

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 2013
6:00 P.M.**

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

**Approved
June 12, 2013**

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Altman called the meeting to order at 6:07 p.m. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ben Altman, Ray Phelps, Al Levit, Phyllis Millan, and City Councilor Julie Fitzgerald. Peter Hurley and Marta McGuire were absent. Eric Postma arrived after roll call.

City Staff: Chris Neamtzu, Barbara Jacobson, Katie Mangle and Steve Adams

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

A. City Council Update

Councilor Fitzgerald reported that recently City Council:

- Reviewed the Transportation System Plan (TSP) and proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code recommended by the Planning Commission. Everyone was pleased how that process was going.
- Considered plans for improving the parking lot at Memorial Park.
- Continued discussion about implementing a Tax Increment Financing Zone, which was proceeding well.
- Was close to beginning work with the Tourism Strategy Taskforce. Formation of the committee was about 95 percent complete. A request for proposal was being developed for a professional consultant to guide the work of the taskforce, similar to how the Economic Strategy Taskforce was handled. Councilor Fitzgerald would be the ex officio chair of the tourism taskforce.
- Passed a resolution to modify the street lighting standards for some sections of Grahams Ferry Rd adjacent to Villebois resulting in lighting that would be shorter in height.

V. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

The April 10, 2013 Planning Commission minutes were unanimously approved as presented.

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. LP13-0003 - Adoption of an update to the City's Transportation System Plan (TSP) and associated Comprehensive Plan text amendments. (Neamtzu)

Chair Altman read the Legislative Hearing Procedure into the record and called the public hearing for LP13-0003 to order at 6:12 p.m.

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, briefly reviewed the adoption process for the TSP Update, which was included in the Staff report. The public involvement summary and all the comments received to date were included on a CD in the record and as a 600-page appendage to the TSP. He noted that Gail Curtis of ODOT, the Transportation and Growth Management (TGM) Grant funders of the project, would make a few comments about the TSP Update. He reminded that the Planning Commission would be providing a recommendation regarding the TSP to the City Council who has the final authority on matters at the local level. If the TSP Update was forwarded with a recommendation tonight, the City Council would convene its public hearing on June 3, 2013, allowing for more opportunities for public testimony and input into the draft TSP. If no recommendation was rendered tonight, the TSP would be revisited by the Commission at their June meeting. At that time, a continued public hearing and additional discussion regarding outstanding items would occur, and that the June 3rd meeting with City Council would not take place, but instead be continued to a later date.

- He explained that the first case file, LP13-0003, included the TSP and Comprehensive Plan text amendments. The second case file, LP13-0004, regarded a series of Development Code text amendments that would be presented by Katie Mangle and addressed in a separate public hearing. He noted that citizens could testify on either case file during this hearing's public testimony and Staff would carry comments regarding the Development Code changes into the next public hearing, which was acceptable to the Commission.

Chair Altman disclosed a potential conflict of interest, stating that as currently drafted, the draft TSP scheduled for hearing tonight included no specific recommendations for a preferred alignment for the Brown Road/Old Town extension. However, testimony might be presented during the hearing that would lead the Commission into a discussion of the two alternative alignments. If such a discussion did arise, he would recuse himself from that discussion based on a potential conflict of interest.

- In the past, he represented OrePac by providing analysis and recommendations about the alignment of Kinsman Road extending south of Wilsonville Road. The analysis also included a consideration of two alternative alignments presented in the current TSP. He noted he also discussed the alignment options with Wilsonville Concrete, but only to explain them as they are currently presented. He was never under contract with Wilsonville Concrete nor did they request that he represent any preferred alignment on their behalf. He was not currently under contract with OrePac or any property owners or businesses with specific interest in either of the two alternatives, but there was potential for public perception based on his past representation. To avoid any potential consideration that a conflict existed, he would not participate in any discussion related to the alternative alignments.
- He explained that when the Commission got to that portion, noting testimony had already been received, he would step aside and allow the rest of the Commission to consider the testimony related to the two alternatives, reach a conclusion, and make a decision on the alignment. He would then participate in the rest of the hearing and the decision to be made on the TSP Update.

Barbara Jacobson, Assistant City Attorney, said Chair Altman's disclosure was helpful, adding that Staff's current recommendation did not involve getting into those details. As testimony progressed, there might be testimony from the audience and he was welcome to stay at the dais to listen to that testimony, but she recommended that he refrain from commenting one way or the other. They would see if there was any issue when it came time to vote, but she suspected there would no issue with Chair Altman voting on the TSP tonight.

Commissioner Postma arrived at this time.

Mr. Neamtzu entered the following exhibits into the record:

Exhibit G: Letter dated May 6, 2013 and accompanying material from Alan Kirk of OrePac.

Exhibit H: Email dated May 7, 2013 received from Commissioner Al Levit regarding proposed changes on the TSP Comprehensive Plan Amendments.

Gail Curtis, ODOT Land Use and Transportation Planner, thanked the Commission and City for partnering with ODOT, noting that through the TGM Program ODOT has funded the majority of the costs of the TSP Update. She has played two roles, both as Grant Manager and as the ODOT Project Manager. It has been a pleasure working with Staff who had done a tremendous job along with the consultant team. The work had been challenging as Staff had to become transportation planners when they were accustomed to doing a number of other different things. She noted that Wilsonville was important for many reasons, but especially because of Wilsonville is a major employment center for the Portland metropolitan area. In terms of trends of transportation from the state's point of view, optimal transportation systems were those that provide transportation choices for both people and the distribution of goods. The TSP before the Commission furthered those choices for the Wilsonville community. She encouraged the Commission to adopt the TSP and thanked them for their partnership.

Scott Mansur, DKS & Associates, presented an overview of the TSP Update process via a Prezi presentation, entered into the record as Exhibit I. His key comments regarded the following:

- He explained why the TSP is important and how it fits in the planning context and relationship with other City documents, including previous TSP Update documents, the Comprehensive Plan, municipal codes and standards, as well as other City master plans. The current Development Code and Public Works Standards would be updated for consistency within the TSP Update, which must also coordinate and comply with all state, county and regional requirements, including Statewide Planning Goals, Metro's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and the Metro 2040 Regional Framework Plan.
- The TSP Update process began in the spring of 2011 and involved a significant number of work sessions and public outreach methods and venues, including outreach to freight users in the area.
- With regard to the TSP's organization, he explained that the intent of the TSP was to tell a story of the City's vision for the transportation network and how that ties into planning efforts and helping the community achieve their vision for the transportation network. He briefly reviewed each of the proposed TSP chapters, describing their content and purpose within the TSP as a whole and identifying key factors of the ongoing process that would help achieve the City's vision. Items in the TSP Appendix were also noted and described.
 - The focus of the proposed TSP Update was to apply best practices and support Wilsonville's progression toward a well-connected, multi-modal system, setting the stage for future needs, development and transportation.
- He briefly described the changes that had been made to the TSP Update document since the Planning Commission's March meeting, including items addressed by City Council which were shown in the "Issues Memorandum" of the meeting packet.
- He concluded stating that the next steps in the TSP adoption process would involve making revisions based on feedback received from the Planning Commission and during public testimony tonight. A revised draft of the TSP Update would be presented to City Council on June 3, 2013.

Chair Altman confirmed there were no questions from the Commission and called for public testimony.

Sheila Stites, 29036 SW Courtside Drive, Wilsonville, OR stated that her testimony regarded the continuation of Canyon Creek Road past the Sundial Apartments, which would dump traffic into Vlahos Drive/Town Center Loop East. Her concern regarded how Canyon Creek Road would funnel into Town Center Loop East or onto Vlahos Drive. Her concerns were two-fold:

- One regarded the dangers of the high traffic flow to pedestrians. Residents of Windfield Village and The Wilsonville heavily travel Vlahos Drive on foot and using wheelchairs and walkers, to reach local amenities and the Mentor Graphics path. In her 20 years of residency on Courtside Drive, she

has seen a large amount of traffic flow. It was a great place for citizens to live and be able to walk without fear of a lot of traffic. She stated that the Mentor Graphics path was heavily used for walking, jogging and bike riding. If Vlahos Drive were heavily traveled, it would affect pedestrian safety.

- As a resident of Courtside Drive, she was also concerned about the traffic flow of vehicles using Courtside Drive as a thoroughfare instead of traveling onto Town Center Loop East.

Tim Knapp, 11615 SW Jamaica, Wilsonville, OR stated for the record he was testifying as a citizen this evening and that his testimony would pertain exclusively to the map and description regarding the Brown Road Extension Alternatives on Page 5-15 of the TSP draft document, and to Exhibit F which began on Page 60 of 135 of the Staff report, all of which pertained to the alternate Bailey Street/5th Street option that was in the Appendix. He had personal interest in properties that would be advantaged or disadvantaged by the choices there. He intends to recuse himself on that portion of the TSP when it came before City Council because of his personal interest. His understanding was that Staff would be able to bifurcate that portion, so he would be able to address the balance of the TSP in his capacity as Mayor. He would not participate in voting or discussion when this portion was addressed.

