

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY NOVEMBER 8, 2017
6:00 P.M.**

**Wilsonville City Hall
29799 SW Town Center Loop East
Wilsonville, Oregon**

*Minutes approved as
presented at the December
13, 2017 Planning
Commission Meeting*

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Greenfield called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. Those present:

Planning Commission: Jerry Greenfield, Eric Postma, Al Levit, Peter Hurley, Phyllis Millan, Kamran Mesbah, and Simon Springall.

City Staff: Chris Neamtzu, Miranda Bateschell, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Nancy Kraushaar, Jordan Vance, and Susan Cole

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

CITIZEN'S INPUT

There was none.

CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

A. Consideration of the October 11, 2017 Planning Commission minutes
The October 11, 2017 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

II. WORK SESSIONS

A. Year 2000 URA – Boeckman Creek Bridge (Vance)

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, announced the project team would present a substantial amendment to the Year 2000 Urban Renewal Plan.

Jordan Vance, Economic Development Manager, explained the substantial amendment to the Year 2000 Urban Renewal District would increase the maximum indebtedness of the District to fund a capital project, the Boeckman Dip Bridge Project. This major transportation project located on Boeckman Rd just east of Canyon Creek Rd would help allow for development in the area. The project team received direction from City Council and the Urban Renewal Task Force to assess the financial viability of increasing the urban renewal district, and tonight' briefing was in preparation of the upcoming hearing in December.

Scott Vanden Bos, Elaine Howard Consulting, LLC, and Nick Popenuk, Tiberius Solutions, LLC, presented the proposed Year 2000 Urban Renewal Plan 11th Amendment via PowerPoint, describing the background, purpose, and process related to the amendment and reviewing the Y2000 Finance Plan details.

Nancy Kraushaar, Community Development Director, added that the Planning Commission's role in reviewing the amendment was to ensure it was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and that the various components reflected in the Year 2000 Plan that refer to the Comprehensive Plan were still consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. She responded to Commissioner questions as follows:

- She confirmed the decisions the Planning Commission made concerning Frog Pond implied a direction of increasing the maximum indebtedness to facilitate development and therefore, the Commission had been in

conformity all along. The amendment would be a formal recognition of that direction, should the Commission find that to be true for this particular project.

- The bridge could be finished in 2023. Quite a lot of environmental permitting was involved with the project. Once the amendment was approved by the various agencies, the project team would work with the City's finance director to obtain the funding and hire a consultant. Keeping Boeckman Rd open as much as possible was a key consideration. The City would speak with contractors about how to stage the project to avoid closing Boeckman Rd for the two to three years needed to construct the bridge.

B. Town Center Plan (Bateschell)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Manager, recalled that at the joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting in May, the vision and goals developed with the community for the Town Center Plan were solidified. Staff continued engaging the community at various events over the summer to gather input on how to achieve the vision and goals. The result of all the public engagement and community input, including ideas from the Design Workshop, Community Block Party, and Visual Preference Survey, was a concept for the future of the Town Center. The Town Center Task Force reviewed the ideas received, and helped the project team formulate a draft community design concept for Town Center, which was provided in the Commission packet.

- She introduced Alex Dupey and Molly Cooney-Mesker, both from MIG, and noted the project team would gather additional public input in early 2018 regarding the draft design concept in order to verify that the team heard the community's ideas correctly and to refine the concept further. The Commission and City Council would discuss the draft concept during the joint work session on December 4th, 2017.

Alex Dupey, presented the Town Center Community Design Concept Discussion via PowerPoint, reviewing the many public outreach events and describing how the public was engaged to provide input on many key design elements to inform the draft Town Center Design Concept. He described the building blocks, green spaces, connectivity, and land use, which were developed to organize the public input received and used as key categories when developing the draft design concept. He also discussed the key outcomes from the last Task Force meeting, noting consistent results were received from the two groups of Task Force members working independently to develop the community concept. The project team sought the Commission's input on whether the design concept was at a point where the team could take it to the public for further refinement and on things that needed to be considered moving forward, both in the look of the design and from a zoning and regulatory standpoint.

