

## COMMITTEE FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT MEETING NOTES

Tuesday, May 1, 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](http://www.westlinnoregon.gov/meetings).

### 1) Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 5:35 p.m.

### 2) Approval of the April 17, 2018, meeting notes.

Chair Pryor opened the discussion and introduced the membership. Chair Pryor asked if the members had reviewed the meeting notes. Member Ramasubramanian noted he plans to abstain due to the poor quality of the tape recording which made it difficult to verify the meeting notes. The members provided minor clarifications to the meeting notes.

**Member Holmes made a motion to approve modified meeting notes for the April 17, 2018 meeting. Seconded by Member Cummings. Motion passed with four members voting for approval (Holmes, Axelrod, Cummings and Pryor), one abstention (Ramasubramanian).**

Member Walvatne arrived at 5:50 pm

### 3) Public Comments

There were none.

### 4) Continued from April 17, 2018 meeting – Planning Process: Continuation of Problem Identification & Topic Review

Chair Pryor introduced the item and Member Holmes introduced material provided by email prior to the meeting. A memo and updated review document from Member Ramasubramanian and two submittals from Member Pryor consisting of a flow chart from Corvallis and suggestions for a goal update.

Member Axelrod asked about the review process. He noted submittals that arrive in a piecemeal fashion would make the review of documents time consuming and could be difficult to understand. Because of that concern, he chose to wait until all submittals were received and the document was updated

before he completed a review. Chair Pryor confirmed that pieces were still pending. He summarized the review process has been to consider edits, discuss recompiling the document with agreed upon edits and then moving forward. He thought this process to review proposed changes should consider a completion goal to have an updated document by the end of June. Member Cummings expressed a concern on the proposed timeline. She noted that if the document was not ready until June, Council would not be able to take final action on forming a committee until July and committee action may not happen until sometime in August. The Committee considered how that timeline could be accelerated. For example, have the working group consider this final draft and then complete any needed updates. In addition, Member Holmes noted that the working group would consist in part of CCI members that would aid the transition as they start work on the project.

Member Smith arrived at 6:05 pm.

Chair Pryor explained his concern on speeding up the process. His outreach with NA and other citizen groups expressed a concern regarding the focus on development versus the goal of maintaining quality of life for the community. Member Holmes noted the development code guides how the community develops and wondered if the code language required revision to meet the needs of the greater community. She also noted the benefit of providing material to inform the public on the land use process. Member Ramasubramanian spoke to the focus audience and how recognition of the audience should set the tone on the drafting of a document. He noted the process requires that the first focus is the Council and noted the Committee will provide a set of recommendations for their consideration. The second focus is the citizens who also have an interest in the information provided on the land use process; this focus should provide information that would be understood by lay people. Toward those goals, he supported working on the project at least until June as he felt the project would better identify the impacts to the public from the land use process and then the end product may better represent the outcome desired. That outcome should consider how those proposed land use process changes were implemented and evaluate the outcome to see if that met project expectations.

Member Holmes discussed potential decision paths the Council could use. She wondered if Council would need the CCI recommendations before it sets the working group. Alternately she wondered if Council could set the working group now anticipating the receipt of the final document. Member Axelrod spoke on Council processing of the request and wondered if the process should be faster. The thought was Council would benefit from having a completed package before taking action to create the working group. He noted that the document does not need to be a polished draft, instead the focus should assure that all issues raised were classified in the document and not attempt to develop solutions. He supported packaging that product and forwarding a recommendation to Council. An expedited delivery will provide more time over the summer for the new working group to work on the review.

Chair Pryor expressed a concern on one issue, the pre-application meeting. Is the focus to serve the developer or provide time for the public to ask questions and get education on the project? Member Axelrod noted the pre-application conference was designed to provide technical advice on land use projects for the applicant. Chair Pryor noted he has feedback that taxpayer funds pay for staff time and the public should be allowed time to speak. There was consensus on that point. The committee noted that the developer pays a fee to assure that technical staff is available to answer developer questions. Member Axelrod noted past discussions supporting a pre-application conference brochure that explained these issues, provided an explanation for the public to understand what is discussed, differing ways to participate or be educated on the process. The Committee discussed a process that includes how a neighborhood representative could be trained in the process, how to take notes on the key issues and how to report back the neighborhood association. Member Axelrod concluded the issue is an identified problem area in the land use evaluation document.