- He stated that he had participated in the previous TSP and a subgroup that the Planning Commission and many citizens were members of called the Adjunct Transportation Planning Committee. The Committee met for seven years to hammer out the TSP that currently existed in the City of Wilsonville and was adopted in 2003. He knew it was a lot of work and he was very impressed with how thorough the current process had been without occupying as much time.
- He displayed several photos of his project, called Old Town Village, via PowerPoint (Exhibit J). The business was located between the north side of 5th Street and down to 4th Street, along the west side of Boones Ferry Rd. Since 1996, he and his wife have worked on the Old Town Village project, developing a three building complex that includes small business spaces of a type that were not generally available in Wilsonville. The project was built with a historic motif designed to be both attractive and durable, and not subject to a fad of retailing changes or things of the sort.
 - The complex could accommodate up to 18 businesses, dependent upon how internal partitions were managed, and was designed with wide sidewalks and setbacks in a neo-traditional style with differing rooflines, setbacks and finish materials that gave the look and feel of a row of common wall early 20th century buildings.
 - The buildings were actually constructed of concrete and very serviceable for a variety of different usages. He believed they brought a strong local business component to the community, housing businesses that would otherwise not be able to exist and function within the economics of other available spaces in Wilsonville. As such, he believed they were an asset to the community and had worked for a long time to make the project work economically.
- The question of Bailey Street or 5th Street related to how effectively the policies in the community either supported or disadvantaged local small businesses at this scale.
 - The primary consideration of the TSP should not be how much traffic can be moved but how well policies enabled the community to function as people wanted; how well does it enable businesses and residents to live in the community and have a desirable type of community in which to succeed. As such, the TSP should be supportive of the qualities being sought in the community.
- He has invested a lot of time, money and effort working on his project over the past 17 years, and he had strong concerns about routing local traffic away from this area and he believed that doing so would make it very difficult for local business at this level to succeed in this complex.
- He outlined numerous ways over the past 17 years that this concept has been folded into the City's overall plans and accepted as the direction the community intended to go as follows:
 - He displayed an image showing the end of Bailey Street looking west where the Bailey option would have to connect (Page 135 of 135 in the Staff report). He indicated 25 large evergreen trees that are about 18 inches in diameter, 40 to 50 feet of OrePac Product's warehousing facility that would have to be a taking by the City of Wilsonville, and a railroad spur feeding that facility that

- the City would have to reroute. There were other significant impediments to that particular connection and he did not believe that the connection was appropriate.
- He presented a brief overview of a list of documents referenced in Exhibit F on Page 65 of 135 of the Staff report as follows:
 - The map on Page 66 of 135 was displayed. He stated a Lennertz & Coyle discussion was included in the TSP and regarded a concept by nationally recognized consultants that neighborhoods essentially consist of a ten-minute walking radii. The idea was to lay out areas in Wilsonville where such neighborhoods exist.
 - He indicated the area being discussed which was the center of the Old Town Neighborhood. The concept was that there should be a civic, social or community component in the neighborhood center to draw neighborhoods together. The ultimate idea was to work to interconnect, neighborhood-to-neighborhood, throughout the city. This presented a challenge because of the I-5 corridor and the river running east/west. (Page 67 of 135)
 - He hoped that the City would remain committed to the idea of interconnecting Wilsonville's neighborhoods. The Old Town Neighborhood and the connection at 5th Street were an inherent part of that idea.
 - Starting on Page 68 of 135, Exhibit F outlined several different pieces within the Wilsonville West Side Master Plan, which he urged Staff to read. The Plan was adopted in December 1996 and discussed the intent of having commercial services available on that side of the freeway, so people would not be required to go east/west through the city's limited interchanges to access commercial services and goods on a day-to-day basis.
 - The Main Street Handbook, starting on Pages 84 of 135, was initiated and issued by Metro in March 1996. The handbook described traditional and neo-traditional Main Street commercial districts throughout the Portland metropolitan area and discussed their advantages and what they brought to the community. The discussion within the noted section involved why main streets work and their advantages and the need for traditional style development for that purpose.
 - The Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan also rolled in different components of alternate mode connections, as well as the need to be able to get to and from commercial services by bike and car. This Master Plan also included several pages of discussion.
 - The Old Town Neighborhood Plan, specifically created by the Old Town Neighborhood, was adopted by the City in 2011. The Plan designated blocks within the neighborhood to create a neo-traditional Main Street commercial district within Old Town. This concept contained in the Old Town Neighborhood Plan had advanced and was agreed upon through multiple years of discussion in the development of that Master Plan.
 - At the center of the Neighborhood Plan was the 5th Street connection. Bailey Street then routed traffic around this commercial district; thereby creating a significant challenge regarding how viable it would ever be if people were not able to see and pass through it.
 - Metro's Main Street Handbook contains significant sections discussing the traffic needs of traditional Main Street commercial.
 - The Comprehensive Plan included a section that discussed public facilities and services, as well as the transportation network and outlined several broad concepts important for the Commission to understand. In Exhibit F, he highlighted several sections for the Commission to review.
 - The Comprehensive Plan discussed Special Area of Concern F, the area west of the tracks, and the way it needs to be integrated into the city. Also discussed is Area K, the section along the riverfront west of the railroad tracks. The Commission needed to understand the specific and unusual components that make up the special areas of concern.
 - He noted the Old Town Overlay Zone section of the Development Code. An Old Town Overlay Zone was actually developed through the history of meetings within the community and called for the neo-traditional style of development along that area and indicated the desirable outcomes.

- This particular Code influenced the development of the Fred Meyer and somewhat at the Albertson's center. The architectural approaches desired by the community that were codified in this section.
- The Old Town project he had built was mentioned in the section as an example of the type of development the Code section called for.
- Included in Exhibit F were a few pictures not shown on the PowerPoint presentation. The pictures showed the streetscape looking west in more detail along the Bailey Street and 5th Street alignments.
- A map was also included in Exhibit F that included some hand drawn concepts. The intent of the sketches was to maximize the available land utilized in the zone called for in the Comprehensive Plan.
 - The area along the railroad tracks was industrial. The layout he suggested maximized the amount of industrial land available for development without taking up space for roads.
 - The area west of Industrial Way on the south side of Wilsonville Road was residential in the Comprehensive Plan and the layout maximized the acreage of residential land available for the owners to develop.
 - The layout missed takings on the Young property, on the former Ehlers farmhouse property, and Tom Bernert's house, thereby minimizing public expense to provide direction on and connection to this road by not allowing excessive public takings of properties that did not need to be taken. It also maximized the utilization of the existing 5th Street right-of-way (ROW), which went quite a distance west of the railroad tracks, there again minimizing expense.
- Also included in his submission was a significant list of errors, as he perceived them, in the understanding of the proposal for Bailey Street and what the costs and impacts of connecting at Bailey Street would be.
- He felt that there was a significant indication that items requiring further consideration existed and needed to be discussed. In the past few weeks, he had opened dialogue with owners of other properties along the west side of the railroad tracks, specifically representatives of OrePac.
 - A letter from Mr. Kirk, who represented both the company and the property owners west of there on OrePac property, had been distributed to the Commission. The letter indicated that in the future they would like to have expansion capability to the south and that would be torpedoed by the Bailey Street alternative. Therefore, they supported the 5th Street alternative.
 - He also had a discussion with David Bernert, owner of Wilsonville Concrete, who was present at the meeting tonight.
 - He had found some hope amongst the property owners to continue discussions and arrive at mutually agreeable, beneficial plans for the area. There had not been time to achieve that yet, but there was cause for optimism that it was a possible route to the future and he hoped they could continue with that.
- His concern was that a judgment not be made on a short time frame using incomplete or erroneous information, which was why he felt it was necessary to outline that material in his submission.
- He asked that an adverse decision not be made tonight. If the Commission was moving toward a decision, he believed the material he submitted made a very strong case about what the appropriate direction is.
- He also believed it reasonable to suggest that the City should pursue private discussion amongst property owners in order to see if a plan, which met everyone's largest needs, could be met as effectively as possible.
- His intention was to try to do that, if they were afforded time to do so, about which they had already started discussion.

Commissioner Postma:

- Noted the Staff report stated the Commission was including a recommendation for deferring the decision and asked if Mr. Knapp disagreed with that.

- Mr. Knapp replied it was a difficult answer. He agreed with the recommendation in the immediate short run. In the long run, if it were ten years before the City came back to the TSP, it was a problem because it inhibited potential private-sector investment in the proposed Main Street commercial district along Boones Ferry, the industrial land that laid west of the railroad, and conceivably in further development of some of the property west of the railroad that ran down toward the river and might have development potential.
- The optimal approach would be to not decide temporarily, but rather enable and encourage the owners to move forward in a fairly short time frame to have discussion to see if a consensus among property owners was possible.
- He clarified he was not advocating for today, but sometime soon, before ten years from now.
- Asked if Mr. Knapp took issue to specific language, noting that OrePac provided an indication of Pages 4 and 5 where they specifically spoke about the Brown Road extension, advocating for a decision sometime soon.
 - Mr. Knapp agreed with sometime soon, but was unsure as to how it should be done.
- Confirmed Mr. Knapp had no objection to language as currently stated.

