

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JULY 13, 2016
6:00 P.M.**

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

*Approved as
Presented
9/14/2016*

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Jerry Greenfield called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. Those present:

Planning Commission: Jerry Greenfield, Eric Postma, Al Levit, Simon Springall, and Kamran Mesbah. Peter Hurley arrived at 6:07 pm. Phyllis Millan and City Councilor Charlotte Lehan were absent.

City Staff: Chris Neamtzu, Michael Kohlhoff, Nancy Kraushaar, Miranda Bateschell, and Jordan Vance

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

III. CITIZEN'S INPUT - This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Planning Commission on items not on the agenda. There was none.

IV. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT

No Council liaison report was provided given Councilor Lehan's absence.

V. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

A. Consideration of the June 8, 2016 Planning Commission minutes
The June 8, 2016 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

Commissioner Hurley arrived at 6:07 pm.

VI. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Coffee Creek Urban Renewal (Kraushaar)

Chair Greenfield read the legislative hearing procedure into the record and opened the public hearing at 6:12 pm.

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, reminded that late last year the Planning Commission received an extensive urban renewal update from former City Economic Development Manager Kristin Retherford and Nick Popenuk from ECO Northwest. As with previous urban renewal plans reviewed by the Planning Commission, the scope of tonight's review regarded compliance of the Urban Renewal Plan with the applicable sections of the City's Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, the Plan was not being adopted or recommended but rather a finding was being made through the Commission's action to the Council that the Urban Renewal Plan conformed to the applicable sections of the Comprehensive Plan. The findings contained in Attachment C of the packet demonstrated that compliance. Tonight would be a more robust presentation to ensure the citizens and community knew as much as possible about the plans and this particular urban renewal district.

- He described some revisions to the packet based on testimony received this morning from Commissioner Postma as follows:

- He entered Commissioner Postma's email dated July 13, 2016 into the record as Attachment D. This email was the rationale behind the proposed revisions to the resolution, which were reflected in the revised, redline and clean versions of Resolution No. LP16-0002, which were also distributed to the Planning Commission.
- He noted the Staff report, Coffee Creek Urban Renewal Plan, and findings (Attachment C) were available at the side of the room.

Nancy Kraushaar, Community Development Director, introduced Jordan Vance, the new City Economic Development Manager who came onboard in June, noting that as he became more involved in the Urban Renewal and Economic Development Program he would be more involved in all the urban renewal plans and their implementation.

- She noted a typo in the revised, redline version of the resolution distributed to the Commission as the word conformance had been misspelled once toward the bottom, but corrected versions of the resolution had been prepared.
- She described the proposed Coffee Creek Urban Renewal Area, which was near the North Wilsonville Interchange with I-5 and bound by Day Rd on the north, Graham's Ferry Rd on the west, Clutter/Ritter Rd on the south, and 95th Ave and Boones Ferry Rd on the east.
- She reviewed the background leading to the Urban Renewal Plan, noting an Urban Reserve Plan was developed in 1998 as a concept plan for the area as it was uncertain whether Metro wanted to bring the area into the UGB. In 2002, Metro did render a decision to include what was then called Area 49 in the urban growth boundary (UGB). In 2007, a master plan was developed which set the stage for future zoning, which was Planned Development Industrial, Regionally Significant Industrial Area (PDI-RSIA). At the time, approximately 1,800 jobs were envisioned for the area, a \$55 million annual payroll, and an increase in assessed value from \$62 million to \$790 million, so Coffee Creek was considered an attractive area for new employment. The 2007 Master Plan also included urban renewal as a potential funding source for some of the infrastructure.
 - In 2011, a complete infrastructure analysis was done to better understand what it would take to serve the area and begin to determine future sewer and water line locations and what the streets would look like.
 - The City's Urban Renewal Strategic Plan for urban renewal citywide was completed in 2014, and after many meetings with a wide range of community members and stakeholders, the recommendation from the Urban Renewal Strategic Plan was to first determine feasibility and if feasible, then develop an urban renewal plan for the Coffee Creek area to kick start development and provide much-needed infrastructure that could be quite a hindrance for new development coming in.
- Last fall, consultants Mr. Popenuk and Elaine Howard helped Staff prepare the proposed Coffee Creek Urban Renewal Plan (Plan). In April, the Plan was presented to the Urban Renewal Task Force, which voted unanimously to forward it to City Council and all other public bodies as part of the public process required when adopting a new urban renewal area. Staff has since met with City Council again and also sent formal and informal notices to all of the taxing districts informing them of the proposal. The report on the Plan discussed the details about how this Urban Renewal Plan would affect the other taxing districts.
- The proposed Plan was being presented to the Planning Commission because according to statutes, the Commission also had a role in moving the proposed Plan forward for adoption.

Nick Popenuk, Project Manager, ECO Northwest, and Ms. Kraushaar presented the Coffee Creek Urban Renewal Plan via PowerPoint, which was distributed to the Commission, with these key additional comments:

- Although the statutes for a new Urban Renewal Plan required the Planning Commission to view it and make a recommendation, the statute did not specify exactly what that process should look like. However, a related statute stated the Urban Renewal Plan must be in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. Given the proliferation of urban renewal plans in Oregon over the last few decades, best practices had evolved which stated the role of the Planning Commission was to examine the conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and recommend it go forward to City Council for their consideration if it met same.

- Because this was a public hearing open for public comment, a broader overview of the components of the proposed Plan would be provided.
- Although the Plan would be adopted by the City of Wilsonville, the Plan did include unincorporated property currently outside the city limits. Both the City and County attorneys agreed only the City's Planning Commission needed to take action in terms of review with the Comprehensive Plan. The intention was that as new development was ready to occur, those properties would be annexed into the City of Wilsonville and over time, the entire urban renewal area would also be annexed into the city, which had always been the plan for the area.
- The key limitation on urban renewal is maximum indebtedness, or the total dollar amount of urban renewal funds of tax-increment finance revenue, that could be used to fund projects in the area. As stated in the Plan, the maximum indebtedness is \$67 million, which was included in the ballot measure language that went out to the public for an advisory vote last fall. The public was comfortable with that amount and passed the measure.
 - Because the \$67 million was a hard limit, if someone wanted to do \$100 million worth of projects in the area, they would not be able to fund all of them with urban renewal. Although a substantial amendment could be made to the Plan later to increase that limit somewhat, even tougher restrictions existed on how the City would increase that in the future.
- Nothing in the statute stated the Plan must have a hard and fast end date. The Plan was estimated to be completed in about 25 years, which was the amount of time to invest in new infrastructure, have new development take place, use the increased tax revenues to pay off the debt on that infrastructure, and then close the Plan down.
- The projections for maximum indebtedness and tax increment finance revenue that funded the projects in the urban renewal area were made based on growth and assessed value in the area. Assessed value could grow from appreciation of existing property, as well as new development. Because the proposed area had a relatively low amount of value today compared to its acreage, which had a lot of vacant property, appreciation was not expected to be a large component of the growth and value, especially in the State of Oregon where appreciation on an annual basis was limited to 3 percent per year for properties.
 - In order for urban renewal to be successful, new development had to take place. When forecasting new development in an area that was largely vacant, there was no crystal ball. Assumptions had to be made about the amount of development that would take place, what kind of development it would be, the value of the new development, and how quickly new development would occur.
 - To assess all of that, the project team relied upon the series of planning documents that had been done for the proposed area over the last two decades, in particular, a 2011 Coffee Creek Funding and Marketing Plan that tried to assess the type and value of the development that would take place. Those assumptions were amended a bit to assume that Coffee Creek would take 20 years to develop at a rate of eight acres each year with values of approximately \$3 million per acre. Again, the actual timing and value of development would vary which could result in a more successful or more time-consuming Plan over time than estimated in the forecast. The numbers were not binding or a guarantee of what would happen, but understanding the assumptions that went into the Plan was important.
- The TIF Forecast chart (Slide 7) illustrated how tax increment finance would work for the proposed urban renewal area. At the beginning, the area was generating roughly \$1 million per year in property taxes which would continue to go to all of the affected taxing districts: the City, County, Fire District, School District, etc.
 - The increment was any growth in value that took place over time and that would be used to pay for projects specific to this Urban Renewal Plan. The increment started off very low, meaning there was a limited ability for the Urban Renewal Area to invest in projects, but over time it would grow as new development took place and in the later years there would be quite a lot of increment value that would allow for many projects while also paying off bonds and/or loans quickly.
 - Toward the end of the Plan, the revenue labeled "shared" on the chart was a relatively new occurrence in State statute, which stated that once an urban renewal plan was mature and its annual

revenues reach a certain threshold, the Plan could no longer be permitted to retain all of those revenues but had to share some of it back with the affected taxing districts. This legislation resulted because some urban renewal plans in the past dragged on for a long time and the affected taxing districts had to keep waiting to see any of the benefits; that was no longer the case.