Comments and input from the Planning Commission was as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- Bike access to Town Center was a concern. If the pedestrian bridge was built over I-5 as indicated in the design concept (Slide 22), it would not work unless that part of Town Center loop was changed. Villebois would use it as bike access. Bikes could access the Town Center from the east and north sides of town, but access from the west side remained very difficult. Was there a way to make an easy transition to Wilsonville Rd?
 - Opening up Parkway Ave for bikes to go south from Wilsonville Rd, where it was currently cut off, and routing bikes down near the Clock Tower and cross directly to a bike access across the road would be shorter than trying to cross Wilsonville Rd and go up to the I-5 overpass.
- While the team tested images of different styles of hotels on the Visual Preference Survey to see what the community would like to see of a building like a convention center hotel located in Town Center; however, the project team was not looking at specific buildings in specific locations at this point, though the discussion had been to allow entertainment, office, and tourist-type uses.
- In the Survey, the existing office building near the movie theater was consistently rated as not appealing, likely because people had no reason to go there. Popular locations were such because people had reasons to be there.

- The bar charts seemed to present positive feedback on everything, even for things that were less than 50 percent positive. Was the team able to determine if some people were voting no on everything, because some people just did not want change?
 - While it was likely some people did vote no on everything, the team did not look at specific user data. Many that were close to 50 percent, were either 'worth considering' or 'not wanted', but if 'worth considering' was the larger percentage, the team read that, not necessarily as positive, but as that those development types needed further exploration, not totally excluded.
- On the Community Design Concept diagram (Slide 22), Parkway would be the main street. Parkway needed to carry traffic and also be very walkable. It would be the area to focus development with cafés and markets with people strolling along that area. People driving through Town Center to get somewhere else should not use Parkway. The question is are there ways to have them use Town Center Loop East?
 - The team was still trying to determine how the intersections at Parkway, Town Center Lp E, and Town Center Lp W would interact with Wilsonville Rd. Could those intersections work together to help with the traffic flow and also create a gateway into Town Center? The team was just starting to address the technical piece and are working with a traffic consultant to consider different ways to deal with the intersections, such as how the signals could function together.
- Although repositioning Town Center Lp W would cut Fry's Electronics off from its large parking area, if only 5 or 10 percent of the parking lot was being used, could that parking be better organized to help with future infill development at that location? With infill development, the area would become a more urban location, and the road would still be a slow, pedestrian-friendly street. A lot still needed to be figured out in terms of design, but how could the City start being more effective in the land use, while not restricting existing development? Pedestrian safety was a paramount factor, as it was not a safe environment now.
 - The Town Center Plan was a vision document and concept plan intended for the long term, 20 to 25 years from now. The reality was the Town Center Lp W would probably be repositioned when the Fry's site redeveloped, not when Fry's customers needed to cross to the parking lot. The road would be put in when a different type of development form occurred on both sides of the road. In addition, the cross sections, which had not yet been discussed, would likely have on street parking and could provide door front parking spaces for some of the capacity for some of the existing buildings and new businesses.
- The process itself seemed to assume, superficially, a blank slate, which did not exist. While the team diagrams showed recognizable buildings, the input process seemed to be designed around what the public could easily misconstrue as a blank slate. The existing structures and landowners were an underappreciated constraint and it was unknown how the transition might roll out.
 - Trying to add more connectivity to an already developed area where the land use pattern did not necessarily support that connectivity is an iterative process. This was a vision document. Ultimately, the Plan would state where eventually the City wanted its road network to be, but it did not preclude existing uses from happening now. If development occurred and a road connection was needed, Staff could point to this document in support of requiring street right-of-way and connections in a given location.
 - Seeing lines on a map could be scary, especially to existing business owners. The City needed to do a good job emphasizing that this was a long-term vision and it did not preclude a business from staying or growing over 20 years to stay competitive. Similarly, 40 years ago, this Plan showed where things were moving from a pedestrian and accessibility standpoint. Businesses today were looking to locate in these types of uses without parking right in front of the businesses. The consumer could park once and then walk to multiple stores or even live in the district.
 - Such transformations were usually done a block at a time, beginning with the most desirable locations developing as anchors. Development then spread around the anchors or up and down the main street as it became a focus for pedestrians, window-shopping, cafés with outdoor seating, etc. It was a slow process definitely driven by the market forces. This process was happening in Lake Oswego.