Commissioner Phelps:

- Appreciated Mr. Knapp's comments.
- Stated he was prepared to defer this until such time as the local property owners had a chance to work it out. Given his past experiences with the legislative process, he did not believe this was the right forum. If the people with the problem wanted to work together to solve it and bring a solution back, he felt the City should stand down and wait. He saw no reason to burden the Commission's process or create uncertainty among people that vested a great deal of money in the property if a solution may be at hand, and he suspected it may be closer than the Commission believed.
- Recommended the decision be delayed until the Commission heard back from the property owners.
 - Mr. Knapp stated he was unsure, from Staff's point of view, if it was difficult to foresee a short-term amendment to the TSP, if the process were to go through and the TSP as a whole were moved forward to keep consultant bills from running up. With all those involved, he wondered if it were possible to do that and say that an amendment would be considered in a relatively near term if private owners could arrive at a recommendation jointly. If it were possible, he wondered what the process would look like.
 - Mr. Neamtzu stated that an amendment to the TSP would be a legislative amendment and would follow the process that had currently taken place: work sessions with the community, dialogue with the Planning Commission, a public hearing, a recommendation of the City Council and final action of the City Council. TSPs had been amended in the past and it is a lengthy process, even for a relatively small addition to a policy document such as this one.
 - That being said, it was important to hear all testimony. Then the Commission could determine if there was an opportunity to insert something that spoke to what was being suggested and if any appropriate additions needed to be made to tonight's proposal.
- Was not opposed to anything other than resolving the situation and suggested a deferment until the next meeting, which might stop the flow for only a month, but allowing three or four weeks opportunity for the entire plan could be sent through to City Council. If that did not work, parallel to that Staff might be working on Mr. Knapp's suggestion to bifurcate the deal and set it up so it was available and prepared to go forward as soon as there was a resolution.

Commissioner Millan:

- Understood the Commission was looking at the language in the Staff report, which stated, "It is recommended that the decision related to the two conceptual alignment alternatives be deferred to a later point in time due to a number of outstanding issues." The Commission was hearing testimony from the public that they preferred one resolution versus another. She did not understand why this would hold up passing the TSP Update as it was currently stated, explaining it would not prohibit the

process from going forward. She asked whether it would interfere with the process going forward where a good decision would be reached at some future date.

- Mr. Neamtzu believed the Plan was set up to achieve the objectives of collaboration amongst property owners. Perhaps it was not as clear as it could be regarding the time line Mr. Knapp articulated. He believed the Commission would want to collect all testimony and decide whether the information in the Plan was appropriate as written, or if some adjustment might be warranted. He was unsure what additional testimony would be heard tonight and was apprehensive to offer much guidance in terms of what should be done at this point in the process.

Chair Altman proposed continuing with public testimony, returning to the current issue and then determining where the Commission stood. He asked Staff to consider how this particular element might be separated, to allow for a continuation of that part of the public hearing, and return to the Commission before it made its way to Council. The Commission had not heard all testimony and he was unsure whether they may hear other components that would affect the rest of the TSP. He noted that alternatives had not been scattered throughout the Plan, whereas the current issue had been around for a long time.

Commissioner Levit:

- Asked how long it would take for property owners to meet and how many were envisioned to do so.
 - Mr. Knapp stated he was prepared to meet intensively and multiple times in the upcoming weeks and month if the other property owners felt they could and jointly thought it advantageous to do so. He stood prepared, but the other property owners would have to speak for themselves regarding whether they felt that was a high potential approach.
 - It was difficult to answer how many were envisioned to meet because multiple properties were owned by groups of people, not one person.

David Bernert, Owner, Wilsonville Concrete, 41200 SW Industrial Way, Wilsonville, OR, stated for the record that he owned Wilsonville Concrete and represented the property owners, entirely or with other owners present, for 99.8 acres, so all property west of the railroad to the water treatment plant and from the river to Wilsonville Road. Wilsonville Concrete's companies, of which five were located in Wilsonville, had been in Wilsonville since 1958, and had watched and aided in the development of Wilsonville over that period of time.

- He had read the entire TSP Update, commenting that it was a very good overall plan that complemented previous plans, which Wilsonville Concrete was involved in. The body of work spoke for itself in terms of its thoroughness in a somewhat difficult environment due to conflicting interests. Mediating those is no trivial task.
- They were very pleased to see Policy 25 which had a marine emphasis. Wilsonville existed because of the Willamette River and looking at historical trends, this section of the river supported two million tons of freight, or 80,000 truckloads, on average over a 50-year period. In 2006, it supported 600,000 tons of freight. The TSP had significant infrastructure impacts and the ability to incorporate marine transportation, particularly over a 20-year period, was critical.
 - He believed the TSP could be expanded. Marine transportation was in three or four places, but it did not get the kind of coverage roads did. While that was appropriate, it was definitely a development area because of the long-term deferment costs when removing trucks from the road and also having significant greener options. The cost reduction in moving freight by marine was 75% less per ton of freight moved per mile and marine transportation was 85% more environmentally friendly in terms of the reduction of gas emissions.
- He had written a letter, one of the few documents not found in the evidence, and would like it to be included in the Appendix because it specifically regarded the Master TSP.
 - Staff responded to his letter very positively and a few work sessions took place and most all his critical items were addressed; number one being roundabouts. Some of the future designs for the Brown Road extensions incorporated roundabouts that his dump trucks with a tongue and pup

could not move through. The implication was to their property, because they would have the largest impact with the 100 acres the Brown Road extension would go through. In comparison to the 15 acres OrePac had in terms of Section G, Wilsonville Concrete owned essentially all of Section G, which raised a good point; the Master TSP is part of the Master Comprehensive Plan for the City of Wilsonville, which included goals and objectives for Section G, which would have the highest impact, and also Section K. These should be reviewed because there were some very specific objectives there.

- The extension of Industrial Way was reflected in the TSP as a freight route. Industrial Way was privately owned by Wilsonville Concrete, who allowed easement to the City and OrePac for use. The company was on the road moving trucks every day and it was nice to see this incorporated into the TSP, reflecting their work session with the City.
- Language regarding development and the rights to adhere to policies associated with the Comprehensive Plan if Section G or the Brown Road extensions were developed had also been incorporated into the TSP. Two items were not included in the TSP that should be.
 - The first he had mentioned, the documentation submitted in a letter format was not in the Appendix, which could be easily rectified. The letter expressed significant points on policy contradictions and issues that were addressed for the most part.
 - Second, the base conceptual map for the TSP had errors. There was a settlement agreement in 2006 when the City built Arrowhead Creek Lane on Wilsonville Concrete's property. Part of that settlement was to eliminate bike and pedestrian paths.
 - Page IV of the TSP still showed a default graphic that had been replicated throughout the entire document. The graphic showed City paths on Arrowhead Creek Lane, which is in direct conflict with the settlement agreement that shows no paths to that portion. This was an error that should be corrected both in the Comprehensive Plan and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.
 - The City set expectations with citizens that Arrowhead Creek Lane was a given path and reinforced those expectations with their maintenance of the path. After having maintained the path, they added a sign stating that it was, in fact, not a path. However, if the path is mowed and use is encouraged by behavior, the City was not supporting Wilsonville Concrete's settlement agreement. The agreement was important because it was a safety issue. There were significant conflicts with pedestrian traffic and Wilsonville Concrete's truck traffic. The two were not compatible until the roads were developed, which is the main reason it was maintained as a private road. He noted it was for sale if the City wanted to buy it.
- The routing of Brown Road extension was currently a point of conflict. In the letter, they clearly supported the study DKS put together which showed Bailey Street as the optimum route. It was 15% cheaper, consumed significantly less resources in terms of the total available land, and was a more direct route. The company was open to conversations. He believed a property owner intended to speak.
 - The company has continued to support the Bailey Street extension since the early 1980's because of its impact to the rest of their acreage, which was significant compared to any other property owners.
- He thanked Staff for their work, noting they had produced a very powerful document and a very strong vision for the City of Wilsonville. Wilsonville Concrete supported the City's vision, but felt enhancements should be made to the inter-modal capability sets on the marine side, which was a jewel that very few cities had. When considering cities with significantly more history, people moved back to the river and used it as a much stronger asset than what was incorporated in the proposed TSP. It may take 100 years, but laying the foundation now was important.
- He would like to see the letters they submitted in the Appendix of the TSP, just as everyone else's had been.
- He thanked the City for the work sessions, noting that they did a great job incorporating their feedback.

- They would also like to see the use of stronger language with regard to rights to develop and the privilege associated with whether the Brown Road Extension became a City-based project. It was pretty clear that if the road extension was a developer-based project, the process would become a capital project for the City. Some of the language was still a bit soft and they would like it more assertive, similar to the requirements associated with developer funded roads and extensions, particularly in Section G.

Chair Altman confirmed that policy conflicts mentioned in the letter had been corrected.

Mr. Bernert answered yes, adding most of the conflicts dealt with the settlements, as well as previous documentation. For example, Wilsonville Concrete gave Morey Lane to the City to allow access to the Water Treatment Plant so there would be no need for a bike or pedestrian path out Arrowhead Creek Lane, and right away, they put paths out for almost the next two years. Most policy conflicts mentioned were because no one knew the 50 years of City history the company had in its files. There was a bit of turnover and they had been fairly stable, so their files might be more complete with regard to their narrow scope of interest.

Sherilynn Young, Silver Leaf Farms, residing at 6189 SW Delker, Tualatin, OR, stated she was among the property owners associated with the Bernerts on the west side of the railroad tracks. She was on the West Side Task Force in the 1990's and stayed on the planning process into 2003.