- If the actual tax revenue matched the projections, the Plan area would hit that sharing threshold in about 20 years and start giving some of that revenue back to the other taxing districts. In 2042, 25 years from Plan's implementation, the Plan would close and all of the increase in revenue would go back to the taxing districts, so their patience would be rewarded in the long run with increased property tax revenues that were intended to be much higher than without urban renewal. The proposed area wanted to develop for the last 20 years but had been struggling to get any development without the infrastructure, but the urban renewal increment and investment could jumpstart the area and get the development to take place, which would result in much higher property tax revenues than seen there today.
- The \$67 million of maximum indebtedness was in nominal dollars. The project team took a list of projects the City wanted to fund in the area (Slide 8), which added up to \$58 million in today's dollars, and then estimated the inflation given the anticipated timing of those projects over the next several years to calculate the estimated projects' costs, which was \$79 million. With a maximum indebtedness of \$67 million, not all of the projects could be funded with tax increment finance revenues, which was fine because such projects were not typically funded 100 percent with tax increment finance revenue as system development charges (SDCs), private developer contributions, and other funds would help pay for those projects.
 - While developing the Plan, the City hired an outside engineering consultant to closely review all of the projects that had been investigated in previous plans to ensure the cost estimates were not underestimated. The consultant used very good, planning level estimates with a good contingency to provide a realistic look at what could be built with the maximum indebtedness and what would require the use of other funds.
- The projects proposed in the Coffee Creek Urban Renewal Plan were reviewed as noted on Funding for Projects (Slide 8) and indicated on the Proposed Coffee Creek Urban Renewal District Map (Slide 9) with these key comments:
 - Project 6 Coffee Creek Industrial Area Sewer Extension was estimated at approximately \$2 million. Currently, the City has an existing sewer line where SW Clutter Rd, Garden Acres Rd, and Ridder Rd came together, but no city sewer currently extended to the Boones Ferry/Day Rd, which would be a very costly investment. The recently approved Universal Health facility had a temporary connection to the sewer currently in the Commerce Circle area. As interest in the developing on Day Rd and the entire area grew, a public sewer line would be needed.
 - Project 1 Day Rd would address an existing structural deficiency in its pavement section and bringing Day Rd to a multi-modal five-lane road. The Transportation System Plan (TSP) specified Day Rd as five lanes, particularly approaching Boones Ferry Rd, but this Plan assumed five lanes clear to Grahams Ferry Rd, most of which was contingent upon more detailed studies regarding when the project would be done and the timing of the Basalt Creek Parkway, which was part of the Basalt Creek Concept Plan Area. This was an expensive project that envisioned Day Road with a concrete section, due to the heavy industrial traffic through the area, as well as buffered bikes lanes, sidewalks, and landscaping.
 - Project 2 anticipated improvements on Grahams Ferry Rd to the edge of the Urban Renewal District.
 - Project 3 Java Rd was more of a collector street that would connect Grahams Ferry Rd and Garden Acres Rd in the Urban Renewal District.
 - One recent amendment to the 2014 TSP was the elimination of Kinsman Road Extension from Ridder Rd to Day Rd between Grahams Ferry Rd and Boones Ferry Rd. Following a more intense traffic analysis for the area, Staff determined it would be just as effective to have only Garden Acres Rd connect to Day Rd and Grahams Ferry Rd. Service to the area was just as good using Garden Acres Rd as the main route through the Urban Renewal District and Coffee Creek Industrial Area.

- Project 4 Garden Acres Rd project also included a reconfigured intersection with Grahams Ferry Rd in front of the Coffee Creek Correctional Facility with either a signalized intersection or large roundabout that could accommodate trucks. More study was needed on both concepts before any design and construction could start.
- Project 5 Clutter Rd was an old County section that did not meet urban standards and needed to be rebuilt.
- Assorted storm water improvements were proposed throughout the area, including Project 8 Coffee Creek Regional Detention Pond, which was needed to serve the area for detention and water quality purposes.
- Most of the roadway projects included at least some underground utilities. Fiber optic cable would be included throughout the roadway system in an effort to provide the kind of internet service needed for any future employment in the area.
- Project 9 Railroad Undercrossing only involved planning. The existing railroad overcrossing at Grahams Ferry Rd was deficient due to vertical and horizontal clearance limitations. Additionally, the steep topography and adjacent wetlands and Metro's open space made it a complicated area that would require a lot to develop the scope needed for the project, so \$2 million was included for project development to better understand what was intended given that the existing bridge did not meet any standards and carried rail daily. It could take a lot of time just to understand what the best improvements were for that project.
- When talking about urban renewal, it was important to emphasize the impacts to taxing districts. Urban renewal used tax increment finance that was not free money, but money that was diverted from the places it would ordinarily go. The project team estimated the foregone revenues, projecting how much revenue would be generated in the area with urban renewal and all of the development that came with it and identifying where that revenue would have otherwise gone. This might be an overstatement of the impacts to the affected taxing districts because without urban renewal, all of that development might not have taken place. Nonetheless, it was better to overstate rather than understate them because districts were valuable partners, and the City wanted to make sure they understood the costs of using urban renewal.
- In the Coffee Creek Urban Renewal Area Report, on Page 58 of 66 of the meeting packet, the first page of Chapter IX, Impact of the Tax Increment Financing, was narrative describing the impacts, which were for permanent property tax rates. The urban renewal area did not have any impact on local option levies. General obligation (GO) bonds were only impacted if approved prior to 2001, of which very few were outstanding. Only one was in the Wilsonville area, but it impacted GO bonds differently than permanent property tax rates.
 - Pages 59 and 60 indicated the annual revenues going to the Urban Renewal area each year instead of to the affected taxing districts. Those numbers and information had been shared with each of the affected taxing districts. State law required the City to consult and confer with those taxing districts and that the taxing districts have an opportunity to provide written comment to the City Council as part of their decision-making process.
 - The numbers started off small and humble, just like the TIF revenue, \$50,000 per year in aggregate, and over time, they build up until they would reach approximately \$7 million per year. Once everything was said and done, the increase in property tax revenue would go back to the affected taxing districts.
- School districts were slightly different from the other taxing districts with regard to impacts and were not directly impacted by urban renewal. School districts were funded based on a state-wide formula with a general purpose grant of X dollars per student. If property tax revenues for an individual school district went up or down, it would not affect their actual funding. However, if there were 100 urban renewal areas all over the state that were taking some local property tax revenue away from their local school district, it was conceivable that the state would fund schools at a lower level than they otherwise would have, so the exact amount of that impact was difficult to say.
- The City showed the school districts the full amount of the foregone revenue, and consult and confer with them. The school district was invited to participate in the Urban Renewal Task Force on this project.

A very small part of the city overlapped with the Sherwood School District, which was the district of concern.