- Both Bridgeport and Lake Oswego have blocks where the vehicles were excluded. Lake Oswego was built around a parking lot and parking structure and Bridgeport was vacant land before its development. Wilsonville Town Center was an existing area with vehicles going around the loop.
- The extensions of Parkway and Canyon Creek into Town Center, could result in Town Center being a major route for north-south traffic from Wilsonville Rd, and therefore, I-5 to the rest of Wilsonville and the residential area on the east side. How could these traffic networks be supported while still having a walkable, pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly neighborhood in the center, given the substantial amount of traffic expected on the streets? While the reason for rerouting Town Center Lp W was understood, perhaps routing traffic primarily around Town Center Lp E rather than through Parkway would benefit the walkability at the center itself.
 - Routing traffic onto Town Center Lp E was exactly what the concept plan would do. One issue was Town Center Lp W was right next to the freeway interchange. Traffic stacked up because people coming from the tech firms up north cut through Town Center to get to the freeway. Changing that traffic pattern would begin shifting traffic to the east. If Parkway was to be a walkable area, it was important that Parkway did not become a freeway. Keeping Parkway as a walkable area could be accomplished through design as a slow, narrow street with on street parking. People trying to cut through Town Center would then take the easiest route, which would be Town Center Lp E, since it would essentially stay the same as it was today.
 - The technical traffic analysis would help the team understand how some of these changes would work and how to deal with Wilsonville Rd from an intersection and signalization standpoint. Understanding those factors would help ensure the design resulted in a walkable district in the central spot and no traffic where it was not wanted. The last thing people wanted was a nice street grid with people zooming by and that was unsafe for pedestrians.
- Having an illustration of the design of the main street would be helpful. The streets design needed to be traffic-calming. Narrowing the street, slowed people down because their perception of speed was heightened due to visual cues like on-street parking, trees, and people present engaged in activities. The design of the main street would be critical in making it operate that way.
 - Facilitating traffic flow on Wilsonville Rd was also discussed. The traffic study would show how traffic would change. The more the main traffic was moved east, the more capacity Wilsonville Rd would have to stack cars. Moving traffic to the East Loop would provide a longer path for drivers to adjust and move in the right direction, rather than stacking on the West Loop and having to cut across to traffic lanes to get to the I-5 onramp. The traffic analysis would show whether the plan would work or it would negatively affect some other area, which was not the intent.
 - Task Force meeting discussions considered how pedestrian and bike traffic would cross Wilsonville Rd. People at the concentration of activities and interests on the north side of Wilsonville Rd would want to go south to the library, shopping centers, and activities on the south side of Wilsonville Rd. This issue also needed to be addressed through design. The idea was to design the main street as an old-fashioned, small town main street with parallel parking, for example, that people would stay away from if in a hurry.
- Bicycle connectivity was also needed to the existing bike trails on the north side connecting to Town Center Lp W that were not greatly used at this time because there was nothing to go to there. What kind of mechanisms, other than stoplights, could enable bicycle and pedestrian connectivity north/south across Wilsonville Rd to bring the library and retail areas south of Wilsonville Rd into the network? A small footbridge or bike bridge would be great.
 - Bicycle connections south of Wilsonville Rd were needed for safe access across Wilsonville Rd in order for Town Center to become the hub or the heart of the city. Making sure intersections on Wilsonville Rd were safe and provided for multiple connection points for pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles was necessary. The next step was figuring out how those intersections would start to function. If Town Center Lp W, with its double left turns hostile to pedestrians was treated differently than today, would the road become a better connection to the south? If Parkway were extended, how could the intersection be designed to make people feel safe crossing over to Town Center? The traffic analysis was needed,

but the team wanted to ensure the Commission agreed the concept plan was generally on the right track in order to start thinking more critically about some of the pieces.

