



COMMITTEE FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT MEETING NOTES

Tuesday, February 6, 2018

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

Present: Karie Oakes, Emily Smith, Russ Axelrod, Ken Pryor, Gary Walvatne and Ramiah Ramasubramanian.

Citizens Present: None

Staff Present: John Boyd

1) Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 5:40p.m.

2) Approval of the December 19, 2017, meeting notes.

Member Walvatne made a motion to approve the December 19, 2017 meeting notes. Seconded by Member Axelrod. Motion passed unanimously. The Committee discussed the January 30, 2018 meeting notes. Member Ramasubramanian identified a spelling error to the word “misunderstanding” on page three. That was the only proposed change. **Member Axelrod moved to approve the January 30, 2018 meeting notes as amended; seconded by Member Pryor. Motion passed unanimously.**

3) Election of Chair and Vice Chair

The committee held a short discussion on the background of annual election of officers. Chapter 2 of the municipal code identifies actions for committees. There was a proposal for the existing vice chair to move to the chair position and to elect a new vice chair. That concept was accepted as one possible outcome, the committee agreed to hold discussion on the topic, asked members to consider potential candidates and conduct the election at the next meeting. The committee members concurred.

4) Citizen Comments

There were none.

5) Discussion: Citizen Comments/Public Comments

Member Axelrod discussed background on the use of terms. The committee reviewed a letter provided at the January 30, 2018 meeting that considered the term citizen, how one potential meaning derives from

the statewide planning goal for Citizen Involvement. Staff distributed sample agendas from City Council, Planning Commission and the Historic Resource Board and noted there was not a consistency in the use of terms.

Emily Smith arrived at 5:50

Member Axelrod and Walvatne arrived at 6:00 pm.

There was a discussion focused on a submitted letter requesting to clarify the use of terms. The proposal (from the draft document) considered the use of the term public as it related to the comment section of the agenda. The CCI discussed other terms (i.e. resident versus citizen) that Committees could use as part of their meeting material. Only one change was proposed for recommendation to council.

Member Smith moved to recommend to City Council that agendas for City Council and all advisory boards use the term “Public Comment”. Seconded by Member Walvatne. Motion passed unanimously.

6) Continued from January 30, 2018 meeting - Planning Process: Continuation of Problem Identification & Topic Review

Chair Oakes deferred to Member Axelrod to update the committee on the status of the document. He noted that Member Walvatne had provided his updates into the draft document and that document was submitted to the membership for review. Member Axelrod noted he will take that document and incorporate the changes and publish a new draft. This draft will be renamed version three.

Member Axelrod asked the members to consider what problems or solutions may have been missed in our review. He noted the areas he identified. The first item was listed under solutions as staff training and community member training (such as the NA’s). Chair Oakes noted she had made a similar comment to Member Martin and those changes were supposed to be incorporated. The document was entitled “early involvement.” Staff Boyd noted all documents are now available on the CCI webpage.

Member Pryor noted the workgroup has been tasked with many projects. His concern was the focus may be lost in the volume of material produced. Over the year, the committee considered DeNovo, worked on the formation of the mixed-use group and have moved forward on the land use process review. He asked for the land use review process; what Council would be looking to review in a finished product. It will assist in working toward the final draft. Member Walvatne asked what value there would be in working on the land use review diagram. All agreed this was a helpful guide. The question remained, what was the outcome the Council desired and what steps are needed to achieve that goal.

Member Ramasubramanian noted having a clear outline of the document location and version number denoted on the document will assist each reviewer in finding the correct resource. Member Axelrod agreed and supported all efforts. He commended the members on what was achieved so far and noted that adding a table to the document that provided an outline and organizational chart will also assist the reviewers.

Chair Oakes noted it would be better for the reviewers to work from one single document. She suggested having a simple process to consider. Member Axelrod continued his review. He noted during a review process there is a time savings doing parallel reviews tracking and proposed adding this item to the document. Another item was a timeline and considered a simple Gantt chart to identify how the process works. Generally, the topic should cover the 120 day period and explain the key points. Another item was the appeal process and the DeNovo hearing review. He stated that his travels took him out of town and asked how that item was incorporated into the process. Member Pryor shared his concern that the

DeNovo change was intended to be temporary. His recollection was that process was favored yet the outcome may be uncertain. He suggest as the timeline is organized some of the questions on the steps and the appeal process may be better understood.