- The Comprehensive Plan Conformance was the heart of the matter this evening. The Planning Commission's Staff report, Attachment C on Pages 64 through 66 of the packet, identified a number of Comprehensive Plan goals related to the urban renewal area which generally referred to urban growth management, public facilities and services, including water, fire, and transportation, and also land use and development. Those goals were listed along with an explanation from City Staff on how the Urban Renewal Plan related to those goals.
 - The Staff report noted that the Urban Renewal Report provided the infrastructure to allow the development to occur according to the plans that had been laid out for the last 20 years for the Coffee Creek area. The Urban Renewal Plan did not in any way try to change the vision or plans the area had always had. It was an implementation tool for the infrastructure that the project team believed would facilitate the growth that had always been planned there.
 - The Staff report concluded that the establishment of the Coffee Creek Urban Renewal District was supportive of and in conformance with the applicable provisions of the City of Wilsonville Comprehensive Plan.
- The State had limits on the percentage of a city that could be included cumulatively in urban renewal areas. The City already had two large urban renewal areas, the Westside Urban Renewal Plan and the Year 2000 Plan, as well as three small individual property specific TIF Zones. No more than 25 percent of a city's acreage or assessed value was allowed in those plans. (Slide 12)
 - If the proposed urban renewal plan was created, the City would still be well under the limit at 7 percent of the total city assessed value. However, the City was very close to the acreage limit at 24.5 percent, so at this time, the City could not add additional property to any of its existing urban renewal areas or create any new urban renewal areas unless an existing urban renewal plan was closed down or its acreage reduced. The City was essentially at maximum capacity for urban renewal.
- With regard to the Plan's timeline, the dates following tonight's Commission meeting were uncertain because the City learned earlier today that the July 19th Washington County Commission meeting had been postponed, which could impact the dates of City Council's hearing and votes. (Slide 13)

Ms. Kraushaar noted the modifications to the amended Staff report (new Exhibit A) and resolution, made in response to Commissioner Postma's email (Attachment D), had been distributed to the Planning Commission.

- The revisions to the Staff report included the additional impacts or benefits to the community and that indebtedness was required with an urban renewal district which did impose some risk for the City. Language was also included regarding the 25 percent cap on acreage and that the proposed Coffee Creek Urban Renewal Area would definitely approach that limit for the City's overall acreage.
- The red line version of the resolution distributed to the Commission included two misspellings of the word conformance, in both the title and the NOW, THEREFORE paragraph.

Commissioner Postma highlighted the concerns he discussed in his email (Attachment D) with the following:

- With regard to the resolution, he noted the statute did not state what the Planning Commission was to be recommending; however, multiple jurisdictions had taken the approach that the Planning Commission should be recommending the comparison of the Urban Renewal Plan versus the City's own Comprehensive Plan for conformance. However, the first draft of the resolution stated the Planning Commission was recommending that City Council approve and adopt, which he interpreted as the Commission was to review all the numbers and everything to essentially say the Urban Renewal Plan was a good idea, which he did not believe was within the Planning Commission's purview, according to general statute.
 - He appreciated Staff's response in revising the resolution to reflect that the Commission simply had to determine if the Urban Renewal Plan as presented was supportive of the City's current Comprehensive Plan, which was appropriate as he could not make a recommendation regarding \$67 million worth of indebtedness.

- The initial Staff report spoke to the impacts that infrastructure development was a good investment in Coffee Creek due to the expected increase in property value and added value to the community for industrial development. However, for the sake of transparency for the citizens, it was important to also point out the downsides, such as the indebtedness. Just because it was believed to be a low risk investment did not mean there was no risk.
- The most important issue was the 25 percent cap because the current proposal would put the City .5 acres away from the cap, meaning that until another urban renewal district was closed, the City could not do anything more. This was a very big impact for Wilsonville because approving the Plan would take away a good funding option for maybe a decade. However, that did not change the fact that it should probably be done because industrial development was needed and had been discussed for a long time.

Commissioner Levit noted the asterisk by the City of Wilsonville on Slide 12 and asked since the land was outside the City's boundary was the 25 percent cap for the City based on the City's current land area or the area that would be brought in.

- Mr. Popenuk explained the total acreage of the urban renewal area was 258 acres, which included the acreage outside the city, so it included all of the acres in the area once all of the annexations took place in the future. Technically, the City would have a slightly higher amount of land available in the cap now, because not all of the areas had been annexed yet, but when annexed it would be 258 acres. The asterisk also applied to the City of Wilsonville's assessed value because the number on Slide 12 was not the total assessed value. The statute required that the amount be the total assessed value less the increment value in existing urban renewal areas. It was a complicated formula, but that was what the statute required. He confirmed the City was nowhere near the cap.

Commissioner Springall understood one of the urban renewal areas would be closing within a couple of years.

- Ms. Kraushaar responded the Urban Renewal Strategic Plan recommended that the Year 2000 Plan wrap up the remaining projects and close down in the next three to seven years. There was a caveat indicating that because of the bonds that the school district had in compression, it might be advantageous to the school district to wait several years to close down that district.
 - She noted the Boeckman Rd between Canyon Creek Rd and Wilsonville Rd was a deficient rural road used by cars, trucks, cyclists, and pedestrians. While the City had been able to put a sidewalk in on one side, the slopes had some real limitations for safe access by the general public.
 - The area was in the Year 2000 Plan, so it was possible to talk to the Urban Renewal Task Force about using any potential remaining increment in that district or increasing the maximum indebtedness, which would involve a lot of public conversation. While there was some uncertainty as to when that district might close, it was definitely on its glide path to being closed.

Commissioner Postma:

- Asked if the Plan included putting fiber in the ground or just the conduit, noting Page 18 of 66 stated, "Install fiber optic conduit and cable will be installed." He believed another spot indicated that as well. He believed it would be easier to sell the land in the future if the fiber optic was already laid, though he was uncertain it was within the funding source.
 - Mr. Popenuk explained all of the numbers of the project cost estimates were done recently and included the cost to install conduit in each of the streets, but did not include the cost of the actual cable. He believed the major portion of the expense was installing the conduit, since it involved digging up the road, but he was unsure about the marginal cost of the cable.
 - Ms. Kraushaar agreed a clarification should be made in the report. She believed in some cases the City would install fiber as that was being done in many other parts of the community.
 - Michael Kohlhoff, Special Projects Attorney, suggested checking with the City's IT Department to see whether a portion of this Plan might affect their Strategic Plan which involved some fiber installation. He added the school district had indicated two things with regard to compression. One, values were increasing outside the recession, which would help the compression issue quite a bit. Secondly, the

district was trying to get a fix on the issue through the legislature, though the results were anybody's guess, the legislation was expected sooner rather than later.

- Asked if the \$67 million in the Plan would be used for land acquisition where needed and the costs associated with any necessary land acquisition, like eminent domain, etc., as well as the actual construction work. The capital costs of actually acquiring the land would involve a lot of speculation given widely fluctuating land values.
 - Mr. Popenuk responded that Wilsonville and Coffee Creek were not unique in that regard. Communities often try to come up with funding plans for capital projects that require land acquisition and would take 10 to 20 years to build. Estimating the inflation of the actual construction cost was difficult enough, but estimating land acquisition costs was particularly difficult. This Plan included the most detailed and recent cost estimates of any plan he had been involved in, so the City did a really great job of studying these projects and re-studying these projects, specifically for this Urban Renewal Plan update. Fairly generous contingencies were also included to help cover that. The City had previous experience with the West Side Urban Renewal Plan where inflation wound up being significantly more than originally anticipated, and so that was in mind as the City came up with the cost estimates for the currently proposed Plan.
 - He confirmed the City had attempted to project land costs and construction costs were included as part of the contingency costs associated with each project.
- Asked if the \$2 million was earmarked to study the railroad, adding he was concerned about spending \$2 million to find out there was nothing that could be done. Certainly something always could be done, but at what cost?
 - Ms. Kraushaar responded the City knew the Railroad Undercrossing would be an expensive project that could take many years to acquire the funding to construct an improvement, but from her experience, with so many complicating factors arising in a project that was scoped to provide the best engineering solution, and \$2 million was a reasonable cost estimate to help the City understand what would be needed. It was worth taking a lot of time to study it upfront.
 - There would probably be a bridge replacement as well as a temporary bridge structure due to the active railroad and WES traffic. The wetlands and slopes were factors, and widening it to serve bikes, pedestrians, and other vehicles was important.
 - Construction costs were not included because only so much return on the tax increment could be anticipated and trying to relate construction of the entire project to impacting the tax increment of the development within the Coffee Creek Urban Renewal Plan was a bit of a stretch. However, Staff believed it was important to identify the scope of future improvements, but not necessarily include the cost of construction.
- Noted his question was triggered by statements on Page 37 of 66 that said money would be spent to determine the project's scope and potentially partially fund improvements, which scared him a bit. He did not want anybody to have the grand idea that the Plan was going to pay for a fix, too, because it seemed too drastically underfunded for a fix.
 - Ms. Kraushaar explained the project team tried to be flexible there because it was also a Clackamas and Washington County intersection and Wilsonville could possibly provide some impetus for a local match, if it was done as a partnership. However, recommendations for changes were welcome.
- Suggested striking the language.
 - Mr. Kohlhoff believed the language was important and could be explained because if federal funds became available and the City just needed to do a match, then having a little money from urban renewal might be helpful. The City could explain that it was primarily for scoping the project, but including it in there provided flexibility down the line to obtain federal and state funding given the railroad situation, enabling the City to leverage a little funding a long ways.
- Asked if Mr. Kohlhoff believed some additional explanation might be necessary.
 - Mr. Kohlhoff suggested adding adjectives like, "primarily used for scoping" and "potentially" could be added for flexibility but that type of wordsmithing made it difficult, but the explanation was that it was primarily for looking at scoping.

