

5. Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement. When a county acknowledges that no evidence in the record supports a determination that an adequate flow of water exists, and essentially follows the third *Rhyne v. Multnomah County*, 23 Or LUBA 442 (1992), option, it must comply with all of the third *Rhyne* option and defer its decision making to a proceeding that provides the statutorily required notice and hearing. *Wachal v. Linn County*, 78 Or LUBA 227 (2018).

5. Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement. Where a local government has adopted and acknowledged a Citizen Involvement Program (CIP) that implements Goal 1, the only way a petitioner can demonstrate a violation of Goal 1 is by demonstrating that the local government failed to comply with the CIP. *Deumling v. City of Salem*, 76 Or LUBA 99 (2017).

5. Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement. A county ordinance that adopts a text amendment to a comprehensive plan that discontinues a coastal advisory committee that is provided for in the comprehensive plan, and replaces it with a process for “appointing advisory committees to address specific land use issues” does not violate the requirements of Statewide Planning Goal 1 (Citizen Involvement) to provide for “clearly define[d] * * * procedures by which the general public will be involved in the on-going land-use planning process” and for the “continuity of citizen participation and of information that enables citizens to identify and comprehend issues.” *Oregon Coast Alliance v. Clatsop County*, 75 Or LUBA 277 (2017).

5. Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement. Arguments that a concept plan fails to comply with Statewide Planning Goal 1 (Citizen Involvement) provide no basis for reversal or remand for lack of compliance with Goal 1 where the concept plan does not amend or affect the city’s acknowledged Citizen Involvement Program. *Graser-Lindsey v. City of Oregon City*, 74 Or LUBA 488 (2016).

5. Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement. A county’s use of a “redline” and “track changes” approach to show text that is being added and deleted, as well as marginal notes to further explain the amendments is sufficient to comply with the Goal 1 requirement that “information necessary to reach policy decisions” be in an “understandable form.” *Stevens v. Clackamas County*, 68 Or LUBA 490 (2013).

5. Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement. While Goal 1 requires ODOT to make use of existing local citizen involvement programs in amending the Oregon Highway Plan, it does not require ODOT to create new local citizen involvement programs, or mandate that local governments create or invoke local citizen involvement programs in coordinating future OHP future amendments to the Oregon Highway Plan. *Setniker v. ODOT*, 66 Or LUBA 54 (2012).

5. Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement. A city’s failures to follow comprehensive plan and land use regulation provisions that were adopted to implement Goal 1 may constitute substantive or procedural errors; however, without more, any such errors do not constitute a violation of the city’s Goal 1 obligation to develop a citizen involvement program. *Jaffer v. City of Monmouth*, 51 Or LUBA 633 (2006).

5. Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement. Goal 10 (Housing) requires local governments to inventory available residential buildable lands, and Goal 2 (Land Use Planning) requires those inventories to be part of the comprehensive plan. Where the residential buildable lands inventory in the

comprehensive plan is not useable, and an applicant presents evidence regarding the current inventory of buildable lands, Goal 1 (Citizen Involvement), Goal 2 and Goal 10 require that the comprehensive plan be amended to incorporate that inventory. *Lengkeek v. City of Tangent*, 50 Or LUBA 367 (2005).

5. Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement. Goal 10 (Housing), Goal 2 (Land Use Planning) and Goal 1 (Citizen Involvement) require that a population projection that forms the basis of a city’s residential lands needs analysis be incorporated into the comprehensive plan. *Lengkeek v. City of Tangent*, 50 Or LUBA 367 (2005).

5. Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement. A citizen participation requirement for appointment of a three-person citizens’ advisory committee when considering major land use regulation amendments is a procedural requirement. A petitioner who wishes to assign error to the local government’s failure to appoint such a committee must have objected to that failure during the proceedings below. *Dobson v. City of Newport*, 47 Or LUBA 267 (2004).

5. Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement. Where a planning commission fails to formally appoint a three-person citizens’ advisory committee from the community at large when considering major land use regulation amendment, as required by an applicable citizen involvement comprehensive plan requirement, that failure does not constitute reversible error where the planning commission in fact seeks the advice of four members of the city’s design review committee who are citizens of the community. Where no party disputes that the design review committee members are members of the community at large, the planning commission’s decision to seek input from the design review committee either constitutes de facto compliance with the citizen involvement requirement or renders any failure to formally appoint a citizens advisory committee a procedural error that resulted in no prejudice to the petitioner or other citizens of the community. *Dobson v. City of Newport*, 47 Or LUBA 267 (2004).

5. Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement. The Land Conservation and Development Commission has exclusive jurisdiction to review allegations that a county’s proceedings under periodic review failed to comply with Goal 1 and LCDC’s rules for conducting periodic review. *Manning v. Marion County*, 45 Or LUBA 1 (2003).

5. Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement. Amendments to Metro’s Regional Framework Plan and the Metro Code that do not amend or affect Metro’s citizen involvement program can violate Goal 1 only if the decision is inconsistent with Metro’s citizen involvement program. *Homebuilders Assoc. v. Metro*, 42 Or LUBA 176 (2002).

5. Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement. Where amendments to a local government’s comprehensive plan or land use regulations do not amend or affect the local government’s acknowledged citizen involvement program, the only way a petitioner can demonstrate a violation of Goal 1 is by demonstrating a failure to comply with the acknowledged CIP. *Casey Jones Well Drilling, Inc. v. City of Lowell*, 34 Or LUBA 263 (1998).

5. Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement. A city violates Goal 1 when it fails to follow its acknowledged citizen involvement program in adopting a temporary land use regulation. *Western PCS, Inc. v. City of Lake Oswego*, 33 Or LUBA 369 (1997).

5. Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement. Where amendments to a local government’s comprehensive plan or land use regulations do not amend or affect the local government’s acknowledged Citizen Involvement Program (CIP), the only way a petitioner can demonstrate a violation of Goal 1 is by demonstrating a failure to comply with the acknowledged CIP. *Churchill v. Tillamook County*, 29 Or LUBA 68 (1995).

5. Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement. A local government does not violate Goal 1 or comprehensive plan policies implementing Goal 1 by adopting a decision six weeks after the final planning staff report is available, where a great deal of citizen involvement and participation preceded issuance of the final staff report. *Friends of Cedar Mill v. Washington County*, 28 Or LUBA 477 (1995).