- The team did discuss Courtside as a potential main street running east to west as a pedestrian-only street. From a retail or restaurant standpoint, traffic was not a bad thing if the traffic were slow, safe, and used on-street parking. With Parkway as the main street, it would become the gateway into Town Center as people turned off Wilsonville Rd. The Courtside/Parkway intersection was key because Town Center Park was right next to it. That area could become the center for development, so from an entry standpoint, Parkway was important.
 - The idea of Courtside being pedestrian-only did not come up in any conversations, either with the public or Task Force. Currently, Courtside was the only east-west connection and had the potential to cut through with little to no impacts to buildings at this point; parking lots and lot lines could be worked around. Taking that east-west connection away without an easy vehicular east-west connection might be difficult to the transportation system. The idea could be tested through a sensitivity analysis, if more interest was expressed about the idea.
- Because the Plan created the opportunity to vacate Park Place, one Task Force group discussed Park Place becoming a pedestrian mall as part of a discussion about the southwest corner of Town Center. All the small restaurants there have very difficult access and was usually bogged down with traffic.
 - In the Design Concept (Slide 22), the circulation modified the Loop and put the main street on Parkway punching through to Wilsonville Rd. This would eliminate Park Place, which would help a lot by diverting cut-through traffic that caused safety issues at the intersection and with the backing up of traffic due to the proximity to the interchange. Both Task Force small groups identified Park Place as an opportunity for a greenway and pedestrian mall.
- No real aggregation of parcels or businesses was needed to achieve the proposed design in the southwest corner of Town Center; the intent was to make the access there better for existing businesses. The area was a great location for new businesses just starting out and needing small spaces, but it was easy to get lost in there. The intent was to maintain some of the energy in the near-term, so such businesses continued to come into Town Center and thrive. However, pedestrian and vehicle connectivity was difficult in the area. The idea was to put in a more formal connection without taking out a business or building. The team had drawn a line in that quadrant trying to fit a connection in, but it would be a very narrow space, possibly an existing unstriped parking lot that would allow passage.
 - Building connectivity in the southwest corner would be challenging, given the existing development pattern, and should be looked more in depth with the Task Force, Planning Commission, and others to figure out the best circulation pattern.
 - The team's best attempt to address that challenge was the narrow loop drive through the southwest quadrant (Slide 22) which would consolidate some of the existing accesses into something more formal so drivers would know better know where they were as opposed to simply driving through a parking lot.
- The City's Transportation System Plan (TSP) currently included and City funding was allocated for the bicycle/pedestrian bridge, which was a key component of this concept plan. The emerald chain of green spaces looked nice, but the pedestrian bridge had a problem because it would also have to go over Boones Ferry Rd. The ADA slope requirements meant the bridge would extend a good way on either side of I-5 and the little green space shown on the concept plan seemed insufficient for the design, which meant dumping people on to the Loop road. The Loop road would have to change to create a safe environment.
 - Currently, there was no design for the pedestrian bridge across I-5, but there had been conversations about ADA compliance and the slope requiring the bridge to be longer than desired. However, the bridge provided the opportunity to get people across the Loop and it lined up well with the concept plan that modified the Loop. Dumping people between the Loop and I-5 was not a good option because there was insufficient space, it was unsafe, and it did not work well for Town Center.
 - The Task Force preferred moving the Loop, which provided potentially more space to consider different designs that bring people into Town Center. People crossing the bridge would land in a plaza space, small park, etc., and would also bring them into the Loop and Town Center, which

provided an opportunity for more place making. While the Town Center project team was working in close coordination with the Boeckman Bridge project team, but no specific bridge design could be added yet since the Bridge project did not start until next fall. Still, the team knew the direction would be to look at a landing on the other side of the Loop.