Commissioner Levit questioned why the City should bother with the railroad undercrossing since any truck traffic going south would go into areas where trucks did not necessarily need to be, and there were other ways for trucks to get around due to the other infrastructure being built, making the underpass less critical.

- Ms. Kraushaar believed this was where Clackamas and Washington Counties would play a big role as they owned that section of road. Washington County has worked hard to improve the safety and signage on the north side. The City and both Counties would have significant input regarding what types of vehicles any future bridge would serve in that area. She confirmed Clackamas County was south of the undercrossing.
- Mr. Popenuk noted none of the funding allocations for the projects and cost estimates were set in stone. The Urban Renewal Plan identified the projects that money could be spent on and the maximum indebtedness identified the total amount of money that could be spent on all of those projects combined. However, the amounts in the Plan and Report for individual allocations to specific projects were completely nonbinding. Ultimately, the Urban Renewal Area was run by an Urban Renewal Agency, which had an annual budget process just like the City. During those annual budget processes, the Urban Renewal Agency would decide which projects to allocate funds to for the year. That was not an excuse to not pay any attention to the project costs, but it was worth noting that if there were reservations about a specific dollar amount to be spent on a specific project, those decisions would be revisited on an annual basis during the budget process.

Commissioner Postma added it was involved, but there was a process to increase maximum indebtedness, so if, for example, the right solution was found for the railroad overpass, the City could go through the process to see if a few extra million dollars could be added to the maximum indebtedness to complete the project.

- Mr. Popenuk added the State wanted to ensure it was not easy to increase maximum indebtedness, but there was a process and it was done across communities in Oregon every year, to increase maximum indebtedness to fund projects at a higher level. He confirmed increasing the maximum indebtedness also affects the closing of the district.

Commissioner Springall:

- Stated noted the description of the Grahams Ferry Rd project on Page 37 of 66 extended outside the Urban Renewal District as it included Grahams Ferry Rd improvements from Tooze Rd to Day Rd and Tooze Rd was outside of the district.
 - Ms. Kraushaar clarified the same projects were described in slightly different ways in the Urban Renewal Plan and Report, but Page 37 generally discussed the significant transportation needs within the area and referred to specific projects within the TSP. The project description in the TSP included Tooze Rd to Day Rd but urban renewal funds could only be spent on that portion of the project that fell within the Urban Renewal District, which was important to understand. She offered to add language to clarify that portions of the TSP's project description was clearly outside district.
- Believed adding clarifying and specific language to the Grahams Ferry Rd discussion was a good idea because discussion of the undercrossing was specific to what was being done in the urban renewal district.
 - Mr. Kohlhoff understood 100 ft was the maximum distance outside of an urban renewal district that a project could extend.
 - Mr. Popenuk replied that was up to legal and bond counsel, reiterating the statutes state that urban renewal funds must be spent within the urban renewal areas. He noted the organization of the Report often caused confusion that section of the Report was intended and required to document existing conditions and how those existing conditions contributed to the statutory definition of blight. One statutory definition of blight was insufficient infrastructure. As such, best practices had evolved through dozens of these reports over dozens of years that said verbatim project descriptions from adopted city plans should be included to show that the City had planned for a particular project that had not been funded or built, and the project was partially or completely in the urban renewal area, which therefore established conditions of blight. Elaine Howard, the primary author of this Report, could provide input on how to clarify it exactly, but

rather than amending an individual project description, a blanket disclaimer could be added at the beginning to acknowledge that was the purpose and that those projects were not intended to be wholly within the Urban Renewal Area.

- Agreed that would make sense.
 - Mr. Kohlhoff clarified that when dealing with acquisition of some land that could not be parceled out, the City's position has been that as long as some of it remained within the urban renewal area and only a little extended outside, urban renewal funds could be used.
 - Mr. Popenuk believed, in his non-legal opinion, that was within legal limits.
 - Mr. Kohlhoff agreed it was only within a half mile, maybe a mile. The City had also asked for other legal opinions on that particular issue, but he believed it dealt with right-of-way and land partially-in and partially-out of a district.

Commissioner Postma asked if some disclaimer language should be considered at the outset.

- Mr. Kohlhoff believed there had been a general statement about the application. The City tended to watch those things and looked at some of those issues and the back and forth. Staff looked at everything they did project-wise to make sure the City stayed within the parameters. Legally, they did not have a great deal of flexibility, but there was some.

Commissioner Levit noted the beginning of the Report discussed the economic impact of 1,800 jobs and salaries, adding the numbers worked out to minimum wage at \$15 an hour. He asked if there was a reason for it being that conservative.

- Mr. Popenuk believed the numbers were taken either from 2007 or an earlier document, adding they were restating that this Plan identified this many jobs at this salary, but no adjustments were made for inflation over time. Often, it was necessary to go back and look at the initial study that estimated those jobs. As an economic consulting firm, ECONorthwest often did those kinds of standard input/output analyses, and when jobs were listed, they were not necessarily fulltime equivalents. The number of jobs being summed there might not be FTE, so the total wages could end up being more per hour because the hourly estimates associated with those jobs were unknown. Essentially, no new analysis was done for this Plan; the numbers were pulled from previous planning documents.

Chair Greenfield:

- Stated it was important to reflect the actual, realistic projection, adding that the City needed to be dealing with FTE numbers. Secondly, since the Plan was out for public approval, the figures needed to be realistic and not have something embedded in it that could be challenged.
 - Mr. Popenuk explained that urban renewal plans did not require estimates of employment or wages. This Plan happened to have a previous study to cite that had estimated employment and wages previously. He believed those numbers were dated, and he was not familiar with the details of the original analysis. The numbers could be studied to see whether they were appropriate to continue referencing, or if there was an easy way to update them to reflect changes in wages from then to now; however, neither element was a required component of an urban renewal plan, so it was not a standard item that was updated when a plan was adopted.
- Noted that even if it was not a legal requirement, it was in the area of public perception and should be attractive.
 - Ms. Kraushaar agreed those numbers had from some preliminary financial studies in the 2007 Master Plan, but the project team was happy to take a look at it.

Commissioner Levit clarified he was going forward with the minimum wage, not back, so far more should be calculated than the inflation over the years.

Chair Greenfield agreed that would be desirable.

Commissioner Levit added it would probably show more impetus to do it, rather than being so conservative. Hopefully, there would be more than warehouse jobs.

Commissioner Mesbah noted the Commission was getting into a semblance of cost/benefit analysis; however, this analysis was not really cost/benefit, which could leave the impression of cherry-picking the benefits if they were not careful about what is included and all that was not included, so what was the point.

Chair Greenfield asked if Commissioner Mesbah was suggesting the point be omitted entirely.

Commissioner Postma suggested it was not for the Commission to recommend a change on the wage figures because he believed it fell outside of the Commission's purview, which was to ensure the Plan complied with the Comprehensive Plan. However, as a next step, he agreed revising the wage numbers to ensure transparency to the public and ensure they understood the cost/benefit analysis. He did not believe the WPC should be doing the cost/benefit analysis, and would not personally recommend changing the Commission's recommendation process.

