



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

COMMITTEE FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT MEETING NOTES

Thursday, June 19, 2018

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

Present: Ken Pryor, Gail Holmes, Emily Smith, Russ Axelrod and Teri Cummings.

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 5:30 p.m.

2) **Approval of the May 31 and June 7, 2018 meeting notes**

Chair Pryor introduced the membership and opened the discussion on the meeting notes. **Member Smith made a motion to approve the meeting notes for the May 31, 018 meeting. Seconded by Member Holmes. Motion passed unanimously.**

Member Holmes made a motion to approve the meeting notes for the June 7, 018 meeting. Seconded by Member Smith. Member Axelrod abstained. He was not present at the meeting and chose not to vote. There were four votes in the affirmative and one abstention (Axelrod). Motion passed.

3) **Public Comments**

No members of the public were present.

4) **Continued from June 7, 2018 meeting – Planning Process: Continuation of Problem Identification & Topic Review**

Chair Pryor introduced the item and identified his edits in the marked up version seven. Member Holmes asked a question on his edits to the first page of the proposed alternate executive summary. The concern was focused following the term watchdog and the committee provided comments to address transparency in the second paragraph on page one of the document. The committee then discussed issues related to transportation in the third paragraph regarding conflicts and complex issues and worked to

resolve issues in that section.

The Committee discussed the second paragraph and agreed upon a clarification to the second sentence which noted “. . . of the LUP which at times have failed the citizenry, ~~at times~~ adversely ...

The Committee reviewed the fourth paragraph related to reports to the City Council and creation of a working group. The concern asked for a clarification that the council receives the report from the CCI and appoints any working group. “The City Council will oversee the process.”

The Committee sought to point out needed improvements to the planning process to better serve the city. They discussed the importance of terms and how they have been used over time. The point was to understand the audience and assure each term is correctly used.

The committee discussed working through the comments provided in sequence to make progress and achieve set results. All agreed. On the historical background that followed the introduction section, the committee proposed omitting the last paragraph (shown in ~~strikeout~~). The committee discussed the value of the background information. The core item discussed was to remove the last lines of the second paragraph that included terms not defined or previously used in the document. The consensus of the committee was to delete the language marked with ~~strikeout~~.

The section under goals discussed the first paragraph related to “require less staff effort”; the discussion considered the benefits of the goal and the value added by the changes. The concern was related to the imbalance from the perception of the staff effort remark. The focus was on central goals for education and transparency. The concern about staff time or developer benefit was not considered as an evaluation item for the committee. The committee considered alternatives that worked toward efficiency of operations (removed the end of the sentence after “improved applications”); and considered that information did not provided any additional clarity.

Moving on to section 5.1 Early Involvement - the Committee discussed the first paragraph, last sentence, the language addressing how a pre-application meeting may be used as a “de facto neighborhood meeting”. While it was considered an opportunity for citizens to learn about a project, it does not substitute for the required neighborhood meetings. That was the consensus of the committee. The committee considered the pre-application conference is an “opportunity to learn about a project and share common concerns” or a time “to understand and perhaps influence the project.”

The Committee discussed two items in this section. First, the information provides important background that must be retained. Second, it identifies core areas of confusion in the roles people play in the process. This will be important for the working group to consider for positive correction. The concern is in formatting the edits, the core concerns are being lost and the proposed remedies cloud the original concerns and needed changes. One example was an informational brochure that discussed roles and responsibilities, how and when to participate and the path a development takes working through the process. In the end, consider the problem areas identified, concerns raised about the citizens role, the opportunities to speak at the pre-application meetings and consider them targeted for action by the working group.

Ken Pryor left the meeting at 6:35 pm.

Member Holmes commented on issues related to the citizen participation in the pre-application meeting. The goal was to ask questions and speak to the process, and the pros and cons of citizen’s attendance at the conference. Member Axelrod noted the citizen’s role in the pre-app and the organization and purpose of the pre-app need to be clarified. Clarity of those items should provide certainty for those citizens wishing to be heard. In addition, Member Holmes suggested that completed pre-application notes should be mailed to the attending neighborhood associations.

Member Axelrod noted that the document also contains items under communication, the need to distribute the meeting notes. There was a discussion of public participation at pre-application meetings in

the past and how it can be difficult to overcome perception. Member Holmes noted we need to work as a team and best understand how to make the process more uniform and understood by the public.

The Committee reviewed Item 5.5.2 and considered each of Chair Pryor's submitted comments. After a substantial discussion, the Committee considered removing the last sentence of Item 5.5.2 on page 9: An applicant has the right to develop property up to the limits of the code and the applicant bears the burden of demonstrating compliance with the code.

The review of the code ended before Section 5.6.2

5) Member Comments

Member Holmes requested consideration be given to election of a Vice Chair, the consensus of the committee was to wait until next meeting when all members would be available to vote.

An email will be sent to check quorum at the next meetings scheduled for July 3 and July 17, 2018.

Member Cummings asked that the Oakes Email and discussion be scheduled on the next agenda.

6) Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 7:10. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday July 3, 2018, at 5:30 p.m. and if held would be located in the Rosemont Room located in City Hall.