- The team needed to find a better way to move people across Wilsonville Rd to Memorial Park, the library, senior center, and other activities, especially the East Loop was used as the more centralized way to move traffic. Currently, there was not a safe connection for seniors with mobility issues to get between the senior center and the park. Since moving the senior center was unlikely in the foreseeable future, it was important to provide these connections if the traffic increased on the East Loop. Creekside Apartments had the same issue.
 - The issue was really about being able to walk effectively and safely through Town Center. While tonight's comments regarding the bridge, safely crossing Wilsonville Rd, and connecting the Town Center, all focused on pedestrians and bicycles. As the team moved forward, that was a critical element and defining feature for what the road network/connections patterns would look like. If the team designed to that scale, then the other pieces could fall into place.
- The parking problem would be a big issue in the sequencing of development. One workshop group favored strategically located, multi-story parking structures, which would be a solution to taking all the parking from Fry's. In terms of sequencing, would the parking structures be built first and developers invited to develop around the structures, or should parking structures be part of a development proposal regardless of the existing development or traffic pattern?
 - Parking was a challenging topic. A cursory parking analysis was done on how parking was being used throughout Town Center, and the Safeway shopping center was the only location seeing a lot of use. Most parking in the rest of the Town Center was either empty or almost empty throughout the day. Moving forward, right-sizing the parking would be important from a zoning and regulatory standpoint.
 - Changing technology was another consideration that would challenge some of the existing paradigms of how parking was paid for and used in the near future. Currently, Portland and Pittsburgh were asking businesses to provide proposals for autonomous vehicles on their streets. No one knew what the impacts on transportation and parking would be; thinking strategically about how to do parking long-term was important moving forward, so an expensive four- to five-story parking garage did not sit three-quarters empty in ten years.
- The Commission briefly discussed whether the Wilsonville community would walk, bike, or use transit to and within Town Center. While cold, rainy weather was a major factor in deterring people riding bicycles, they would likely walk despite such weather. Public transit also needed to be considered in the Concept Plan.
 - The more bicycle-accessible the Plan was, the more people would use bikes because they would not feel threatened, but that would depend on how that accessibility was provided. Bicyclists felt safer with separated bike lanes than bike lanes on the side of the road.
 - All the demographics of the community must be considered. A high school was within the plan study and high school students and others without cars used transit, biked, or walked to access Town Center. Hearing from this segment of the community had been important for the team to understand where the main disconnects and big safety issues were, and where additional access would be most valuable.
 - Electronic cars charging stations were also a consideration.
- The emerald chain of open space was admirable and nixing the Town Center Lp W was a good idea.
- Putting in larger Class A office/retail was suggested along I-5, and thoughts about residential development seemed unlikely unless it was on the east side of Town Center. Given the 30,000-ft view of the Design Concept, there was opinion that by the time Town Center Lp W was repositioned, Fry's may not still be in its current format or location. Even if the building remains there, it would be under a different use. Separating the building from that parking lot does not seem to be an issue when thinking about the long-term nature of the plan.
- The connection to Wilsonville Rd was a big challenge. Given that a larger percentage of people were accessing Wilsonville Rd via Town Center Lp W from the high tech businesses to the north, putting in a 'cut

and cover' might be a solution. D.C. neighborhoods have used cuts and covers for decades as they allowed for a vibrant neighborhood on top and a tunnel underneath.