Commissioner Levit clarified that was not his intent, but it would make the Report more comprehensive, but the Commission did not have to suggest that any changes be made.

- Mr. Popenuk noted the project team was happy to take all comments on the Report, regardless of whether they were specifically focused on the conformance issue, which was before the Commission. He agreed the Report did include a full cost/benefit analysis, but isolated pieces of information.

Commissioner Hurley suggested using a footnote to indicate the numbers were taken from a 2007 report, then no one would have to go back through all of the economic analysis to figure out what was an FTE or a part time employee, or who was a manager or a subordinate.

Commissioner Mesbah:

- Noted it was straightforward to figure out whether the proposed Plan was consistent with current plans, as noted in the Statutes referenced in the presentation. However, the first Statute reference regarded whether the Urban Renewal Plan was a good idea, which was different from whether it was consistent with the City's plans. Commissioner Postma's comment about the City foregoing another urban renewal possibility begged the question: What are the other possibilities and had a comparative study been done. If not, the Commission really did not know if this was the best option. He clarified he was not proposing that be done.
 - Ms. Kraushaar responded it was always hard to take a snapshot in time and build on it, but that was part of the purpose of the citywide Urban Renewal Plan completed a couple of years ago and the City's Economic Development Strategic Plan before that. One of the City Council's goals was to implement an urban renewal area within the Coffee Creek Industrial Area to encourage development. Council was looking for robust employment and even things not seen in Wilsonville in the past.
- Stated if studies had already looked at different areas as a candidate for urban renewal, and Coffee Creek had consistently been the top candidate over two decades, the Report could reflect that it was possible the City was foregoing another project; however, the City had looked at it and Coffee Creek was the biggest peach of all the potential projects in the city, which was why this district was so desirable.
 - Ms. Kraushaar added that was not to say it would be the last need once Basalt Creek came into the city in another 10 to 15 years.

Mr. Kohlhoff clarified in response to a previous question that the description on Grahams Ferry Rd (Page 37) was under the section that listed what was in the TSP and also indicated that these were not all of the projects in the Urban Renewal Plan. The project description on Page 44 of 66 for the Grahams Ferry Rd urban renewal project was SW Day Rd to the railroad underpass, so it was covered.

Commissioner Postma added that even Page 37 stated these were the significant transportation needs in the area. It did not provide any equivocation as to whether or not it was a potential project.

Commissioner Mesbah:

- Noted the Urban Renewal Agency would evaluate each of the projects as they arose and make a decision. He asked if that evaluation would include a cost/benefit analysis.
 - Mr. Popenuk answered it was not typically a cost/benefit analysis, but the standard municipal budget process. He confirmed that in Wilsonville, the Urban Renewal Agency is the City Council, which met separately and wore different hats. The Urban Renewal Agency would meet to review Staff's budget recommendations for the next year. There would be a forecast of the tax increment finance revenues, a reference to the projects identified in the Plan, and an identification of what projects the City recommended funding in those years. It was not typical to do a full cost/benefit analysis at that time, although that general framework was often used. People want to ensure they were considering the costs and benefits, but doing a full cost/benefit analysis on an annual basis was not typical. As an economic consultant, he believed strongly that a cost/benefit analysis was a great way to evaluate decisions, but it could often be outside of the scope of what a jurisdiction could handle on an annual budget process.
 - Ms. Kraushaar stated that in this case, the phasing of the projects would be linked to what development opportunities were presented. Currently, the City had a 5-Year Capital Improvement Plan for urban renewal, which would be reviewed more carefully if the proposed Plan was adopted. When developing the budget for capital projects, the hope was to get the most value for the dollars spent, but it was not always related to everything included in a cost/benefit analysis. A lot of the time, it was weighing public need against the existing infrastructure and how many more homes could be serviced before further improvements were needed.
- Said that made sense, adding that as an engineer, he had done cost/benefit analyses to determine whether a project paid for itself or not, which begged the next level of questioning: What was the City getting for \$2 million more, and could Staff identify that and all the things that were not monetary. Transparency was explaining that \$2 million would pay for a bike lane and an additional turn lane to reduce accidents, which was very qualitative as opposed to hoping for a good return on investment, which gets some municipalities into trouble because they hope for a good return, but it does not come. Some areas had gotten into hard times based on that kind of analysis. He had wondered where more of that kind of analysis could be considered and the answer was when the budget was done, which was great.
 - Mr. Popenuk added that rather than just spend the annual tax increment finance revenue, urban renewal agencies would typically take on debt that could come in tax increment bonds or sold on the bond market, but the debt could also be bank loans, loans from the State, or loans from other City funds. Whenever an urban renewal agency was going to take on debt, they need to do a forecast of their future tax increment finance revenues. Most lenders, unless the City was borrowing internally, want to see an outside party forecast revenues not based on speculative development, but based on certain things, such as whether a development agreement was signed and in place, development permits had been pulled, and shovels were in the ground. Essentially, what amount of development was certain to occur if the loan was funded, and would that new development generate the tax increment finance revenue necessary to pay back the debt? If not, then no lenders would be found. There was nothing that legally required a city to do that, but most lenders would require the City to that. The City of Wilsonville, in recent years, had done those studies before going out for new loans, so there were definitely best practices and they were definitely recommended.

Commissioner Levit:

- Noted the "Funding for Projects" table (Slide 8) had an implied timeframe for each of those projects due to the three percent annual increase in the Report. It would be helpful to have an anticipated year that those projects might be done to go along with the dollar figures provided.
 - Mr. Popenuk replied that beginning on Page 48 of 66, Table 6 showed the annual cash flow of the Urban Renewal Area, which listed each of the projects and their timing. Again, none of it was written in

stone as Table 6 was the projection used for the Plan, but it showed, for example, that Garden Acres Rd was intended to be the first project to receive funding in the area, and that the project's expenditures would occur over a four year period with the bulk of the costs, the capital expenditures themselves, taking place in 2020 and 2021. The information was in the Report, but a bit too overwhelming to present in the PowerPoint.

- Stated although he could figure it out from Table 6, he believed including the number of years in the future represented on Table 6 to Slide 8 would be simpler.

Chair Greenfield called for public comment on the Coffee Creek Urban Renewal Plan. There were none.

Commissioner Postma noted some suggested changes had been discussed and asked whether anybody thought they were necessary at this point. He did not, adding he believed the Commission could recommend the Staff report as it stood and revisions regarding the fiber optic lines and etc. could be made in the future.

Chair Greenfield added the Commission was considering the very narrow issue of conformance and he believed those changes were outside of that issue.

Mr. Kohlhoff agreed, adding Staff had listened and had the minutes, so they could look at some of the points raised because common sense supported some of the issues as well, so it would not be difficult for Staff to move forward on that. If that was resolved, then the question simply regarded the changes to the proposed resolution and Staff report.

Commissioner Postma noted the Staff report (Exhibit A) had incorporated the redline revisions of the resolution.

Mr. Kohlhoff added and the two spelling changes.

Paula Pinyerd, ABC Transcription, clarified for the record that the resolution for signature was correct, only the redlined version included the two spelling errors.

Commissioner Postma moved to approve revised Resolution No. LP16-0002 with the addition of Attachment D and revised Exhibit A. Commissioner Levit seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

The Planning Commission took a brief recess at 7:32 pm. The meeting was reconvened at 7:40 pm.

VII. WORK SESSION

A. Frog Pond Master Plan (Neamtzu)

A three-page handout showing Conceptual Development Plans of the Krielkamp, Wehler, Pike and Killinger Properties was distributed to the Planning Commission.

Chair Greenfield noted there had been opportunity for public input at beginning of the meeting, but further public comments would also be allowed at the conclusion of the Frog Pond Master Plan presentation.

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, stated the project team has been very busy creating the packet materials for tonight's work session on Phase 2 of the Frog Pond Master Plan. He explained that the Infrastructure Financing Plan was on a separate track and would be presented to the Planning Commission and City Council for discussion after City Staff concluded their work on the initial drafts. The Financing Plan would probably come before the Commission in mid-August. The draft schedule included one more work session on September 14th, which would be preceded that same evening by a public open house as was done in May 2016. He hoped that with the Commission's concurrence, Staff would be prepared for public hearings on the Draft Code package for the Master Plan.