- She kept looking at the maps presented and was highly concerned with something taking place south of Wilsonville Road. She noted the Area of Special Concern circled in red on Figure 5.5 in Chapter 5 The Projects, adding essentially from Boeckman Road to the Willamette River. She agreed with Mr. Knapp and Alan Kirk that they had to move forward with the Brown Road alternative. People have been talking about this for more than 20 years. The high priority projects, included fixing things up at the corner of Villebois and projects like the \$11 million project to extend Kinsman Road to Boeckman Road, and Boeckman Road had already been extended.
- She was concerned the City did not prioritize things within the city that had been a problem for citizens in Old Town. Part of the planning process had been to find an alternative to Wilsonville Road, south of Wilsonville Road, not just for property owners, which was a key point of concern. Commissioner Millan had noted the Commission was hearing public concern, but honestly, they were actually hearing from property owners. The push for this road came from Villebois, and those living to the west and in Old Town who were not present at the meeting and have not registered their priorities for the City. She questioned whether they would care more about having a road going from Barber Street to Boeckman Road or having another way to get out of Old Town when Boone Bridge breaks and Wilsonville Road is clogged up for six hours.
 - One thing Mr. Knapp discussed was if the extension went to Bailey Street, traffic would be directed away from his business. She believed if traffic could flow out of Fred Meyer and Albertsons, making its way to Brown Road or Villebois, Mr. Knapp would have a lot more traffic much closer to his business than existed currently. And Old Town residents that felt trapped would have a major improvement, maybe 1,000 ft between Wilsonville Road and Bailey Street, where they could get out.
- Whether or not property owners could get together on this should not be the Commission's only consideration. There are real differences of opinion amongst property owners. She liked Mr. Knapp and had spent hours talking with both he and Alan Kirk. She knew they had specific interests regarding the extension, but felt that the Commission had to be ready to consider what they wanted. When going home from Fred Meyer, if one left via Bailey Street to Brown Road the route was shorter than going north from the Fred Meyer entrance and up Wilsonville Road, or at least it was when mapped out 16 years ago.
- If the City were to have a work session, all the maps needed to be taken into consideration and any errors could be worked through. Mr. Knapp's map had many good ideas, but it also included many

inaccuracies. The City could try to work these through with property owners, but an underlying fundamental difference would still be present.

- She noted the photo of Bailey Street Mr. Knapp provided looking across the railroad crossing and at the trees near OrePac. The Commission should take a good look because she believed that 30 ft of right-of-way was already in a City easement.
 - She empathized with OrePac wanting to expand to the south and not wanting a street there, but noted it was not the Commission's concern to benefit OrePac over anyone else's industrial use. If OrePac was allowed to skip landscape buffering by using an easement area for trees and using it for their industry, she questioned whether that was a policy the City should move forward with. If someone developed a portion of the city, allocated an easement to the City and then built on it, would the City have an obligation later to allow them to colonize. That was an important policy issue.
 - She would like to see the trees, but that was already a City easement property and ROW should be looked at all the way along that area.
- She noted there was no longer a house on that property and she did not think the City's determination of what a road route should depend on a 60- or 70-year old barn. It would be inconvenient to the property owners if it had to be removed.
- Another point when looking at Mr. Knapp's map was if the route that he was advocating was taken, it meant that a second crossing would be necessary to get from Industrial Way to the property that OrePac wanted to expand on. This meant having two bridges. She recalled that the West Side Task Force felt that one crossing should be concentrated on and, if anything, two railroad crossings. As owners, they were open to saying if Bailey Street was there, there would be a second road north/south between Bailey Street and 5th Street. These options had to be looked at from many angles.
- Mr. Knapp stated that his proposal would minimize property damage, but when looking at the 5th Street extension across the south part on the west side of Seely Ditch, his proposal cut an industrial property into two triangles at its base. She wondered how his proposal ended up having one acre in the triangle in the corner and another triangle. Every time a triangle was created on a property, the useable square footage was reduced. Industrial property was currently running \$9 per square foot. How much did the City want to acquire at mitigation rates to put a road ROW through here or two to three extra acres of property that was otherwise buildable industrial? Many considerations needed to be laid out regarding the price of different roadways at they would be beneficial for.
- She emphasized that this could not be put off for another ten years, even though it had already been put off for 20 years because the area north of Bailey Street had commercial development now. Whether or not Main Street, south of Bailey Street, was an acute tourist attraction, when it came to moving people and meeting the city needs, the City was looking at how to service the commercial area with its large amount of traffic, citizens and needs to get them in and out of the large residential areas to the west.
 - There was another option if they came in at Bailey Street and a 5th Street crossing was not possible. Mr. Bernert had always said you could not have two railroad crossings, but he had also discussed arranging railroad crossings as well, so it was not that two crossings could not be done. Wilsonville currently had one crossing that was private and one that was public. Even if there was only one, underpasses could be created on the railroad tracks closer to the river, so other options were available for citizens to get out of Old Town.
- She noted Mr. Knapp mentioned that many of the old people that planned and came to Wilsonville, but that did not dictate policy, the overall policy the City was creating had to be looked at.
- When talking about priorities, the location on Mr. Knapp's map indicating a possible OrePac access showed the access crossing Seely Ditch. She had not testified to the Commission regarding this, but when the last Stormwater Master Plan was created that crossing was one in which the City replaced the owner's bridge in the 1980's to enhance Seely Ditch for the City's stormwater purposes. However,

the City did not replace the crossing at the same level they had others and it has now washed out and was broken.

- At the time, she had asked if the crossing could be identified in the City's Stormwater Master Plan to allow the owners the opportunity to put in a new one. The owners would take responsibility for going to the state and taking care of permitting, but the cooperation of the City was required because DSL would not listen to owners if the City objected.
 - At that time, the vote was to not identify that at all in the Stormwater Master Plan because it was not important and was not considered to be a public responsibility, and one reason not to do it was that this new TSP was underway and would take care of the crossing.
 - As minor as the Commission might felt it was, she could no longer get her combine up the road to Boones Ferry and had issues getting agricultural equipment and heavy trucks back and forth on it because the culvert was broken.
- As far as she was concerned, the City made a commitment to do something to get the road across Seely Ditch and if they wanted to put it off for another five to ten years, it needed to be revisited to allow owners to put a new crossing in themselves because they needed to get across.
 - Her family owned property that they farmed in common with Mr. Bernert, but they also farmed north of Wilsonville Road. They needed to get the crossing in and the City needed a decision on it. They could try to work with other landowners, but it was not the landowners' concern. Instead, it was the Commission's concern regarding the priority of what was needed for the city as a whole on this specific section of the city.

Commissioner Levit understood the culvert was located between the new nursery and just north of the Young house or barn.

- Ms. Young answered yes, just north of the barn, adding it was supposed to be a 6- or 8-ft culvert, like the one south on 5th Street, but the City ran out of culverts and installed two small culverts covered with concrete instead. City Engineer Mike Stone, Building Official Martin Brown, Natural Resources Program Manager Kerry Rappold, and others had visited the location several years in a row to take a look at the culvert, stating it could not be fixed; it was broken concrete and was not fixable.
 - She added that the business of having trails marked that were not trails was dangerous. She took bikes, trikes and toys out of that crossing regularly. People already cross from the Bailey Street crossing through the nursery. It was an attractive hazard and they were unsure what could be done about that until there was a proper crossing.

Mr. Neamtzu responded to comments provided during public testimony as follows:

- He confirmed for Ms. Stites that Staff had identified how safe the Wilsonville transportation system was through the update process. The Canyon Creek extension to Vlahos Drive would have a connection to Town Center Loop. He understood there was a plan for a signalized intersection, which would control pedestrians coming from the Windfield Village side of the line. He assured that safety was at the foremost of everything that the City does.
 - He would be happy to have the Civil Engineering Staff talk with Ms. Stites about her safety concerns to ensure that Staff was thinking appropriately about the issues she had been raised and to make sure that designs had taken into consideration the movements she had observed as a resident of that local area.
 - He confirmed that the Canyon Creek extension would go all the way to Town Center Loop and Vlahos Drive would intersect to it. The extension would come down west of the Sundial Apartments, parallel to their property, and then hook over.
- Regarding Mr. Knapp's testimony about bifurcating, he stated that was an approach that could be taken at the Council level and he wanted to be clear that Mr. Knapp could recuse himself on that issue regarding any decision that was potentially made. One could see why the plan was set up the way that it was; hearing the strong testimony on both sides of the issue, Staff knew the Brown Road Extension was going to be a major issue in the Plan tonight and were not surprised. He believe the Commission

had a Plan that set the stage for future discussions and he invited the Commission's input about what the Plan stated regarding what had been heard on testimony tonight.

- He clarified that Mr. Bernert's letter was provided at a prior Planning Commission meeting, and he was certain it was in the record, most likely in the Planning Commission's record leading up to this point. The Commission had seen the letter and it had been circulated at this meeting. He confirmed that he would track down its location to confirm where it was in the record.
- Showing the proposed extension of the Tonquin Trail across Arrowhead Creek Lane, Mr. Bernert discussed where the path ended and where it was graded out as it headed to Arrowhead Creek Lane. Staff added language to the report to specifically state that it would stay on the west side of Industrial Way and not cross Industrial Way. He stated that it was always a tricky situation when proposing a plan that was a 20-Year plan, especially when trying to show connections within existing conditions. If there were something Staff could do to make sure that it was more clearly identified as a proposed future condition, they would. Staff never meant to promote pedestrian access onto Industrial Way.
- He had not read all of the details of the settlement agreement.
- The policy measure had been added on the marina and port concept. Staff had been given a lot of great background material and was excited about some of the possibilities that concept held. If the Commission found it appropriate to add additional text, it seemed like a small task and something that could be fleshed out more. He confirmed that there was no objection from Staff on addressing that.
- He noted OrePac was not present to provide additional input to the Commission about the testimony they submitted.
- Many great comments came from Ms. Young. Mr. Knapp and Ms. Young had some of the lengthiest histories on planning issues in the community, along with Chair Altman. The City had three individuals that had seen it all from the very beginning and when they discussed these issues, they had been there and done it. They had done their time considering the issues and it was always enlightening to receive testimony from the individuals that had been a part of the foundation of planning this community.
- He noted Ms. Young had raised many good points. He had been a part of some of the Stormwater Master Plan issues and was unsure how they had addressed the crossing she mentioned in the TSP, short of a public crossing, because they were discussing public streets and public trails. His understanding it was a private crossing used for equipment that was used to farm those areas so that one was a bit more difficult. He was unsure what he could do in the TSP to address the crossing. He might have to look back at the Stormwater Master Plan or talk with the Staff members who had been a part of some of those discussions.