- Depending on the geology around Parkway, the current lack of buildings there could allow for a two-lane cut and cover to bring people north from Wilsonville Rd near the freeway interchange and into the high-tech sector. The narrow tunnel would simply be a bypass and not function like a business loop. A cut and cover would likely improve business because it would remove the rush hour commuting traffic from Town Center.
- It was uncertain how changes in the technology of self-driving cars or ride sharing might change things in the future as well.
- Since parking structures were expensive and hard to pay for, they should be designed so the top two of the five floors could be easily converted to something else.
- Pedestrian and bike buffers did make people feel more secure. It was frightening to walk where Town Center Loop currently came out at the corner of Chipotle's, but installing a buffer and routing traffic through a tunnel might encourage people to cross there.
- Breaking up the hard turns on Town Center Lp W would have some traffic-calming effect. However, a lot of real estate would be created to the west of the repositioned Loop road, which meant a lot of vehicles and traffic, given the entertainment, mixed use with office/retail/restaurant land uses, so putting high intensity vehicle traffic back at that location might counteract the traffic-calming effect.
- Creating a main street out of Parkway with traffic-calming notions, like restaurants with outdoor seating and small shops, was ideal, but was that realistic? Siphoning traffic over to the east was unrealistic because people would have to go two intersections passed the interstate they were trying to reach. If traffic could not be siphoned to the east, the traffic-calming effects of the main street feel would be negated and, traffic-calming was an important component of a pedestrian-friendly center.
 - Pushing the repositioned West Loop a bit closer to the interstate would reduce the real estate west of the road, so the size of the uses there could be limited, and perhaps calm things a bit more.
- While the idea was to have small, local, non-chain businesses, nothing had been discussed about what the market could actually bear and create. It would be impossible to have rents low enough for small businesses to afford spaces in the expensive structures being considered. Rents were not maximized for either residential or commercial markets when those properties were combined too frequently. The possible result was a lot of residential and commercial vacant space, and economically the area would either be stagnate or have high rent prices.
 - Residential was proposed all over the area, but the Plan should be more focused on where residential should be located. If residential was allowed everywhere, what was being created? How could anyone afford to build it and ensure it was not largely vacant?
 - Not tying the desired land uses, like more restaurants, to the market relationship between building expenses and rents would result in a utopian, unbuildable community, which was a frightening possibility. While there had been a lot of discussion about what was wanted, there had not been enough discussion about what was realistic and practical.
 - The scope of work did include a market analysis. Once the project team had a better understanding of the land uses and the types and designs of buildings wanted, the team would pick some key integral sites for each type of use and building and have market and fiscal analyses done to determine if any gaps existed in the plan with regard to the current market. If so, the size of the gap, the timeframe to fill the gap, and efforts the City could make to help fill the gap, such as regulatory changes or financial incentives, would be discussed, along with any potential tradeoffs. Those discussions would occur when implementation actions.
- The concern was that the conversations with the public were creating unrealistic expectations about what Town Center might become because currently, there were no budget constraints. While the market analysis would be part of another phase, it could not be ignored in this phase.
 - When presenting the Concept Plan to the public, the team should be better about clarifying the visionary aspect of the Plan and explaining that the plan would occur over time as elements not market feasible in the short-term became more market feasible in the long-term.

- The existing Town Center Master Plan was very rigid about where different types of commercial uses could go. Further discussion by the Commission was suggested about the proposed Plan having more flexible verbiage to not be so specific about which uses could go in a given quadrant or parcel. For example, not locating residential right next to the freeway, but rather closer to the park or the existing residential neighborhood on the east side, and not allowing all the types of uses because the team wanted to remove some of the uses from being adjacent. At this point, the team had only made two distinctions; that residential was not on the freeway and there were fewer commercial uses on the east side. The team had not been as limiting to say they wanted to allow the market to determine, to some degree, a mix of uses appropriate for a main street district/town center type development and was more open to the private sector determining where and how that was implemented, but certain unwanted uses would be removed. Determining whether certain areas should have more specific direction was a valuable conversation that could evolve through public discussion or with the Commission and City Council.
 - Certainly, a balance was needed between being specific enough and yet not too specific. From conversations about these issues over the years, the public was very wary of apartment construction and development. The concern was that every square inch of space that could be potentially designated as residential, would be designated residential and then turn into an apartment complex, and that was exactly what could happen. The situation could get too big, too fast, and become uncontrollable because the City did not take the opportunity to control it.
 - It was important to not be too specific and allow the market to have a better role in determining what developed, but a lack of trust also existed that if the Commission was not more specific, some market elements would run away with it. The concept plan did not provide any balance with respect to residential based on how terrified citizens were about being too open with what could be residential and what it would look like.
 - Starting to look at specific uses with respect to scale and location within Town Center would be a great discussion for the next Task Force meeting.
- Building incentives into the development design standards as tradeoffs for developers was suggested to allow the market to decide what it wanted, while retaining some City control without being too prescriptive. For example, getting a green light faster in the permitting process if certain developments were proposed, such as restaurants along Parkway.

