



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

COMMITTEE FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT MEETING NOTES

Thursday, May 31, 2018

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

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

Citizens Present: Civic Class students (Marty and Brenna – no last name available)

Staff Present: Jennifer Arnold

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 5:30 p.m.

2) **Approval of the May 15, 2018, meeting notes**

Chair Pryor opened the discussion and introduced the membership. Member Axelrod discussed the meeting notes and felt they were acceptable with one minor deletion on the second page. He asked that a reference to a report in the fourth paragraph be removed.

Member Axelrod made a motion to approve the amended meeting notes for the May 15, 2018 meeting. Seconded by Member Holmes. Motion passed unanimously.

3) **Public Comments**

One student accompanied by an adult asked if the CCI members would discuss the purpose of the CCI. Chair Pryor provided a brief overview of the CCI in West Linn. Member Axelrod added a statewide view and discussed the CCI purpose within the land use perspective. The CCI role included a consideration of the needs of the city and provided a method for the community to provide feedback. Member Holmes discussed how the CCI can be used to improve the local land use process.

4) **Continued from May 15, 2018 meeting – Planning Process: Continuation of Problem Identification & Topic Review**

Chair Pryor introduced the item and the materials provided at the meeting. He noted the last draft had comments submitted by Member Ramasubramanian and Chair Pryor. At the last meeting, the members considered the material and the status of the latest draft.

Member Axelrod summarized the document is essentially in final form and noted that edits provided

appeared to be focused to the Executive Summary. Member Axelrod explained the proposed changes to the executive summary and provided background linked to comments raised during the editing sessions. Member Ramasubramanian expressed his concern about edits to the document (tone or accuracy) and asked for examples that led to the need to make changes. The committee reviewed those comments and discussed changes made to the latest draft. The general concern was the number of edits to this draft. Member Ramasubramanian's concern was the amount of changes completed without providing adequate time for review by the committee members.

Member Axelrod summarized the changes made to the latest draft, adding info to the executive summary, defining acronyms and removing duplicative or unclear historical background. The committee discussed the potential for additional review or discussion when the working group convenes.

Member Ramasubramanian noted the latest draft removed core questions that were addressed in detail in the previous version. He summarized his concerns were based upon the quick pace of the review along with significant revisions to the document that limited the committee's ability to analyze material and provide comments. He concluded that some issues could have been resolved if the committee's focus was on the identified list of problems. Instead, the committee is attempting to complete an interim review of the land use process. He expressed a frustration that council had not provided any clear guiding requests at the start of this process; the lack of direction he felt was where the problems lie. Member Axelrod considered those comments, added acronyms, edited the executive summary and provided his explanation on the proposed changes. He considered that many of the concerns raised could be evaluated by the future working group.

Member Walvatne arrived at 6:08 pm.

Member Axelrod outlined the changes to the organization and to the content of the executive summary contained in the latest update. Member Ramasubramanian expressed his concern on the content of the changes, quality assurance and the cost to the city for those changes. The committee discussed the issues in relationship to the purpose of the CCI and the guidance provided by council. He noted that contacts with outside experts note that local land use development is set in the urban context and taxpayers are increasingly forced to pay for that level of development. Council is not considering (either by choice or passively) the long term implications of growth and is forcing the taxpayers to foot the bill for construction of roads, water, sewer or schools. He concluded the committee's report considers the use of temporary fixes to these issues, instead he thought the report should comprehensively address those issues and analyze the impacts. In the end he recognized that council has the power to make those decisions. The committee noted the report could summarize short comings and future action to address those short comings. Member Ramasubramanian is considering an option to publish his own report for presentation to council that presents the citizens position on the proposed alternatives.

Member Axelrod noted that the proposed changes are by themselves acceptable. But considering the proposal in total must consider the goal of the project. That Council is awaiting a recommendation from the CCI to take action on the issues identified to improve the local land use process. Member Ramasubramanian disagreed and repeat the shortcoming he identified that Council did not clarify their direction when sending instructions to the CCI. He noted examples such as LOT and the Sunset School project that cost the local community during the land use review and into the future. The Committee evaluated the scope of the statements versus the task the committee has undertaken. Member Walvatne summarized the scope of the project the committee was asked to consider over sixteen months ago. The committee was not tasked with the issues of taxation or land use policy. Those solutions were the responsibility of the council. The Committee discussed how the project considered issues and identified the questions for the report to consider, in addition, the committee asked if the citizen involvement process was successful. Have the issues that restricted participation been identified and could outcomes be improved. Those have been the focus of the group for the last year.

Member Holmes noted during their neighborhood meetings, citizen concerns were focused on the project identified at the pre-app differed from the project presented at the neighborhood meeting. Those were the topics of importance at their meetings. Chair Pryor summarized there appears to be agreement on all sides. He felt the issues were not perfectly identified but were close. Member Ramasubramanian noted one of his ongoing concerns has been the question of scope has continually changed. He argued that the lack of direction from council has impacted the evaluation of the project, and that the direction of the review has continually changed.

The Committee reviewed the project and had differing opinions on the status of the items achieved to date. Some of the differences were based upon which committee should consider the questions. The issues of policy should be presented to Council, the issues for economic development should be vetted through the Economic Development Committee. The Committee considered how these points could be assigned as follow-up tasks, not tasks to be assigned to the CCI, but could be assigned by council as the results of future reports.

The discussion returned to the draft document and walked through the proposed changes provided in the document "mark up". The committee held a round table discussion, considered each comment, and then agreed upon changes needed for each item for the final draft.

Member Holmes noted that the document should not be so specific that the working group tasks are inflexible. She noted that many of the problem statements require discussion and evaluation. If the problem statements are overly defined, there is little discussion available. There are some items that are policy matters that require a decision by council. Those items would not be relayed to the working group.

Member Axelrod completed his review of the comment sections. This involved a discussion of each general item that provided adequate direction to complete the final draft. There was an extensive discussion on the "DeNovo appeal" topic. The discussion focused on what the topic covers who would best address the topic and how the existing language should be tested thoroughly before making extensive changes. Member Pryor proposed simple clarifying changes for insertion in the final version and assisted in the drafting of that language. Member Walvatne noted the directions to the applicant should be clarified. This item is less of an issue for the recommendations to Council. It is more a policy issue to be worked out within the differing departments (Planning and Engineering). Member Walvatne did clarify that it is important to have a statement in the final draft that requests written comments from any department that participates in the land use process. At a minimum a written summary of the comments provided to the applicant.

5) Member Comments

Chair Pryor asked for comments from the membership. Member Holmes noted that NAP is working on their bylaws. The goal is to have a draft by their June meeting for presentation to city council in July 2018.

6) Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 7:30. The next meeting, Tuesday, June 7, 2018, at 5:30 p.m. will be held in the Rosemont Room located in City Hall.