Chair Altman believed it might be an issue that got kicked down the road and did not get resolved. He sensed there might have been a time when that crossing was part of one of the alternatives and that was a conflict. If there was a way to clarify that a private crossing was outside the scope of the TSP it might be helpful so the Commission was not holding up a process there.

Mr. Neamtzu also addressed Commissioner Millan's question regarding whether the TSP was set up appropriately, explaining the Plan stated what was needed to allow conversations to occur. The TSP set the stage for that and, given what was heard, if there was an addition that needed to be made to discuss or encourage a specific time line that would be a small adjustment, requiring Staff to return next month to show the Commission what they would propose to address the issue. He concluded Staff would take the Commission's lead on that.

Chair Altman explained that was what he had been looking for in a bifurcation; if they split that piece out.

Mr. Neamtzu stated he would hold the whole Plan up. He did not want to pull a piece of it out and allow the rest to go forward. It was an entire master-planned document and Staff wanted to make sure

the Plan was cohesive, speaking as one document. If additional work was desired, Staff would hold up the entire Plan. He did not see a real reason to break out a piece and move the rest. It did not make any sense to him.

Ms. Jacobson advised informing the Commission about ramifications of a continuance.

Mr. Neamtzu explained Ms. Curtis was present because he was on a strict deadline under the TGM Grant Program to wrap up this work. The Mayor alluded to the fact that the City would begin picking up the tab after June 30th and a continuation would result in missing that deadline, which was a reasonable thing to do. So this was one minor issue as far as budget implications on the project. One suggestion was that a project that might be added could be a more detailed Corridor Study for this particular area. The topics included in the Brown Road technical memorandum were outlined, the white paper the Commission received on Brown Road. All those headings about the items to be considered were added. It was not uncommon for a particular study to be added as a project. It could be an approach where the City might want to put money towards helping the property owners come to the table to start discussing what this looked like, having a more of a facilitated dialogue around resolution of the issue. He agreed that another ten years on the extension was not an acceptable way to go. The study could be a way to prioritize the project and encourage that it happened soon. It would become a project that the City would have to prioritize with the workload that they already had, but at least it would be a go-to-do kind of thing. He was unsure how people would feel about that, but that was one way to get at the root of the issue and Staff would offer that as a suggestion to break it loose.

Commissioner Postma:

- Asked if a full-scale amendment to the TSP was required to add a corridor study to Brown Road as the language currently stated.
 - Mr. Neamtzu replied that adding a project was easy enough as long as the Commission was clear on some appropriate dollar amount and the consultant team could take that to advance the Plan on to the next level. The Commission would have an opportunity to see it as soon as Staff was able to get it. If a problem did arise, a discussion of what it looked like could take place as they moved into the Council level and the Commission could be very clear in articulating some dollar amount and the identification of a Brown Road Corridor Project to resolve this issue.
- Commented that the fact that the project was in the TSP as it was now did not drastically change the procedure. There would still be an investigative process that would take time, dollars and input from multiple people. They would have to go down that road no matter what, so adding language to the TSP did not really add anything to the equation.
 - Katie Mangle, Manager, Long Range Planning, stated one thing Staff had been discussing regarded what would motivate a decision between the alternatives, such as if it were a City or a private master planning project for the development of those sites. If a project were added, it would identify this as a priority for the City to push the issue forward. But generally, the language in the TSP set up the City to take on any of the three scenarios whether it was privately motivated, publicly motivated or publicly facilitated with the community.
 - She confirmed that incorporating the new project would not delay the process of the TSP. Instead it would be a way to identify the next step, stating that the City intended to fund that next step with the study, but it would happen after the TSP.

Commissioner Millan understood there was the potential for other studies that needed to be completed with any implementation of the TSP. This could not go forward without additional work, but according to Staff, if the Commission wanted to make that a specific recommendation they could do so separate from passing the TSP.

- Ms. Mangle responded a specific recommendation as a project in the TSP and this was the only significant street extension that had alternatives in the TSP. It was different from other new streets, so

it might be acknowledging that there was a City priority and City interest in helping to move that forward towards resolution, but not holding up the TSP process to do so.

Commissioner Levit asked if a developer with grand plans for that whole area could come in and override any alignment the Commission put in or were they beholden to whatever plans were there. He knew in other cases, a developer could not come in and modify a road that was specifically identified.

- Mr. Neamtzu replied if a Corridor Study were done, it would have to do with how that study ended up being officially adopted or recognized. If a study were completed and put on the shelf, it would not carry any weight. If it ended up being created, and there was an agreement around what it looked like and it was recognized by the official governing body via a Resolution, it would carry force and effect and therefore be adhered to.
- He would hope that if they went through the exercise of creating a corridor study it would be agreed upon at the end that the City could come out with something that everyone liked and it would be the implemented alignment. Once a choice had been made, they would want to go back and make sure the Plan reflected those agreements at that time, recognizing that another body, at some point in the future, could do something else. That was one suggestion for moving this down the road.

Chair Altman believed it made sense from a policy standpoint for the City to emphasize doing something to move that forward because it was the only alternative available in the TSP and the only one that had dangled forever. It hampered things from taking place that might happen if a decision was finally reached.

Commissioner Levit agreed. The area was too complex and it would be good to get some forced resolution. The potential conflicts of trails, roads, businesses and the potential flyover of I-5 made it a complicated area and it would be good to get some resolution as to how that would happen.

Commissioner Millan noted recommended language for a motion to approve the Resolution of the TSP to the next level. She asked if a corridor study would be added as an amendment to the motion and, if that was the process whether that would be initiated in the case.

- Mr. Neamtzu stated that there may be the addition of other items in terms of modifications to the TSP during the Commission's deliberations. It would be good for the Commission to spend time deliberating around other topics. A lot of time tonight had been focused on this issue and this was a citywide plan with many projects and a lot of money in many different areas of the community.
- He noted Commissioner Levit had several suggestions under the Comprehensive Plan findings. He agreed with two of the recommendations, which would be amendments to the package as well. There were three items there that the Commission should discuss and other Commissioners could bring forward specific additions. The Commission should start moving into some of that if they were happy with where they were on the Brown Road piece.

Commissioner Postma understood it was not a necessity to put a corridor study or some other alternative into the TSP right now.

Mr. Neamtzu addressed Commissioner Levit's comments in Exhibit H as follows:

- He agreed that Policy 3.2.2 on Page 46 of 135 would read better if "economic" was "economical".
- Policy 3.2.3 was a little more problematic, the problem being that the term "adequate" was vague. A substantial amount of time had been spent discussing vague terms in the TSP. This was existing language that had not been changed very much, if at all. He believed there were more clear policies in the new document that captured the detail of LOS and concurrency that actually build upon the general concept. He suggested that adding more detail would be more confusing than helpful.

Commissioner Levit replied he was satisfied.

Chair Altman stated his tendency was to have a policy that said it needs to be adequate, such as public services, and then the Development Code specifies what that meant, which had been done with the LOS standards and other things.

Commissioner Postma added sometimes vague standards work.

Mr. Neamtzu agreed Commissioner Levit's third suggested amendment seemed perfectly appropriate. There were numerous standards where the word "between" could be changed to "among."

Commissioner Phelps said he was still of the opinion that it could be fixed, but he would not interfere with a budget issue and a few of the other things. He was a bit frustrated that they had waited to get to this point to run out of money.

- He liked the suggestion that those with vested interest could see if they could find a solution.
- He believed the proposed amendment may be an appropriate solution, but to do the Plan and a corridor study in ten years put the City where it was today. He would move this forward but not happily. He believed it could be addressed tonight, but that did not seem to be the case for a number of different reasons.
- He hoped the corridor study would get done quickly because time is money. This company had been there for 25 years and they did not know if they would stay or leave. Pavement on the ground may not seem important to some people but it would put the other guy out of the game. The same was true for the other business developments.
- Wilsonville was changing and becoming much more vibrant and dynamic; they did not have ten more years. The Old Town area had come alive. The Old Town Master Plan was very impressive and he enjoyed driving through the area. However, it definitely needed a transportation fix to make the rest of it available for reasonably good development and putting the corridor study off was not acceptable.
- He would join in on the amendment and vote frustratingly that it was the best they could do.

Commissioner Millan noted they had glossed over the idea of adding some language around marine development and asked if that would be something the Commission would want to add as an amendment in some way. It was sort of silent on the matter and it had been pointed out that it was an area that should be more emphasized in the Plan.