Ms. Bateschell confirmed the team received a lot of helpful feedback, especially on what particular challenges the Commission saw facing the team as it moved forward. The issues and concerns raised by the Commission would be taken back to the Task Force for further refinement before the December 4th Joint Planning Commission/City Council Work Session. An initial sensitivity analysis would also be done on traffic to make sure any red flags were addressed before the draft concept plan went public. The team hoped to present a concept plan recommendation to the public at the beginning of next year for further refinement, input, and confirmation, as well as to address any issues raised in response the Plan.

C. I-5 Exit 283-282 Interchange Facilities Plan (Kraushaar)

Nancy Kraushaar, Community Development Director, stated the City and Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) recently started a joint study of I-5 between the Wilsonville Road, Canby, and Hubbard interchanges, which was an area that experienced extreme congestion. She was the City's Project Manager while Mr. Makler was ODOT's Project Manager. In order to include something in the 2018 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), ODOT needed a public process and an area study to see if there was a solution that could become a project to add to the RTP. ODOT asked the City to provide the public involvement piece for the joint study, which would be manageable and done within the next six months. The first step in the public involvement process was briefing the Planning Commission about the project.

Jon Makler, Region 1 Planning Manager, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), noted the intent of tonight's presentation was to ensure this planning activity reflected both the City's and State's interests with regard to I-5 in the subject area. Given the numerous emails and phone calls received from business owners

and residents about traffic on I-5 and the interchanges, ODOT was well aware of the effect this facility had on the vitality, livability, and safety of the Wilsonville community and businesses.

- He presented the I-5 Wilsonville Facility Plan via PowerPoint, describing the issue and contributing factors, and highlighting the purpose, scope, and schedule of the proposed facilities project, which would include widening and seismically upgrading the Boone Bridge.

Discussion and feedback from the Planning Commission and responses to Commissioner questions were as follows:

- The traffic data showed that 10,000 cars, or 15 percent of the 62,000 vehicles a day, went south on I-5 via Exit 283. Mr. Makler would research how the numbers changed in the Peak Hour and provide that to the Commission.
- In light of the considerable regional importance of the project, a considerable amount of public and stakeholder outreach was proposed (Slide 6). The Technical advisory committee would be comprised of staff from ODOT, the City, and Clackamas and Washington Counties. Washington County recently completed a freight study, so the information and findings of that study would be available.
 - The stakeholder group outreach would include the Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce, Oregon Freight Advisory Committee, and the French Prairie Forum, a long-standing forum that included representatives from many other counties, special districts, and others south of Wilsonville. An assembly of Wilsonville citywide homeowner association (HOA) presidents would be formed as another stakeholder group.
 - The Planning Commission, as the Committee for Citizen Involvement, would also hold an open house.
 - Advocates opposed to any kind of freeway expansion might become involved as word got out. Technically, the project was intended to significantly improve operations.
- Once the joint study was completed and if the I-5 project ended up in the RTP, there were no promises for funding, as the project would have to compete with the other needs throughout the corridor and the Portland region. Priorities already set included Highway 217, the Abernathy Bridge, widening I-205 between Oregon City and I-5, and the huge Rose Quarter project. It could take years before the project was designed and constructed, but this was the first step in the process.
- This was not just a Wilsonville problem. ODOT had heard most from Clackamas County about the congestion on I-5. Clackamas County had been working on several ways to improve connections between Canby and I-5, but regardless of which route driver take to I-5, this section was the next critical bottleneck for traffic. Therefore, Clackamas County was the next stakeholder, geographically.
- The stakeholders in this project ranged from California to Seattle, especially in light of tourism and football games at Oregon and Oregon State. The project was critical for Wilsonville for safety, convenience, and commerce.
- The City of Wilsonville would host an information page on the City's website, though the results of the study were expected rather quickly.
- The project would actual widen the freeway to add another lane, as there was insufficient room on the Boone Bridge to simply paint another lane.
- The project would be coordinated with the French Prairie Bridge project to ensure access for bicyclists and pedestrians currently using the Boone Bridge.
- Years ago, a transit master plan discussed trying to hang a pedestrian/bicycle bridge off the existing Boone Bridge, but comments were made about the bridge not being strong enough because it had to be wide enough for an ODOT sweeper to cross. Comments were also made that one side of the bridge was weaker than the other because the footings were wood.
 - One project feature was to retrofit the Boone Bridge to be seismically resilient, so these were all valid issues to consider as found when working on the Abernathy Bridge recently. Retrofitting the Boone Bridge would be similar to the Abernathy Bridge, which involved reinforcing footings and columns, and even creating considerably larger footings for the bridge, which was a big cost driver on the Abernathy Bridge as much of that work was below the water line. Retrofitting the Boone Bridge would be an expensive project, initially estimated at \$150 million, but retrofitting and adding a lane on the Abernathy Bridge was about \$200 to \$250 million.

- With regard to funding options for the project, there were two avenues to consider.
 - Metro's RTP process first required agencies to identify the revenue needed and then which projects the agency would add if that revenue amount were doubled. ODOT anticipated needing \$1.5 billion in revenue over the life of the 2018 to 2040 RTP. This I-5 project was in that second category, and would be add if that revenue amount was double, so in Metro-speak, it was way out there.
 - The Legislature seemed to engage on transportation about every six to ten years, and the most recent package was completed in 2017. For a project of this scale, it would take an act of the legislature to move the project up in line or create a program to address seismic risk projects and pick this project. The reality was the project was in competition with other compelling seismic risks around the state.
- There was discussion during the last legislative session about doing a larger study of the I-5 corridor, which could potentially be discussed when the legislature convened in February. That larger study should not be confused with this joint study, which would look at the Boone Bridge and how to reduce the friction between these two major interchanges in the hopes of improving operations. The I-5 corridor study would look at a broader perspective, such as how to get better transit further to the north and south.

III. INFORMATIONAL

A. City Council Action Minutes: (10.02.2017 and 10.16.2017)

There were no comments.

B. 2017 & 2018 Planning Commission Work Program

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, noted a lot of items were still coming in for the Commission's 2018 work program, including the citywide Parks and Recreation Master Plan and the Equitable Housing Grant. Staff would prepare a more thoughtful work program for discussion at the Commission's next meeting. He addressed clarifying questions.

- With regard to work in 2018 on the French Prairie Bridge, he noted *The Spokesman's* front-page article reported about the bridge, the archaeological study, and short-term challenges. Until Staff, the consultants, and the Federal Highway Administration finished working through the issues, it was difficult to set a schedule. He would work with Zach Weigel to prepare a program with some dates for open houses and work sessions.

Chair Greenfield expressed concern about not having a joint work session with City Council on the Old Town

- Mr. Neamtzu reported City Council approved the Old Town Design Standards on first reading and was appreciative of the Planning Commission's thorough work. The record the Commission built around the Old Town Neighborhood Plan was helpful. Council made essentially no amendments to the Design Standards, perhaps two small word clarifications on the text itself, and the Pattern Book was approved as recommended by the Commission.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

By Paula Pinyerd of ABC Transcription Services, Inc. for
Tami Bergeron, Administrative Assistant - Planning