Joe Dills along with Andrew Parish, both of Angelo Planning Group (APG), and Ken Pirie of Walker Macy, displayed a presentation of supportive materials such as maps and pictures of the revised Draft Code text and policies proposed to implement the Frog Pond Master Plan. The proposed revisions to the Code language, which were presented in the meeting packet, included Zoning Code updates and Public Realm Designs as noted in the work session agenda provided on Page 1 of 43 in the packet.

Discussion and comments regarding key concepts discussed in the revised Code language for the Frog Pond Master Plan were as follows with responses from the project team as noted:

- Boeckman Frontage Lot Standards
 - Mr. Dills clarified the garages would not face alleys, but would face the full street on the other side of the home. (Slide 6) Developers would have the option to do double-fronted lots, as opposed to having to do an alley or side orientation solution.
 - Boeckman Rd currently had a 40-mph speed limit so the proposed frontage did not seem conducive to that type of road, both for safety reasons and due to the loss of a usable backyard. Children would be playing next to a high capacity, high speed road. Perhaps, the speed limit could be changed.
 - Boeckman would remain as a minor arterial and currently, there were no plans to reduce the speed. However, there were robust plans to improve the street and make the entire cross-section safe, even though it serves higher speeds and a lot of traffic while presenting an appropriate neighborhood edge. The improvements include setbacks on either side of the sidewalk equivalent to the homes shown in Slide 6, generous planting strips, a planned median, sidewalks, bike lanes, and a buffer area.
 - Such measures would not be sufficient to provide enough safety for children in the neighborhood. Setbacks and landscape buffers would not mean anything to a kid with a soccer ball
 - With much of the south side of Boeckman Rd being currently walled, the proposed plan would open it up to be look more like a neighborhood.
 - About the western third to one-half of the Boeckman Rd section was walled along the existing Arbor subdivision. The long-term plan was to improve the south side of Boeckman Rd as well with a landscape strip and wider sidewalk.
 - With regard to ownership, the 25-ft planting strip between the street and sidewalk was currently shown as right-of-way, but that was not a final recommendation. The City's Transportation System Plan (TSP) showed less planter strip than recommended, so the team needed to determine whether the planting strips would be setbacks or part of the right-of-way in the final recommendation. Typically, the area between the sidewalk and curb was part of the right-of-way
 - Concern was expressed about homeowners having to maintain such a large area that they would be unable to use. It was a lot of greenspace that was effectively wasted, as it was not for play, active use, or even decorative; it was just a buffer.
 - The large area would also attract children to play with no backyard to play in and no front yard to play in because it was a street. The plan put streets where alleys should go, and yet prohibited alleys. In reality, there should be an alley and backyard at the rear of house with a garage, and the Boeckman Rd frontage should be the front of the house.
 - Mr. Dills clarified the lot standards presume that all homes have both front and backyards. With a large lot, the backyards on the other side of the wall and landscaping might be fairly generous. The standard being discussed was for the buffer area or streetscape. Additionally, the Master Plan currently carried these as options, so a developer could go forward with an alley-loaded frontage along Boeckman Rd. Alleys were allowed.
 - There was discussion that some previous public comments opposed alleys, but it was generally agreed there were also positive comments, so no strict determination was made to ban alleys.
 - Mr. Neamtzu understood it would be awkward to have a front on both sides of the home, but noted the enhanced rear elevations would be on the street facing sides. The backs of the homes did not all have to look like fronts with doors. A variety of elements could be used, such as articulated roofs, different window treatments, and variations in landscaping, which might also address safety concerns by creating more of a barrier at the street edge to prevent a ball or toy to roll into the street. The project team had

seen existing neighborhoods with the proposed design and wanted to get the feel along Boeckman Rd just right. The Boeckman frontage would be the rear of the home, so the design standards were a significant issue. The team sought direction about how the space between the street edge and the back fence of the homes should look like.

- Mr. Dills clarified three options were allowed, the rear elevation, front elevation, or side elevation, called a sidewinder, could face Boeckman Rd. A house facing Boeckman Rd would be similar to a rear-loaded home and only have pedestrian access to the front.
- Some Commissioners acknowledged finding it difficult to identify the rear elevation of homes as shown on the slides due to the back doors and other details.
- The aerial photo (Slide 6) showed the driveways on the street side with the traditional garage and front yard setting of a front loaded street, while a fence line and vegetation created the backyard space. The lots in Slide 6 were smaller than those proposed on Boeckman Rd.
- Commissioner Mesbah noted the design team had responded to the Commission's request to create landscaping on Boeckman Rd to keep it from looking like a row of rear home elevations, and the proposed design achieved that. If the size of the yard was a concern, perhaps the size of yard should be discussed. The landscaping was doing its job.
- Small, Medium, and Large lots were all proposed along Boeckman Rd, but the same concept shown in Slide 6 would be applied.
 - The current Master Plan did not show a tailored footprint for the size of the rear yards, which still needed work. The lot development table had been constructed, but it included the standard minimum rear yard numbers as opposed to something specific to the proposed concept.
 - If the setbacks and buffering were consistent with the large and medium lots, the small lots would be all back yards with no room for a house.
 - Even a small lot done with an 80-ft depth, still provided enough room for 15-ft front and rear yards, at least. There might be opportunity for 20-ft front and rear yards with the home. Further calculations were needed.
 - The consistency of the look and cohesiveness of the elements along Boeckman Rd was important, and the setback could be a contributor to that. The Code solution for accommodating small lots would be to have a build-to setback with a range; that the home needed to be within X to Y feet from the property line along Boeckman Rd. Determining a standard was a consideration for the next level of planning and design.
- Road noise was a concern as the traffic and speed along Boeckman Rd may increase given the bridge improvements to remove the Boeckman dip. The road surface would be a significant factor, so having a standard requiring smooth pavement would improve livability. Installing a low berm could also reduce the noise level significantly.
- Mr. Neamtzu clarified the diagram in the three-page handout distributed to the Commission showed only the lots that would be built along east end of Boeckman Rd. When the West Neighborhood was fully developed, there would easily upwards of 40 homes backing onto Boeckman Rd. The diagram indicated the 11 R-10 lots in Subarea 3 proposed to front on Boeckman Rd. No illustrative diagrams were available for the other subareas at this time.
 - The Small lots along Boeckman Rd in Subarea 1 would also have the same set of orientation options, as the front, rear, or side elevations of the homes could front onto Boeckman Rd.
 - The homes depicted on Slide 5 represented the size of the proposed homes and lots for Subarea 1. About a third of Boeckman's frontage would look like the houses shown on Slide 5.
 - Referencing the Frog Pond West Subareas map shown on Page 16 of 43 of the packet, Mr. Dills clarified Subarea 1 would have 15 to 20 Small lots, maximum; Subarea 2 would have 4 to 5 Medium lots; and Subarea 3 would have 11 Small lots.
- The Commission and project team discussed ideas to help address concerns about noise, privacy, and safety for the backyards fronting Boeckman Rd. Landscaping elements should create visual interest as well as a barrier to pedestrians on the street.
 - Another concern was the matter of screening all the items people keep in their backyards, such as trampolines, colored play structures, and storage sheds. Slide 7 depicted a Villebois wall with

about a 4-ft high base with 2-ft of wrought iron on top. The low open wall was ideal for homebuyers.

