

Netarts Community Planning Advisory Committee
August 12, 2006
Netarts Fire Hall
10:00am to 12:00pm
(The tapes of the meeting were faulty- as a result, there may
need to be additional clarification made at the September 9,
2006 meeting)

Lisa Phipps, Tillamook County Department of Community Development Coastal Resource Planner, began the meeting. She reviewed the materials handed out at the meeting: a) a copy of the bylaws, b) emails submitted by Jeannette Brinker, Bill Dryden, and Lisa Phipps, c) the agenda, d) a guide to Oregon's Public Meeting Laws, e) the draft minutes of the June 17th community meeting and f) a copy of the powerpoint presentation given at the community meeting.

Lisa began by addressing the emails that she had received. She explained why she had included an email exchange between Mr. Dryden and herself. She had told Mr. Dryden that she would forward the exchange to the committee. She explained that she owed it to both the committee and Mr. Dryden to see her responses. She apologized because she said that she had taken them personally – something that doesn't normally happen but that she is very much invested in this process and felt that both she and the process were being called into question. She said she was sorry for the sharpness of her response but that she felt very strongly that this was a good process and that people were committed to it.

Lisa then took the Committee through the bylaws as this was the next step in the process. The first item that she mentioned was the recommendation to change the name from the Netarts Citizen Planning Advisory Committee to the Netarts Community Planning Advisory Committee. There had been some discussion that this change sounded more inclusive. There was no disagreement and the change was accepted.

Next, she spoke to the Membership Section. A suggestion had been made to require membership to be open to "legal" residents of the United States as opposed to "all people at least 18 years old who reside in..." A question was raised as to how that was going to be monitored. Another was raised as to whether this would actually be an issue. After some discussion, the committee elected to keep the membership requirements as they were written in the draft bylaws.

She then asked the Committee if they wanted the Section on membership to read for "legal residents of the United States." There was a brief discussion centered around how something like that would be enforced and whether this was really an issue that the community would have to be concerned about. The committee decided to leave the membership clause as is. She then said that the membership boundary would need to be made consistent with the wishes expressed at the last meeting where the group agreed that the area of membership would extend north to Fall Creek, south to the northern boundary of the Cape Lookout State Park, west to include the Bay, and east along the lines of the Fire District Boundary. A map was unavailable for this meeting but would be brought to the September meeting.

With the group's agreement, Area of Influence will be amended to Area of Interest.

Lisa then brought up the topic of quorum. At this point she asked Jud Randall, chair of the Oceanside Neighborhood Association, to talk about the method that the ONA uses to establish a quorum and how that has worked for the ONA. Jud said the ONA takes the median attendance of 12 months to establish the quorum for the following year. He said that there have been periods where they were unable to conduct business because of a lack of quorum. He also said that when an issue arises, it can artificially raise the median so that the following year, there may be challenges meeting the quorum. But, he said the ONA researched this extensively and overall feel that it accomplishes its purpose fairly.

Other options were brought up, including the average attendance, a percentage of the total membership, a minimum number, and the members in attendance. There was a good discussion on the pros and cons of each approach. The committee wanted to make sure that a decision was fairly represented without creating a situation where business might not be able to be conducted. It was pointed out that any decision taken to the Department, Planning Commission, or Board of Commissioners, would have the number of people in attendance noted and the outcome of a vote. In the end, it was determined that the number of people present at the meeting was the quorum. Someone then asked if there should be a clause to review this decision in a year. Many agreed that re-visiting the issue after a period of time had passed made sense. But it was agreed that the requirement to re-visit did not need to be in the bylaws.

Voting was reviewed next. At this point, the concept of a proxy vote was brought up. There were several individuals speaking in favor of the concept – among the positives, it would allow more people to vote. The negatives for allowing proxy vote was that the people voting by proxy would not have the benefit of hearing the discussion and the outcome of those discussions. After a lengthy discussion, the committee voted to not add “vote by proxy” into the bylaws. The group then agreed that a simple majority vote was sufficient for the decision making process. There was however discussion on how individuals could make sure their opinions were heard. It was agreed that those who were not present could make their views clear to the group through written statement by letter or email. This would then be entered into the record. The group confirmed this was a policy, not a bylaw. However, it is important that everybody understand that this opportunity is available to them.

Under the section on meetings, the phrase "including but not limited to e-mail notices" was added. Jud said that Staff had been very good about alerting the ONA to issues that were either occurring or upcoming in the ONA community.

Under Bylaws, it was agreed that a simple majority was also sufficient for voting on bylaw revisions.

With that, a vote was taken and the bylaws were adopted. Lisa congratulated the group on becoming an official CPAC. There was a round of applause.

Next on the agenda was the Election of Officers. The Nominating Committee had prepared a slate for consideration:

Chair- Jim Carlson
Vice Chair – Debra Drake
Secretary –
Treasurer – Albert Arcure

Lisa said that the position of secretary was still open. At this point, Mark Josi nominated Joan Cutuly from the floor. Joan accepted the nomination. Lisa then asked for any other nominations from the floor. It was asked if the candidates present could say a few words. Jim said that after some arm twisting he agreed to the nomination for chair and spoke about how he hoped that the CPAC would become a place for people to learn about the issues facing Netarts. Debra and Albert were both unable to attend and had made sure to let Lisa know that. Lisa said both of them had been members of the Steering Committee and were willing to accept the nomination if nobody else would agree to do it.

Lisa closed the discussion. Membership forms and ballots were passed out. Lisa asked that each person voting write their name on the ballot for the record. Only people filling out the membership forms were eligible to vote. She then collected the ballots. She asked Dave Kratovil (a member of the Nominations Committee) and Lorraine Kratovil (member) to tally the votes. Neither individual was nominated for a position. When the votes were tallied, The slate had been elected as presented with the addition of Joan Cutuly as secretary. Lisa congratulated the new officers. She told the Steering Committee/Nominations Committee that now their work was done! She asked the Chair's permission to continue with the agenda as she was next on the agenda to discuss land use actions in Netarts. Jim granted her permission to continue.

Lisa then spoke about some of the land use issues occurring within the area. The bulk of the discussion focused on a Conditional Use application for townhomes across from Crab Avenue. Issues that were brought up included how the development fit within the character of the area, access to the site, parking, and overall concerns with the application. The due date for comments was August 15th. Lisa encouraged everybody who had an interest in the application to submit comments – she reminded them that it was important to focus their comments on the criteria. She said that from now on, these types of applications would be sent to the CPAC. A question was raised on the how applications are noticed to the public. Lisa said that properties within 250 feet of the project sites were noticed. Now, with the CPAC, the CPAC could send the notices to all members of the CPAC extending beyond the 250 feet.

Lisa said that she would work with Jim on the agenda for the next meeting. After the next few meetings, she said that she would step back into the role of liaison.

She congratulated the committee one more time on their accomplishments and thanked the steering committee for all of their hard work.

The meeting adjourned at 12:05pm. Minutes taken by Lisa M. Phipps, Coastal Resource Planner.