

**Voliva, Cliff**

---

**From:** Linda Ludwig [lludwig@orcities.org]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 10, 2009 4:07 PM  
**To:** cliff.voliva@state.or.us  
**Subject:** FW: Comments from OCPDA regarding the CIAC 2009-2010 Work Plan

---

**From:** Linda Ludwig  
**Sent:** Friday, July 10, 2009 4:05 PM  
**To:** 'cliff.voliva@state.or.us'  
**Subject:** Comments from OCPDA regarding the CIAC 2009-2010 Work Plan

Thank you for the opportunity to comment re: CIAC's proposed 2009-2010 Work Plan. The following comments briefly summarize comments received from OCPDA members.

- 1- Planning members generally supported the suggestions to provide/encourage additional online access to information.
- 2- It was noted that the suggestion for additional guidance to local governments undergoing periodic review, plan amendments, etc., is already covered by the implementation of Goal 1. Goal 1 gives general guidance for appropriate tailoring of the citizen involvement programs at the local level, ensuring flexibility to meet a variety of differing situations.
- 3- While some cities may prefer not to undergo periodic review, it needs to be noted that the suggestion to change periodic review to community visioning would engender a sea change in what the program was intended to do, i.e. the review and updating of a city's comprehensive plan. Currently the comprehensive plan implements zoning codes and other land use regulations. Community visioning is and should continue to be a separate exercise, unless the state is willing to eliminate the mandate for comprehensive plan review. And while cities did adopt and enforce zoning ordinances long before SB 100 passed, extensive land use regulations that have passed since that time, and it would be extremely difficult for cities to go back to "pre-comp plan days." The suggestions to change periodic review and to incorporate visioning and extensive citizen involvement during the plan evaluation phase seem to be trying to combine two programs that were, and should be, intentionally separate. One needs to follow the other; if combined the already onerous exercise of a city updating their comp plan would never cease.



From: Phil Stenbeck, CIAC Liaison to AOC PD  
(541) 440-4289

To: DLCD

Re: CIAC 2009/2010 Work Program Survey Results.

### CIAC "opportunities" list.

- \* 1) Provide citizen access to the State of Oregon's Legislative Information Notification Update System (LINUS) bill tracking system, or other comparable tracking system, for interested citizens to follow bill amendments and hearings during the legislative session.  
Rating -      Opposed - 0                  Neutral - 4                  Support - 6
  
- \* 2) Provide a state-sponsored blog site for interaction and information sharing between citizens and interested parties on land use issues, including citizen involvement.  
Rating -      Opposed - 1                  Neutral - 7                  Support - 2
  
- \* 3) Encourage all local, regional and state land use applications to be available online. This effort recognizes that the current budget climate may present challenges for some organizations. The CIAC would work with local and regional partners to make online applications available within a reasonable timeframe.  
Rating -      Opposed - 3                  Neutral - 2                  Support - 5
  
- \* 4) Develop and maintain an information database (including a GIS component) for current land use data sharing between local, state, federal and Tribal entities. Make current data available to local governments and citizens for planning projects, decision-making and comprehensive plan updates.  
Rating -      Opposed - 0                  Neutral - 3                  Support - 7
  
- \* 5) Change periodic review to focus on community visioning. This suggestion recognizes several challenges and limitations: funding, politics, staffing, additional process, public education, etc.  
Rating -      Opposed - 3                  Neutral - 4                  Support - 3
  
- \* 6) Provide CIAC and local governments an opportunity to work together during the plan evaluation phase of periodic review. Also include CIAC as a standing member of the Periodic Review Assistance Team to review and comment on proposed local citizen involvement in periodic review.  
Rating -      Opposed - 4                  Neutral - 3.5                  Support - 1.5
  
- \* 7) Rename Periodic Review to reflect something more meaningful to citizens.  
Rating -      Opposed - 2                  Neutral - 6                  Support - 2

- \* 8) Seek LCDC recognition of formal neighborhood groups in legislative land use processes.  
 Rating -        Opposed - 7                      Neutral - 2                      Support - 0  
 Comments:
  
- \* 9) Early involvement with citizens and neighborhood groups prior to planning projects and land use decisions. This suggestion would also provide specific guidance for local governments undergoing periodic review, plan amendments and local decision-making processes.  
 Rating -        Opposed - 4                      Neutral - 4                      Support - 2
  
- \* 10) Limited appeals of local decisions;  
 Rating -        Opposed - 2                      Neutral - 2                      Support - 6
  
- \* 11) Increased trust of local government planning and process;  
 Rating -        Opposed - 0                      Neutral - 4                      Support - 5
  
- \* 12) Better projects and proposals incorporating citizen input/suggestions;  
 Rating -        Opposed - 0                      Neutral - 6                      Support - 3
  
- \* 13) Better communication between local officials and citizens;  
 Rating -        Opposed - 0                      Neutral - 3                      Support - 7
  
- \* 14) Increased citizen support for overall community vision.  
 Rating -        Opposed - 0                      Neutral - 2                      Support - 7
  
- \* 15) Provide citizen involvement training for elected and appointed officials, and for citizens.  
 Rating -        Opposed - 0                      Neutral - 2.5                      Support - 7.5
  
- \* 16) Demonstrate and showcase successful citizen involvement programs and strategies used by local governments in Oregon and elsewhere.  
 Rating -        Opposed - 0                      Neutral - 2                      Support - 8
  
- \* 17) Develop outcome measures for use by CIAC and local Committees for Citizen Involvement (CCI) to demonstrate improvements over time.  
 Rating -        Opposed - 0                      Neutral - 7                      Support - 3
  
- \* 18) Schedule monthly CIAC meetings with alternating meetings conducted via video conference or other technology. CIAC members suggest conducting a "test pilot" meeting format that could also be used to improve remote participation from citizens, commission and committee members and staff.  
 Rating -        Opposed - 1                      Neutral - 8                      Support - 1