

COMMITTEE FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT MEETING NOTES

Tuesday, April 17, 2018

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

Present: Ken Pryor, Ramiah Ramasubramanian, Emily Smith,
Gail Holmes, Russ Axelrod, Teri Cummings, and Gary Walvatne.

Citizens Present: None

Staff Present: John Boyd

The following meeting notes are a general representation of the discussion. For full meeting content, audio is found under the Committee for Citizen Involvement using the specific meeting date www.westlinnoregon.gov/meetings.

1) Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 5:45 p.m.

2) Approval of the April 3, 2018, meeting notes.

Chair Pryor opened the discussion and introduced the membership. Chair Pryor asked if the members had reviewed the meeting notes. The members provided minor clarifications to the meeting notes. There was a discussion on how meeting notes may be corrected. Citizens can review draft material and ask clarifying questions however only the committee may make changes to the final document. After a short discussion, there was a minor clarification made to the meeting notes.

Member Smith arrived at 5:50 pm.

Member Walvatne made a motion to approve modified meeting notes for the April 3, 2018 meeting. Seconded by Member Cummings. Motion passed with three members voting for approval (Cummings, Pryor and Walvatne), two abstention's (Ramasubramanian and Axelrod) and one member voting not to approve (Smith).

After the vote there was a request for vote discussion. Member Cummings asked if Member Smith was willing to explain her vote. Member Smith noted her concern was based upon a procedural issue related to the beginning of the meeting. A conversation was held that was not recorded as part of the meeting. The conversation was provided to the committee based on a published legal report. The lack of that recording was the basis of her vote not to approve. The members had an extended discussion on what is public record, what are comments that should be on the record and how the issue was resolved in that meeting. The Committee also discussed the steps taken to avoid similar concerns in the future. The group consensus was to have any discussion by the group to be on the record (either the specific agenda item or member comments).

3) Public Comments

There were none.

4) Continued from April 3, 2018 meeting – Planning Process: Continuation of Problem Identification & Topic Review

Chair Pryor introduced the item and staff outlined the submittals received prior to the meeting: Pryor, Ramasubramanian and Walvatne. Chair Pryor turned the discussion over to Member Walvatne who discussed how his edits were organized. Chair Pryor outlined his submittal that provided edits to the executive summary. He also reviewed his edits to version six and passed that information along to Member Walvatne for consideration into the next version (Number 7). His concerns included more clarity on citizen involvement and citizen engagement to assure it was enhanced.

Chair Pryor discussed his submittal provided to the Committee and the members asked clarifying questions. He noted the edits discussed the scope of the land use process and a review what the citizen's role could be: including citizen involvement and engagement.

Member Axelrod noted those items identified in the summary should point out material contained in the report; some of the summary items were not contained in the full report. Two items raised, the DeNovo process and the council call up rule, led to a discussion of the role of this CCI review. Should it be based solely on citizen involvement or could it be a broader look at the land use process. He noted there were many issues raised in the corrections that were not in the executive summary. Chair Pryor noted his comments had consensus of the Committee and the action seemed important. He did understand the concern that the summary works best when it addresses items in the report. The committee considered how to address the organization of the report but did not come to a consensus on the change. Members will be reviewing and inputting amendments and will consider draft language.

Member Ramasubramanian asked if the task before the CCI was to fix a systemically broken land use process or was it to promote citizen involvement. Those were two separate tasks that each have differing levels of work. Member Axelrod reminded the group the task was about the land use process from a broader perspective that went beyond citizen involvement and considered enhancement to staff procedures to the process from the perspective of applicants. The Committee discussed their recollection of that process as an example of the differing roles the land use decision evaluation process has followed. Member Axelrod spoke to the background on the DeNovo changes and the training provided by the City Attorney, the interim fix proposed in that training process and recognition of the need to revisit the process and consider additional changes. Chair Pryor explained his initial concern on an interim DeNovo change until he heard the City Attorney comment that DeNovo changes could be processed without the lengthy process proposed to the legislative process. Member Walvatne noted a few land use examples where the process changes have enhanced the Planning Commission's review capabilities. Chair Pryor pointed out a concern of the language calling DeNovo a burden on both parties (Page 7 of Version 6A) as a negative. The Committee had differing opinions on that term and minor edits (mutual responsibility) were considered for the next draft.

Member Holmes arrived at 6:25 pm.

The Committee considered the language of the interim changes and found some of the adopted changes were not acceptable. There was a discussion on who could provide new evidence, the rights to rebuttal and the time limits of the 120 day rule to complete this process. The committee discussed differing options and asked for them to be considered as edits and brought back in the next version.

The Committee had an extensive review of the process from when a land use application is deemed complete to the how the land use process is reviewed on appeal (DeNovo review). The purpose of the discussion was for the new members to learn from tenured members those items previously discussed and contained within the report. The process is complex and the discussion focused on supporting citizen understanding. In addition, the material will be transmitted to the workgroup and will provide valuable insight into the research undertaken by the CCI to complete the initial analysis on the time line and a few core issues.

Member Ramasubramanian discussed his submittal and how the outline reviews the issues heard and considers items in a systemic manner. Member Holmes asked to retain the consideration of the Neighborhood Groups. Member Axelrod added outreach for changes and shortening the review timeline to allow more time for the decision making group to reach a decision.

Member Ramasubramanian ask for consideration of the points as an organized approach for consideration by the working groups. Member Holmes noted the support of the NA's will be important so any steps that increase their engagement was important. Member Axelrod summarized the concepts raised and wondered how the edits would be processed. Member Ramasubramanian noted that he would work off time and Chair Pryor thought he could also insert his summary into the document. There was consideration of creating a cover memo or alteration of the introduction to address issues raised.

Next steps, there was a discussion on how to present the material to Council. Should there be a summary cover memo? Some members considered the executive summary served that function. There were many ideas how to incorporate new information. The only consensus was a goal not to lose those thoughts. Member Axelrod noted the document has an appendix that tracked items and felt some of the concepts could be provided in that summary. There was a discussion on how Member Ramasubramanian's information could be an addition to the appendix that tracked additional items or a conceptually a master list of items needing discussion.

Member Walvatne suggested the summary from Member Ramasubramanian was important and should be incorporated into the executive summary. He thought the structure was well thought out, just needed more analysis.

The Committee discussed how to prepare for the next meeting to begin the process of constructing another draft on May 1, 2018. Chair Pryor and Member Ramasubramanian will use Version 6A as a starting point and work to incorporate those changes into the document for review by the Committee at the next meeting. They both agreed to work over the next week and bring back a draft (Version 6B?)

5) Member Comments

Chair Pryor considered any comments. Member Smith clarified her delay was due to travel from Salem. The Chair reviewed the next two regularly scheduled meeting dates (May 1st and May 15th) there is a quorum for both dates.

6) Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 7:10. The next meeting is May 1, 2018, at 5:30 p.m. and will be held in the Rosemont Room located in City Hall.