- Suggested landscaping elements included a low berm with a sidewalk, rather than just a grass strip, and a stormwater treatment facility with plantings inside the depressed area.
- The team envisioned the wider buffer with the sidewalk farther away from the curb to help with the Safe Routes to School function. Bioswales would discourage kids from crossing into the street and help prevent balls going into the road.
- Mr. Dills said the team would work on ideas for space between curb and sidewalk, but cautioned against using berms that were too high, which could have too much separation, as seen along Canyon Creek Rd. He believed other options should be explored, but if a berm was used, it would have to be very low.
- The Commission was not ready to include the Boeckman Frontage Lot Standards in the Code yet. Further details were requested about how the space between the sidewalk and curb would look and how backyards could be more private.
 - Mr. Dills stated revisions regarding the height of the wall and its design would be presented next time in response to the desire for more privacy than that shown on Slide 5.
- The Commission had discussed the need for continuity between public, semi-private, and semi-public spaces, and the need to have some visibility into the backyards to allow for ownership of the public spaces adjacent to each backyard. A very private backyard would provide no visibility on the Safe Routes to School sidewalk, which was the purpose of having that transparency. The challenge was having a major road adjacent to the backyards; normally there was park land or natural areas.
- Parks/Open Space Framework
 - Because the majority of acreage in Frog Pond West was the medium-sized lot category, applying the additional 10 percent open space requirement to both Small and Medium lots would mean the majority of Frog Pond West subject to the standard, increasing the 27 percent open space percentage significantly.
 - The project team believed the neighborhood park worked well to fulfill the open space need for the Medium lots, though the park obviously served everyone. The average 7,000 sq ft lot size in the Medium category already provided the opportunity for good side yards and building separation. Combining that with the public open spaces did the job.
 - Because the West Neighborhood was considered a ¼-mile neighborhood, residents would have access to one of the open spaces within about two blocks, and even closer in the Small lot areas due to the additional 10 percent. The team believed the proximity to open space and the amount were appropriate.
 - The Commission discussed the importance of having strategically designed spaces to provide the opportunity to develop community by drawing people to actively use parks where kids could play and neighbors could meet, as seen in Villebois where the parks were more extensive. Although the Boeckman Creek SROZ counted as open space according to Code, the only amenity was a walking path which did not provide a community feel as a place to meet neighbors, kids to play, etc.
 - The Commission would have to make the value judgment regarding how much open space was enough to create community. Other neighborhoods, such as Westmoreland and Sellwood in Portland, many open spaces were just the public spaces within highly, community-oriented neighborhoods.
 - The aggregation of the open space in relation to the homes was the concern, not the total amount of open space proposed. Determining the community feel of the Plan was challenging because the location of the open space areas had not yet been identified, particularly in relation to the homes. The majority of the residents would have Medium lots. Was there space for them to mix with one another and for their kids to play outside their own backyards? That was the community feel desired in Frog Pond.
 - However, if the open space spans major roads, which also have green space strips, the roads would link major open space areas, which work in Villebois. Making the 2.5 acres visible and

accessible, while spanning a good portion of the neighborhood, would provide the community feel desired.

- Unlike Villebois, Frog Pond was envisioned to get people into their backyards, not in front of house, so the neighborhoods would have a different feel.
 - The proposed plan was not so constrained as to have that problem. Seeing the specific park design within the footprint would be helpful for including the community elements desired.
 - Providing linear greens and larger setbacks in certain locations for people to informally kick a ball around, away from Boeckman Rd, was also a component.
 - While 27 percent open space seemed like a big number, it included the SROZ and it was difficult to picture whether there was limited or a lot of open space.
- Mr. Dills noted the public realm of the streets was the important connecting facet between the various open spaces examples. The lion's share of the 2.5-acre neighborhood park would be located on a double block near the center of the public realm.
- The Commission needed to decide if a collection of small open spaces should supplement the large park. No matter what amount of open space the Commission decided to require per development, the baseline would be a highly connected, walkable street system, which was where community forms in addition to the parks and yards where one could kick a ball.
- The squares shown at the ends of the streets (Slide 14) were square, as opposed to round, cul-de-sacs. Homes would be built around them.
- The project team sought the Commission's direction on suggesting an additional 10 percent open space in the Small lot districts and on whether to extend that 10 percent requirement to the Medium lot areas as well.
 - Another possibility was to require but 5 percent open space for Medium lots. However, it was difficult to visualize what that would look like compared to current proposal.
 - Mr. Dills explained one challenge of trying to knit together a parceled area was it could not be designed down to the lot, so general concepts were being used to work toward the standards.
- The half-acre park in Canyon Creek Meadows at Emery Circle served about 115 homes and created community in the neighborhood. The park was much-used by the entire neighborhood, and while by no means an athletic facility, it was used constantly and responsibly by dog walkers, as a meeting spot for neighborhood gatherings and as a play space for children. Canyon Creek Meadows, which was a very compact neighborhood, also had a small pocket park with playground equipment and nice tree plantings. It was a very livable community within a dense neighborhood.
- Mr. Neamtzu clarified the City would ultimately have control of the park's design because it would be a public park and undergo a public process.
 - He confirmed the City did not yet have locational control of the park, but was working on it daily. He noted some public ownership existed in the Plan area and potential opportunities to work with the City's school district partners to secure a public site from their 25-acre holdings. The school district properties were identified on the updated Street Plan (Slide 14). While no negotiations or agreements had been made, two of the school district's properties were in the target area for the neighborhood park, and two were connected with identified greenways.
 - Such synergistic design elements want to put together to maximize the coverage or functionality of the open space.
- Canyon Creek Meadows might be considered park-deficient in light of the standards being discussed, but community is what you make of it. The Commission could go too far talking about how the footprint must be structured to create a community that some might like better than another. The idea that the Commission must engineer what the community feel would be like was uncomfortable; the residents would create their community feel when the neighborhood was built.
- Mr. Dills concluded the Commission was undecided on the Parks/Open Spaces Framework, adding the team would return in September with options, a summary of issues, and perhaps, graphics that might provide more specificity without plunking a park on somebody's property on which the City had not committed.

- The open space redline on Page 7 of 43 referenced the Development Review Board (DRB) many times. Mr. Dills confirmed the working assumption was that the City's existing procedures for plan development review would be used in Frog Pond West so the DRB would review the proposed projects.
- Mr. Neamtzu clarified the only procedural change that had been discussed for the DRB involved Form-Based Code changes possibly shifting to Staff. The DRB would be fully engaged in all aspects of the plan review in Frog Pond.
- Mr. Dills noted the Lot Development Standards, Table 2 on Page 17 of 43, were essentially a compilation of the current City standards being used, erring on the side of more yard or more coverage flexibility wherever there were variations in the standards.
 - He confirmed the next generation of the Boeckman lots would show some specified yards, in addition to the table, that would apply to the rear facades of houses along Boeckman Rd.
- Street Plan
 - The wetland shown in the upper right oval on Slide 13 was on the school property. The wetland designation was not based on delineation, but on a preliminary site investigation that identified wetland characteristics were present. The wetland's specific boundaries would need to be confirmed and this could potentially have ramifications about whether or not that area could be developed.
 - The change to the westernmost access to Boeckman Rd would not significantly affect the traffic circulation plan along the perimeter. Traffic could still move along the outer connection road (Slides 12 & 14).
 - On the May Street Plan, the westernmost connection to Boeckman Rd was pretty close to where the land started to slope down into the dip, so the adjustment was made to move the connection farther east (July Street Plan) to create safer conditions for full movements.
 - The changes to the roads in the southern school district area adjacent to Boeckman Rd were intended to provide flexibility should the school district property develop. The connection to Boeckman Rd could arc in any number of directions from where it was currently located to accommodate development.
- Pedestrian Connections
 - Page 25 of 43 in the packet showed a better example of a slim pedestrian connection than the bottom-right photo on Slide 15 since the photo on the slide does not show trees.
 - Mr. Pirie agreed the pathway connection shown on the upper right of Slide 15 should be redesigned due to the grassy area between the street and pedestrian path. Adding a stub of sidewalk or narrowing the street with a bump out was suggested to encourage through traffic and connect the pedestrian pathways.
- Street Tree Plan
 - Columnar trees would block the lantern-style street lamps called for in the Master Plan as they grew, and tree should not be planted too close to a light because the tree could eventually grow around the lamp, blocking most of its light. Such details should be considered when selecting street trees.
- Boeckman Trail
 - Mr. Pirie clarified the Forest Trail would align with an existing pocket park on the west side of the creek in the Copper Creek subdivision, just south of Canyon Creek Meadows.

Chair Greenfield called for public comment.