Chair Altman agreed some emphasis could be added. He was encouraged it was mentioned and that there was a policy acknowledging it as an issue. Some of the information provided by Mr. Bernert in terms of comparing the volumes of truck traffic and freight movement was important and emphasized why more priority should be placed on considering the river as an option.

- Mr. Neamtzu suggested The Needs chapter of the TSP was an appropriate place to insert a paragraph about that concept. Something could be crafted and added to the TSP as it was advanced, again circling back with the Commission for review of the language and feedback prior to actual hearings before the Council on June 3.

Commissioner Levit asked if that was in addition to what was on Page 4 of 16.

- Ms. Mangle replied she was referring to Pages 4-8 and 4-9 of the draft TSP document which dealt with truck and possibly rail freight. She believed it would be a place to make the points made tonight, acknowledging the opportunities and gaps without necessarily committing to specific actions.

Commissioner Millan responded that addressed her concern about the language being soft.

Chair Altman closed the public hearing for LP13-0003 at 8:08 p.m.

Ms. Jacobson advised the Commission on how to address the proposed amendments in a motion.

Chair Altman clarified that with regard to his declared conflict, there did not appear to be anything being created that he could not act upon appropriately.

Ms. Jacobson agreed, adding nothing would be done one way or another on the road except for maybe to say study it further.

Commissioner Levit moved to amend the TSP Comprehensive Plan to reflect the following language changes:

- **On Page 46 of 135 of the Staff report, amend Policy 3.2.2 to state, “...sufficient to ensure ~~economic~~ *economical*, sustainable and environmentally sound...”**
- **On Page 46 of 135 of the Staff report, amend Implementation Measure 3.3.1.a to state, “Encourage a balance ~~between~~ *among* housing, employment, and commercial activities within the City...”**

Commissioner Phelps seconded the motion, which passed by a 5 to 0 vote.

Chair Altman called for a motion regarding the corridor study.

Ms. Mangle suggested a way to phrase the motion, directing the Commission to Page 5-10 in the Draft TSP which referred to higher-priority projects. The change would be to add new a project to Table 5-4 on Page 5-10; the project being to conduct a corridor study of the Brown Rd Extension to define the alignment. A cost would need to be defined for the study. Staff would work with DKS Associates to ensure it could be accommodated within the higher priority project budget.

Commissioner Postma asked the cost of the study.

- Mr. Mansur responded the cost would be \$15,000 to \$20,000 which could be accommodated within the cost of the Brown Rd Extension Project. That quote would be from the transportation standpoint. He deferred to Staff for ideas on public involvement, which Staff would take the lead on.
- Mr. Neamtzu noted they wanted to discuss bicycles and pedestrians and ensure they were looking at all the modes through there.
- Brad Coy of DKS Associates believed that could be folded into the project, as opposed to making a new project.
- Mr. Mansur suggested changing Roadway Extension RE-04 to RE-04A, so it would be tied to the roadway extension project.
- Mr. Coy noted that on a planning level, \$20,000 for a \$15.7 million project was a wash.
- Ms. Mangle explained that would only put it into this bucket, the actual funding of the project would be a separate, later decision made by Council. However, it would identify it as a standalone step. Staff would assign a number, linking it to RE-04, and send it out to the Commission via email to confirm their direction was being interpreted correctly before forwarding it to Council. She did not think it would be appropriate to include a time line because it had not been done with any other project.

Chair Altman believed it warranted at least a reference to time being important, rather than leaving it dangling.

- Ms. Mangle responded that perhaps something could be included in the Planning Commission resolution documenting recommendation for the Plan, as opposed to being in the text of the TSP. She confirmed no projects were prioritized in the TSP and there was no other commitment to certain timing so doing so would be an anomaly.

Commission Millan asked if there was a way for the Commission to send a message saying that the Commission supported it or wanted it to happen, rather than adding it to Plan.

- Mr. Neamtzu believed having a finding articulating the desire to have it happen on a shorter time frame was a good way to go, incorporating that into the resolution. They did not want to bind a future budget committee to something out of the Commission's control as an advisory body. It was important that they state clearly and nod softly the intent of all parties to work together collaboratively towards some sort of resolution in a short time frame. The language could be included in the revised finding resolution that the chairman would sign.

Commissioner Postma:

- Inquired about tying themselves to the extent that they add it to RE-04 versus a separate item, tying how Council or the Planning Commission could deal with it when it was time for decision-making, funding and green lighting the project. He asked if it would be better to be separate rather than incorporating into the \$15.2 million extension.
 - Ms. Mangle replied she envisioned that it would still be on its own line with the label of RE-04. It would be separated with the advantage of making the point that it would be important to happen next, but not be something else they would need to map or track separately.
- Said he wanted to make sure there was still enough separation between the projects so that from a funding standpoint the decision could be made separate and distinct from the \$15.2 million to conduct the individual study without committing to something different or larger.
 - Ms. Mangle replied it would have to be that way.

Chair Altman:

- Added if there was an A and B under RE-04, then it would break that out.
 - Ms. Mangle agreed, noting, for example, A would be the \$15 million and B would be \$20,000.
- Said he would switch that around.

Commissioner Levit expressed concern because the French Prairie Bridge was also a high priority but the actual project was not. The roadway extension project would be different because it would still remain high priority. He was not happy that the projects were not parallel.

Commissioner Phelps stated that with regard to the resolution, he would like to see that this is resolved and that no work occurs on Brown Rd extension until the corridor study was conducted.

Commissioner Millan suggested going with Staff's recommended language for the amendment, stating something like the Commission is adding to Table 5-4 amendment RE-04A, which would include conducting a corridor study to resolve the placement of the extension in a short time frame, though she was uncertain that should be added. An additional amendment would be to relabel RE-04 in Table 5-4 to RE-04B. She confirmed the new project [corridor study] would be RE-04A and the current project would be RE-04B.

Commissioner Postma stated that then the resolution would be amended to speak to the urgency of the requested urgency.

- Ms. Mangle confirmed there was a resolution to document the recommendation the Planning Commission would vote on that night. The Planning Commission could also write a formal letter to Council regarding this issue.

Ms. Jacobson cited language of the Resolution, stating, "The Planning Commission does hereby adopt all planning Staff Reports along with the findings and recommendations contained therein and further recommends that the Wilsonville City Council approve and adopt the TSP Update and associated Comprehensive Plan text as reviewed and amended by the Planning Commission." She suggested adding, "And the Planning Commission further recommends that City Council direct Staff to make the Brown Road corridor study a priority and assign a time frame for getting the work completed" before

the " BE IT RESOLVED" portion. This would be the Commission's recommendation to Council and then they would discuss what would be reasonable. This would enable the Commission to move the Plan forward and be done. She noted that before getting to the step of adopting the Resolution, other clean up items still needed to be addressed.

Commissioner Phelps:

- Added for the record that using the A and B nomenclature would indicate that the corridor study would be done before anything on Brown Road.
 - Ms. Mangle agreed, adding she believed the corridor study would be the first step of the project anyway. This was saying it was in the City's best interest to pull out the first step and gather everyone together to figure it out. That would probably be the next step whether it was a done privately through a master planned project or as a capital project. They were simply identifying that and saying they wanted to do the corridor study soon.
- Noted many of these projects do not require a corridor study so he wanted to clarify for the record that the corridor study would precede the Brown Road Extension Project.

Commissioner Postma moved to amend the Wilsonville TSP by revising Table 5-4 Higher Priority Projects (Southwest Quadrant) of Page 5-10 of Exhibit A to include RE-04A Corridor Study for the Brown Road Extension with language to be provided by Staff, and for the language for the current project included in RE-04 to be included as RE-04B. Commissioner Phelps seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Altman:

- Noted the other item discussed was the river freight emphasis.
 - Mr. Neamtzu believed Page 4-8 regarding freight-related deficiencies could be an appropriate area to add a paragraph.
- Suggested adding language that the City recognizes the importance of the river's value as an alternate freight movement route compared to trucks moving large volumes of freight and that discussed the energy efficient or green aspect of it.

Commissioner Levit suggested that water needs on Page 4-16 covered what was being discussed.

Commissioner Millan did not believe it addressed any encouragement of recognizing the river as another mode of transportation.

Commissioner Postma believed there were methods by which the City could participate in that process, such as mechanisms for approving docks, the roads to and from, etc.

Commissioner Levit asked where they would be in the city, there was no other waterfront.

Commissioner Millan stated they wanted to make sure it was an option within the current city limits.

Chair Altman said the city limits could move either west or south.

Commissioner Levit said there was no place to put anything.

Ms. Mangle noted the way Water Needs was currently written, the City has no direct jurisdictional control or responsibility for managing activities on the river and deferred to the Corps of Engineers. The Commission seemed interested in discussing freight activity on the river. Activity in the water was not being discussed, but the intermodal port, which was more land-based and acknowledging that the

City did not have much and that it would be a possible future thing. Maybe it would fit best under freight than the water section, although it would be good to coordinate between the two.

Chair Altman:

- Asked if there was a policy component that would add emphasis.
 - Ms. Mangle noted it was covered in Policy 25 on Page 2-8, which the Commission had added, stating, "Maintain access to the Willamette River so that the river may be used for transportation purposes in the future, acquire and approve access to Willamette River for public docking purposes, and consider the potential development of a new port or ports."
- Suggested adding something under the freight-related deficiencies with regard to Mr. Bernert's comments in terms of the value of the river for moving freight as an alternative to truck shipments. He thought that would be a good place to insert it.

