chair Oakes paper and wanted to review the document at the next meeting. This will allow an opportunity for members to discuss the questions raised in the document.

Member Walvatne noted the differing documents had changes in organizational styles and presentation methods. He wondered how one document could be crafted from many differing styles. He also asked staff to resend all the documents to members. Member Axelrod noted that he and Member Martin had volunteered to compile the documents into one master document and send it to the members. They thought that first step would assist in the review by the Committee. Members are asked to complete their assignments and send them to Staff Boyd for distribution.

4) Member Comments

There were none.

5) Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 6:40. The next meeting on January 16, 2018 was cancelled. The next scheduled meeting is January 23, 2018 at 5:30 p.m. and will be held in the Rosemont Room located in City Hall.