Don Hanson, OTAK, stated that he and Dan Grimberg of West Hills were very encouraged by the progress being made. He noted the area along Boeckman Rd that he and Mr. Grimberg were working on primarily was the lowest density area. The lots OTAK and West Hills were proposing were 8,500 to 9,500 sq ft in size, which were huge by today's standards. The lots shown in the images were much smaller than that, and the houses they would propose would be twice the size of those shown in the presentation. These would be high-priced homes on large home sites where people were going to want backyards, privacy, and a degree of security. To address that, the sidewalk connections to Boeckman Rd had been increased from the subdivisions being proposed along that road. Providing more frequent connection points along the corridor into the neighborhood would help achieve that. Those connections were proposed at every two homes.

- Subsequently, they would like to see a bit more enclosure in the backyards. While an arborvitae hedge would be too high, they preferred that the brick wall go a little higher than shown and that the ornamental

metal section on top be a little shorter. They would also like the freedom to do some landscape planting behind the wall. Having the brick wall and metalwork would be a great northern edge along Boeckman Rd and they did not want to clutter that with a lot of shrubs; they wanted to keep the wall very visible as a southern edge to the project.

- He liked the three approaches to interface between Boeckman Rd and the housing development: the rear yard enhancement, the sidewinder or side-orientation lots, and alleys. They preferred the rear-enhanced approach. However, due to the Small, Medium, and Large lot homes that would front on Boeckman Rd, a very busy street, perhaps a menu approach could apply to all three lot sizes. Perhaps a corridor plan or allowing two setbacks to make it interesting along that edge would enable all three treatments in the different density zones along Boeckman Rd.
 - They were concerned about having any alley-facing lots that fronted onto Boeckman Rd because that left no room for guest parking, which did not work from their perspective. They also did not support having individual sidewalks to each back porch that connect to the Boeckman right-of-way; they preferred a bit more closure.
- They were encouraged by the progress made and he believed the overall Street Plan for the district worked quite well. Regarding the location of the parks, the details were important for OTAK and West Hills. He suggested that he and Mr. Grimberg continue interacting with the design team, through Mr. Neamtzu, and perhaps refine their recommendations to produce a balanced approach between their concerns and what had been discussed tonight.

Dan Grimberg, West Hills Development, stated OTAK and West Hills met with Staff a few weeks ago, reviewing concerns about the last work session surrounding front doors facing onto Boeckman Rd. He explained that West Hills did the development in Hillsboro that was displayed. It was a very large-scale, planned development with small lots and affordable housing. Instead of having a flat wall of houses with blank windows, they created articulation and doors to make a more inviting neighborhood, which was not a requirement.

- The issue was that while this looked great, it did not live well because the wrought iron fence made it look like there was great connection to the public space and road, however, the homeowners did not want to go out there; they felt too exposed. This was why West Hills and OTAK spoke against the plan at the last meeting. He realized the Hillsboro development, being an affordable housing neighborhood was very different, while Frog Pond provided a very unique opportunity and would be a very special place. They told Mr. Neamtzu they did not want the same design for Frog Pond. They wanted a brick wall that was timeless, tastefully-done, and would still look good 20 years after construction, and then, OTAK came up with the idea of the connections through the pedestrian ways. He reiterated that although West Hills did the Hillsboro development, they did not recommend that design for Frog Pond.
- As far as parks and open space, they had seen parks master plans used in other urban growth boundary (UGB) expansion areas, so that while each development was part of the overall plan, each development did not design its own park, but be part of the overall system. He was very concerned about the suggested 10 percent bonus open space for Small lot areas. In Frog Pond, the average development parcel was five acres in size, so 10 percent would roughly be a half-acre, a 100 x 200 sq ft space, which was big for that small of a development, plus the roads and houses to be built.
- He questioned whether that space would be usable. Again, the parks fees were being paid to acquire park land to whatever extent the City believed was appropriate. While the 10 percent requirement sounded good, it was not very usable. From their perspective, everyone living in the neighborhood should participate in funding those parks. Otherwise, if a 5-acre park site was designated on Joe Smith's property, for example, his property could be worth zero. In other areas, this was handled by having a base residential zone and the park department pays residential development property prices, and again, the development fees are collected to be used as acquisition money.

Mr. Hanson added he understood the idea was to have an aggregate number in Small lot zones as an objective for assembling usable, small park spaces in those areas, but they were a bit concerned about having to pay parks fees, while also having to meet requirements for overall park facilities on top of the additional 10 percent. This would be a low density neighborhood and a lot of people would have larger yards. They believed requiring

the additional 10 percent open space on top of that was problematic. If this were a higher density development, the discussion about open spaces would be entirely different.

Commissioner Levit asked how likely it would be for Frog Pond to be developed parcel by existing parcel. For efficiency on the developer's part, it would seem the developer would want to have several parcels.

- Mr. Grimberg responded having 50-acre parcels was ideal, but that was not Frog Pond. It came down to individual property owners, who may or may not want to sell, extending utilities, and not hopscotching development; it would be very difficult. That was why a lot of flexibility would be needed. He felt like they were creating this dream community, but with all these regulations, he saw a real need for flexibility because development would not come in one, two, three, four; it did not work that way.
- Mr. Hanson agreed development would be incremental. As stated, changes had already been made to the Street Plan based on conversations with the school district and their future plans. There would be a lot of those conversations heading toward implementation. Assembling two or three property owners at one time would be great, but this was a very good aspirational plan. Though conditions could shift moving forward, if the development still advances toward this Master Plan concept, it would bode well for the district.

Doris Wehler believed the three pedestrian walkways shown on the lower right hand corner of the July Street Plan (Slide 14) between Stafford Rd and Willow Circle Dr, would serve the need without making the backyards open to the street. She agreed people would not buy a million dollar house that was open to the street.

- Regarding parks, she confirmed that overall South, East, and West Neighborhoods of Frog Pond were about the same size as Villebois, which had about 135 acres of parks. So, a 2.5 acre park was a pretty good sized park, and she did not think the Commission needed to worry too much about people not having a place to experience community or gather in neighborhoods. As stated, many of these lots were Medium and Large lots. Large lots averaged 10,000 sq ft and Medium lots were 6,000 sq ft to 8,000 sq ft, which was bigger than many lots being built on today. So, many people would have yards that did not have yards today, and children would play in those yards, so not everyone would go to the park.
 - There was a lot of testimony from people who wanted their children to be able to play in their own yard without the parents having to go watch over them at the park, so she believed the green space requirements would be easily met by this Plan.
- She had wanted the brick wall along Boeckman Rd from the beginning because the other walls with wood and brick stanchions did not look nice long-term.
- She understood the Master Plan allowed an accessory unit, like that used for storage, up to 10 ft in height' however, these would look really strange on the Large lot back yards that front on Boeckman Rd and should be reconsidered.

Chair Greenfield confirmed there was no further public comment.

II. OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2016 Planning Commission Work Program

Chair Greenfield confirmed Staff had no comments on the 2016 Work Program.

Commissioner Postma reported that Mayor Knapp gave a presentation to the Chamber of Commerce detailing the information in the 2016 Congressional Briefing Booklet, Wilsonville SMART, which had been distributed to the Commission. The report was created for a recent trip the Mayor and some Staff members made to Washington, DC to advance a couple projects and provide information about how Wilsonville was growing and the City's plans for the future. There was discussion about development in the community, like Villebois and industrial developments, and how what was currently in Wilsonville provided a lot of benefit to the community, including dollar value, and that these projects were planned 20 years ago. The Commission might not see the fruits of its labor until 2035, which was okay. There was a lot of very dense information in the report and he encouraged everyone to look at it, adding perhaps the Commission could discuss the details further at some point. He

concluded that it was amazing how Wilsonville had been able to grow as a community and the affect that had on future plans.

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, thanked Commissioner Postma, noting the booklet was indicative of the work done on a regular basis by Wilsonville's Public and Government Affairs Director Mark Ottenad. Mr. Ottenad was the primary author of these publications and deserved a tremendous amount of credit for the hard work he does in making the City look awesome, for which Mr. Neamtzu thanked him.

II. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Greenfield adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 9:41 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

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