Commissioner Levit asked if the business should be added to the list on Page 4-8.

- Mr. Neamtzu replied absolutely. He noted the list regarded a list of surveys that had been received as part of the City's specific freight outreach, but that feedback had been received now.

Chair Altman stated they had more than one company moving freight, so all five could be added to make the list longer.

Commissioner Postma suggested adding the indicated benefits to the community of increased marine freight traffic on the Willamette River to the first paragraph of The Needs section under Freight related deficiencies.

Commissioner Millan believed that captured what was missing.

Commissioner Postma moved to amend the Wilsonville TSP by adding to the end of the first paragraph under "Freight-Related Deficiencies" on Page 4-8, "The community would also benefit from increased marine freight traffic on the Willamette River." Commissioner Millan seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Commissioner Postma moved to adopt Resolution LP13-0003 with the amendments to the Resolution as read into the record by Assistant City Attorney Barbara Jacobson.

- **Add the following language to the end of the "NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED" paragraph: "the Planning Commission further recommends to the City Council that the City Council direct Staff to identify funding and begin work on a corridor study for the Brown Road Extension; and"**

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Phelps and passed unanimously.

Assistant City Attorney Jacobson repeated her proposed language for Resolution into the record.

The Planning Commission took a brief recess, reconvening the meeting at 8:44 p.m.

- B. LP13-0004 – Adoption of amendments to the Planning and Land Development Ordinance (various sections) to implement the 2013 Transportation System Plan. (Mangle)**

The following exhibit was entered into the record and distributed to the Commission.

Exhibit 1: Addendum dated May 8, 2013 prepared by Staff in response to issues raised by City Council during work session and indicating changes to the Sections 4.155(.04) Bicycle Parking and Section 4.177 Street Improvement Standards.

Chair Altman reviewed the Legislative Hearing Procedure and called the public hearing for LP13-0003 to order at 8:45 p.m.

Katie Mangle, Manager, Long Range Planning, stated she had been working with Darcy Rudzinski of the Angelo Planning Group to present the set of Development Code amendments that were intended to implement many of the policies in Chapter 2 of the draft TSP that would be going to Council for adoption.

- Many of the TSP policies would be implemented either in the Development Code, through the Public Work Standards, or directly through the City in its Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Updating the Code to do this was one big step forward in starting to implement some of the TSP policies and setting the intent in motion. In fact, the 2003 TSP had been such a long process after seven years that the Development Code amendments to support some of it were never adopted. Placeholder language still existed within the Code that said “This Section to be updated when the TSP was adopted.”
- Staff wanted to be sure to follow up on that and not lose momentum on the project. It was not urgent that it be adopted that night, but keeping the momentum going was important. There had been two or three work sessions with the Planning Commission on the amendments, and a lot of the Planning Commission's comments had been incorporated into the draft TSP.
- A brief presentation would be given to explain what the amendments were about and what impact they might have. Generally, the reason for these types of amendments was, in addition to implementing the TSP, was to comply with some regional and state requirements that the City was obligated to fulfill. Most of the amendments built on really good policy the City had had for a very long time to ensure that development contributed to improving the pedestrian, bicycle and streetscape improvements and making sure development did that along the way. There were also specific things the City was being asked to comply with, which the amendments would help the City to do.
- There were some areas where housekeeping and organizational improvements had been done to make the TSP easier to use and make sure that as Staff spoke with developers, the City's onsite requirements were clear. For example, the City cared about the design for getting pedestrians from the parking lot to the headquarters of a corporation. Making sure the objectives were clear regarding on-street or in the right-of-way improvements and organizing those so it was clear which is which.

Darcy Rudzinski, Angelo Planning Group, reviewed the proposed Code language, referring to the examples of the key changes on Page 4 of 71. She characterized the changes made, mostly for the benefit of the record and to provide a higher level overview of the types of changes being considered for adoption in Wilsonville with these comments:

- The City should make sure its development standards reflect the standards and functional classifications in the TSP. Therefore, a few modifications were made to the existing requirements to ensure consistency between the TSP and the Development Code.
- Current practice also needed to be codified. The public hearing notice requirements was one example of where the City already notified roadway providers with potential authority over roadways within the city of potential development activities that might impact those facilities. The Code language had simply been modified to clarify that it was an expectation of the City.
- Other amendments increased safety, accessibility and connectivity for all modes. So, there was a new section focused on on-site, bicycle and pedestrian connectivity. Another new section also stated the standards for vehicular access and circulation.
- The last category of amendments focused on increasing the opportunity for multimodal travel.
 - Bicycle parking standards had been modified. Transit related requirements took a lot of the policy level recommendations from the Transit Master Plan and implemented it into the Development Code so that it actually became a requirement that transit amenities and facilities be provided with some level of development.

- She agreed with what Mr. Knapp had said about the TSP supporting the qualities they wanted to see in Wilsonville. The TSP should enable the type of community they desired to be. As Ms. Mangle stated, the TSP policies in Chapter 2 were implemented in part through the Development Code.
- Attachment C was a commentary sheet that described the changes to the ordinance and why they had been made. Attachment C had been updated as different versions of the proposed Code language were presented.
- She also agreed with Mr. Mansur's statement about the TSP capturing the latest and best practices and she believed the Code language should be viewed the same way. They had drawn upon model Code language developed and used by the State and modified for each jurisdiction's needs. They had also drawn on examples from other jurisdictions in the region, who were trying to enhance and clarify requirements, particularly around multimodal transportation.
- She briefly reviewed how the current version of the Code Amendment packet had changed since being presented in April. Staff had mostly made the amendments but the consultants had helped respond to the Commission's comments and suggested amendments from April.
 - One of the biggest changes had been to the access drive and driveway approach standards on Page 27 of 71 under Street Improvement Standards, which had previously been two separate sections. One had discussed driveway approach, where the driveway connects into the system. The other was access drives, which regarded the length of access drive connecting the property to the system. There were subtle differences between them. Because the two requirements were so similar, they combined the requirements under one heading and added a definition for driveway approach to clarify what they were.
 - Related to that, Section 4.118(.03) on Page 17 of 71 allowed waivers to the drive aisle design and on-site pedestrian access and circulation standards.

Ms. Mangle explained there had been several times where the Commission had discussed the need for some flexibility, and ensuring people could get waivers was the best way to allow flexibility. She clarified edits had been made to items 9 and 15.

- She noted Exhibit 1, which was distributed to the Commission, was prepared in response to Monday night's work session with City Council, addressing items raised by Council and indicating changes to the Sections 4.155(.04) Bicycle Parking and Section 4.177 Street Improvement Standards with regard to proportionality. She described the changes made to these two sections for the Commission to consider. She noted the changes were indicated in green and red in the packet. Her comments were as follows:
 - The only real policy change with regard to bicycle parking involved the threshold at which long-term bicycle parking is triggered. The current proposal stated if more than four bicycle parking spaces were required by Table 5. Council had questioned if that threshold was too low; if it would capture too small of the proposed development.
 - She directed the Commission to the table on the last page of Exhibit 1, which was not proposed to be in the Code but was provided as background information. She considered the bicycle parking ratios in Table 5 and asked, for example, if the threshold was four, what kind of businesses or uses would be captured and the table in Exhibit 1 showed these results. A hotel, for example, with 20 or more rooms would be required to have four bicycle parking spaces; therefore, that use would trigger the need to meet the long-term bicycle parking standard. Less than four would be the size of uses that would trigger the bicycle parking standard. If the threshold were six, in the next column to the right, the table indicated the sizes of uses that would trigger the long term biking standard.
 - One question from the work session on Monday was where the bicycle parking standards had originated. Staff had erroneously answered that some of the standards were from Portland and Milwaukie, but they had actually come from Villebois. The difference between the two was that in Villebois the numbers for short-term and long-term bicycle parking spaces were listed. However, that approach was not being taken for the rest of the city, therefore a threshold needed

to be defined. Staff recommended increasing the threshold to six, which would be for Planning Commission's discussion.

- The other changes to the Bicycle Parking standards were basically structural, ensuring that bicycle parking spaces required general provisions; Section 4.155.(.04) numbers 5 and 6 were moved up from the short term bicycle parking standards section because they describe how a bicycle parking space needed be designed and used, which is something that should apply to all bike parking spaces, not just short term spaces.
 - The covered parking section had also been moved and that section had been edited for clarity.

Commissioner Levit:

- Questioned how many dentist offices were 20,000 sq ft and suggested decreasing the sizes.
- Asked why there would never be a bicycle rack at a bowling alley.
 - Ms. Mangle responded the number of parking spaces were by lane. According to the table, it would have to be 100 lanes before bicycle parking would be triggered. It could not be changed because they were not reevaluating the entire parking table, but it could be noted as a deficiency.
- Stated although patrons may not be coming by bicycle, employees and visitors could.
 - Ms. Mangle believed there was a minimum of two bicycle parking requirements, but she would have to go back and review the table. Because no 100 lane bowling alleys would be built, the parking would never be triggered. She reiterated that reevaluating the entire table and parking ratios would be a different project. More involved discussions and research were necessary for many of the parking standards for both bicycle and auto; though it might be good to note.

Commissioner Millan confirmed the table in Exhibit 1 would not be included in the adopted standards.

- Ms. Mangle responded the table was created as background for the Commission's consideration, if they wanted to change the threshold from four to six.