Member Holmes expressed her experience in attending meetings. She explained there are not roadblocks for citizen input, the process allows for public input and in her experience has been successful. She concurred with Member Axelrod with the benefits of land use representative training for NA group members. Member Ramasubramanian explained his concern on the public input for the process. He noted his concern that Council could act on the project now and work to fix the document using the working group and not resolve his stated public input concerns. He noted the focus should consider how the land use process will be perceived by the public, will it address concerns or would there still be doubt on the developer focus by the citizens. To make changes to the process, that are recognized by the citizenry, key issues must be identified, acted on and proposed changes evaluated. He discussed core projects, questioned the impacts perceived by citizens and how they are evaluated based upon the changes proposed to the process.

Member Axelrod noted that has been the focus of the problem statements. The report does not propose all changes, crafting those changes are the task of the working group. Chair Pryor raised a comment received regarding citizen participation and pre-application conferences. Any limitations on ability to comment was perceived as a negative impact to the public. He noted his primary concern was these comments were not given a priority. After a lengthy discussion, it was noted those issues have been raised and prioritized in the problem statements. That was also the focus of why the project needs to get to the City Council to allow the working group to work on these problem statements and start developing proposed changes. Member Ramasubramanian noted a delay in the recommendation are based on two conflicts in the process; that the committee should not be seeking solutions to problems and the committee started a process without a clear document from council that tasked them to move forward. The second concern questioned what direction was given by Council. He explained that there are many issues related to land use that have existed for a long time. The Committee noted that the issues have not developed overnight, it has developed over decades. The Committee spoke to changes to the code to return DeNovo and changes to stormwater and geotechnical analysis of sloped land. The current process is considering many issues, it will be an iterative process that also is multi-faceted. It seeks to educate, to promote involvement and to improve the regulatory setting.

Chair Pryor returned to the time frame for council consideration and considered other methods for educating the public on the land use process. He discussed a timeline he found in the Corvallis land use process. The committee discussed the outline and considered that all aspects do not have to be evaluated at this time, the workgroup could be tasked with improving the education and outreach process. The Committee noted they have been open to evaluate what other communities do for education and outreach. The goal is to move forward and not get bogged down in the edits. Member Axelrod suggested that any remaining comments should be submitted; allow time for a compilation and review of the next document draft and support the completion of a final draft for submittal to City Council. He asked what pending document changes are proposed. Member Ramasubramanian noted he will have two or three paragraphs that discuss his issues on quality assurance and process analysis.

Member Cummings had questions on the Corvallis document. The compressed format appeared to be incompatible with state statute and West Linn's process. The Committee noted that exhibits could be developed in the future as the process explanation is provided. Member Holmes noted that for the next meeting on May 15<sup>th</sup>, she suggested that changes should be provided to staff by May 10<sup>th</sup> for distribution and consideration by the full committee. Member Axelrod suggested that the committee should have the full draft material a week in advance. Other discussion focused on the product, should partial feedback be considered or would that be incorporated into a new version. That new version could then be distributed to the full committee. Member Ramasubramanian reviewed items targeted in the comments on the latest version of the document. Each of those comments he asked could be decision points, or need additional discussion. The next draft will take member time to review comments and resolve those outstanding

issues. The Committee discussed the status of draft documents and considered work items for review when preparing the final draft.

Member Axelrod asked when a next version could be developed and distributed to the membership. Chair Pryor wanted to see some changes on a draft chart. Member Axelrod suggested keeping the existing chart and using the Corvallis model as is only as an example for the work group to consider when they evaluate education and outreach. The committee suggested using the example as a reference attached to the document for workgroup consideration. There was a support from the members to use the Corvallis document as an educational tool for workgroup consideration. Member Smith noted she had some formatting and language clean up and wondered the best time to provide those comments. Member Axelrod clarified the executive summary required a revision and had a similar timing question. The Committee wanted all changes on the May 8<sup>th</sup> date to allow, after approval by the committee, the production of a final draft.

The Committee considered tasks to prepare for the final version. The draft product changes should be prepared and sent to staff by May 8<sup>th</sup>. Staff will filter those documents to the full committee. The next step will be to compile those changes into a new and final draft version. Member Ramasubramanian volunteered to compile the final document and when completed will provide that document to staff for distribution.

## 5) Member Comments

Chair Pryor reviewed the next regularly scheduled meeting dates (May 15<sup>th</sup>, June 5<sup>th</sup> and June 19<sup>th</sup>). The committee confirmed a quorum for all dates. May 31<sup>st</sup> was discussed and set as a special meeting date.

Member Cummings noted that public participation has been negligible, and she wondered what outreach could be undertaken to promote CCI activities and participation in workgroups. Member Holmes suggested a blurb in the city newsletter to explain CCI activities. Member Cummings suggested committee members should attend neighborhood meetings and other city functions to promote the CCI activities and support public participation. All members concurred.

## 6) Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 7:12. The next meeting is May 15, 2018, at 5:30 p.m. and will be held in the Rosemont Room located in City Hall.