Member Ramasubramanian reviewed December 19, 2017, meeting notes on DeNovo and the status of those changes. The notes considered if additional changes for DeNovo should be proposed by the CCI. The direction at that time was to allow the interim measures to remain in place. He noted the temporary fix was not a solid solution to the problem statement. The role of CCI, he felt, should incorporate citizen input in the process as part of their recommended changes to the process. Chair Oakes noted the feedback received at prior meetings was that there was a hesitancy to promote change or additional revisions at this time. The review of the process would consider the status of DeNovo and it was considered that potentially, no changes in DeNovo might be proposed. The discussion item ended with a discussion on the interim measures and the future direction from Council. The working draft will consider the land use review process, the concern was whether DeNovo should be part of this project. The meeting notes from December 19, 2017, identified the key issues. The members agreed to review those meeting notes. Member Ramasubramanian asked if the current use of DeNovo was working and if the proposed changes should address DeNovo. Member Pryor reminded the CCI that Attorney Ramis completed a thorough review of the process as part of the original training. The committee discussed obtaining more attorney feedback to consider the input he provided on optional changes such as extensions of the 120 day clock.

Member Axelrod continued his review of the issues list and considered “technical adequacy.” This term related to deeming an application complete versus having adequate information for the review process. As the process moves forward, there are questions raised potentially impacting design changes.

Member Walvatne continued the discussion on completeness versus technical adequacy. Staff Boyd considered what steps are completed in the completeness check and that information is provided in a letter. This is not technical adequacy. Member Walvatne discussed his annotation of the timeline and outlined how it consumed the 120 day clock. It was suggested that staff provide a segmented timeline that annotates the time to achieve completeness and when the application is deemed complete the 120 day period begins. The discussion continued with a discussion of the “completeness test”. The committee reviewed ORS 227.178 that contained a general statement for the city to outline the missing materials or deem the application as complete. Member Pryor expressed a concern about the clarity of the process at the time of completeness. He asked that the type of process and time to complete that process be made clear. The committee then reviewed submittal requirements for differing applications such as a conditional use permit, design review or land division. Each had vastly differing submittal requirements. The application outlines what is required to be submitted and staff noted a technical review of the adequacy is not completed. The defense of the application is the responsibility of the applicant. Member Axelrod noted that the committee may had already resolved this issue and additional action was not required. His last item related to “material misrepresentation CDC 99.038.E.6” as the final item missing in the document. The committee discussed the item and did not find it listed in the problem statements. He will add it to the review of the definition items. ***Member Pryor left the meeting at 6:37***

The Committee reconsidered the position of the goal of review of the application and how to review material in a timely manner. Member Axelrod noted the goal was to simplify the process for the citizen attempting to educate themselves and prepare their response. Generally the committee spoke to two core issues. The complexity of the issues, how to allow people to get information in final form. The second issue was providing adequate time for review. Member Walvatne noted that as information is provided, the process allows for request to extend the timeline. Member Ramasubramanian noted the city should make clear all the requirements. The applicant must complete a thorough review of those criteria. If they do not the success of their project could be impacted. There are instances when the applicant addressed concerns by providing additional time and granting an extension.

Member Walvatne discussed that the expedited land division process does not have the same flexibility. There are significant differences in the standard and expedited process. The major challenge was the notification area was reduced, the comment period was reduced and no public oral testimony was allowed. The Committee asked how it could change the process to broaden notification and raised questions on remaining compliant with state statute. It was suggested the report identify the process as a deficiency in citizen participation. One improvement would consider an expansion of the notice area. This change would not impact the expedited process timeline and broader notice would promote greater participation. Member Axelrod asked if this was an issue that required consideration for the legislature to address. Member Walvatne noted this review was the City's first process in a long time. The committee thought action would be too early and suggests tracking additional applications and raised concerns. The Council may be asked to consider changes to adopt a local expedited land use process. Member Axelrod will consider this discussion and add concerns to the list.

7) Member Comments

The members considered future meeting dates. Most agreed the February 20, 2018, meeting contained conflicts. The remaining dates in February appeared to work. The February 13, and 27, appear to be valid working dates.

Vice Chair Smith was asked if she would be willing to serve another year. She noted a willingness to continue serving as Vice Chair and would if asked, accept a nomination for the Chair position. At the next meeting, elections will be held.

8) Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 7:07. The next meeting is February 13, 2018, at 5:30 p.m. and will be held in the Rosemont Room located in City Hall.