Commissioner Phelps confirmed the table was provided for informational purposes. He suggested inserting a column for minimum number of bicycle parking spaces, otherwise it was suggesting that some uses would never have bicycle parking capability, although two was the requirement.

- Ms. Mangle explained the purpose of the table was to evaluate if there was a threshold at which long-term bicycle parking would be required and what would be captured at that threshold. The question posed at Council was if the right things were being captured. The table was designed to be informational for the Commission. She believed four was a perfectly defensible answer and six would be a little bit of a higher threshold.

Ms. Mangle addressed another Council question about proportionality and whether too small of sites would trigger expensive improvements, specifically for transit stops. She believed it was not just a fair question for transit improvements but for any of them. She had discussed it with the City Attorney's office and the last line of the first paragraph of Section 4.177 stated, "The purpose of this section is to ensure that development, including redevelopment, provides transportation facilities that are safe, convenient, and adequate in rough proportion to that impact," which was already included in the proposal and addressed all of that. The City Attorney believed that was enough and that any case law related to Nolan and Dolan overrode all of the City's responsibilities. However, he noted that Section 4.177(.01) had stated, "Such improvements shall be provided at the time of development," which was actually not the way it was done in Wilsonville. Developments in Wilsonville were allowed to make improvements within two years of the time of development, so that was the reference in Section 4.140 to clarify that.

Commissioner Levit:

- Asked about Table 5 in Attachment A and whether everything was a minimum of two bike parking spaces.

- Ms. Mangle clarified that most of Table 5 was not included in the draft because it was not being changed. She would need a copy of the table before she was able to answer the question.
- Had requested, on a couple of occasions, that language be included to require public access at corner lots from the corner and he did not see that language in the draft.
 - Ms. Mangle replied it had not been inserted because Staff had not been sure how to achieve that objective, where to insert it or how it would relate to the ability to place buildings on the corner in terms of how pedestrian access related to building placement and site design. The requirement that the pedestrian route be safe, direct and convenient had been included.
 - Ms. Rudzinski noted that would not preclude what he was discussing; it just did not dictate how it would happen.
- Knew of no place in Wilsonville with pedestrian access from the corner, which meant pedestrians were inconvenienced, especially when it was a parking lot. It was understandable if it was a building and a pedestrian was not going to walk into the building. However, if it was a parking lot with internal circulation for pedestrians, it should connect to a crosswalk.
 - Ms. Rudzinski noted they struggled with making the language too prescriptive.
- Stated it was either there or it was inconvenient. People would either cut through the shrubbery, which happens almost everywhere, or the City should make a path there.
 - Ms. Mangle responded if the language stated, "reasonably direct" that would be one of the routes that would be evaluated when looking at a site plan.
- Replied that although he and Staff agreed on that, it might never be done unless it was specifically written. However, if it was logical, he questioned why it was not being done already.
 - Chair Altman stated he works with that end of it a lot and explained that the parking lot is designed first and then pedestrian lengths are added, which is why they usually end up with them wherever access points are located. Perhaps pedestrian circulation should be designed first.
- Replied an internal pedestrian plan had to be done in conjunction, but currently, if people walk in any parking lot they walked in the middle of traffic because the parking lots were not designed safely for pedestrians.
 - Ms. Rudzinski believed the language provided the City with some tools to request that information be taken into consideration and to have modifications made in a site plan review if pedestrian access was indirect and did not make sense. She was leery of trying to anticipate all of the possible site design aspects because when referring to transit, that was a traction point they would want to have safe.
- Doubted it would happen.
 - Ms. Mangle suggested adding some language on Page 18 of 71 in Section 4.154(.01)B.2.b. "The pathway is reasonably direct. A pathway is reasonably direct when it follows a route between destinations" could be modified to say "destinations including..."
- Responded that although it named public rights-of-way, that could be 50 ft down the street.
 - Ms. Mangle replied that could say including the nearest public crosswalk or something similar, which would guide Staff during implementation; not just from the car to the building, or from building to building but also from the building to the nearest crosswalk or something like that to ensure that it was considered.
 - She clarified that in Table 5, there was a minimum of two bicycle spaces for every use and a minimum of six or four for certain uses. She confirmed the table purely regarded the threshold for long-term parking.
- Said the first time a copy of Table 5 had been provided, there had been something that struck him as being odd but could not recall what it was.
 - Ms. Mangle confirmed Table 5 would not be changed, however there was one change that was needed for regional compliance.

Chair Altman:

- Inquired about Section 4.155(.03)(E.) on page 20 of 71, the 12-ft landscape buffer being a new standard for buffering a parking lot.
 - Ms. Rudzinski believed that was made for consistency with what the City currently required.
- Did not recall a 12-ft buffer, adding there was always a buffer, but he did not recall it being that wide. He was concerned that as the City had more intense urban development, giving up 12-ft buffer for parking at the edge might be overkill. He agreed with Section 4.155(.03)(F.), which said if it works appropriately it would be included in storm treatment elements. He believed setting a standard of a 12-ft buffer for all parking lots was too wide. For example, Town Center would have a 12-ft wide buffer along its entire length on Wilsonville Road. The existing buffer was only about five or six ft, not 12 ft.
- Was also concerned with Section 4.177(.06)(C.) on Page 27 of 71, which assumed there was a bus stop anywhere near the project. He suggested including an alternative location or a contribution toward stops elsewhere. If there was no bus stop nearby, there was nothing to improve.
 - Ms. Mangle noted that Section 4.177(.06)(A.) stated it was triggered if on a major transit street to any bus stop located along the site's frontage, so it was only applicable if a bus stop was located there. The City could not require going offsite to improve a bus stop down the block.
- Responded it was done with trees, requiring developers to mitigate, paying into a tree fund and planting them elsewhere if they could not be planted on site. However, as long as it was related to an actual bus stop, he was okay with it.

Commissioner Phelps said he wanted to know what he was agreeing to when voting for this and all it said was "Shall be designed in accordance with the Public Works Standard". This language was used on Page 26 of 71 and several other places in the draft. He was concerned that the Public Works Standards might change and the language would not.

- Ms. Mangle clarified the Public Works Standards were the City's street design standards and should be included in the Public Works Standards instead of the Code. Therefore, items that stated things like, "The sidewalk should be brown concrete" had been extracted from the Code. That did not belong in the Zoning Code but in the Public Works Standards. For example, there was a part of the TSP with street cross sections and at the policy level of the TSP, the Planning Commission was approving design of what collector streets should look like. Having some flexibility had been discussed and the Public Works Standards might discuss four different kinds of collectors. The Public Works Standards provided another way of implementing some of that policy. Some of the other things in the Public Works Standards involved more details about the types of surfaces allowed, such as what a sidewalk could be built out of, such as asphalt or concrete. The Public Works Standards were easier to amend and update than the Code. The Public Works Standards are updated via a public Council discussion, but did not involve the whole land use process. The Staff could not make administrative changes to the Standards.
- Ms. Jacobson noted the last update to the Public Works Standards occurred in 2006. Provisions within the Standards allow the Planning Director to have some discretion, but the overall standards are adopted by Council.
- Ms. Mangle noted the Engineering Department was working on an update that would go to Council to update the TSP. She confirmed that some of the Standards were based on national engineering standards and often come from ODOT and other sources.

Commissioner Levit inquired about the transit improvements that began in (.06)(A.) on Pages 26 and 27 clearly stating that the sites are adjacent to a transit street, but (A.), (B.), (C.), (D.) and (E.) were all at the same structural level. He suggested making (B.), (C.) and possibly the others subsections of (A.).

Chair Altman suggested eliminating (A.) and making it a paragraph, so that everything under it would be a subcategory.

Commissioner Levit agreed that would work because in (C.), it was uncertain whether it was a transit street or not.

Ms. Mangle agreed. She clarified the 12-ft setback for the parking buffer was an existing standard, but only for parking lots in excess of 200 parking spaces.

Chair Altman expressed frustration that the Development Code still referred back to the Comprehensive Plan. He had been coordinating with Mr. Neamtzu and Ms. Mangle on the issue and it did not look like it would be resolved immediately because it was more complicated than imagined. He would like to see something eventually done where the TSP would be actually implemented through the Code, instead of constantly referring back to the Comprehensive Plan. He was concerned that they would now be bouncing between three documents, the Code, the Comprehensive Plan and the TSP, to make sure all the bases were covered, which was a structure he was not at all satisfied with.

Commissioner Postma entered the email thread from Ben Altman dated May 3, 2013 and response from Planning Director Chris Neamtzu into the record as Exhibit 2.

Chair Altman called for public testimony regarding LP13-0004. There was none.

Commissioner Postma noted Page 18 of 71 was where there had been a discussion about Commissioner Levit's concern regarding internal pathways. He suggested adding "and crosswalks" after "public rights-of-way" at the end of the Section 4.154(.01)(B.)(2.), to provide an additional potential indication that the City intended to get people to the corner crosswalks.

Commissioner Levit agreed the crosswalk was a good idea in the odd situation it could possibly be located in the middle of the block.

Commissioner Postma responded the advantage was that there would not be a "shall" so much as "please try to do this," which provided some design flexibility. The difficulty with removing the prior "and" was that a "shall" was still included at the beginning of that.

Commissioner Levit:

- Questioned what was wrong with that as they were trying to make Wilsonville a pedestrian-friendly community.
 - Ms. Rudzinski stated an alternate suggestion was that the pathway be reasonably direct, which meant it followed a route between destinations including nearest crosswalks or from destinations to nearest crosswalks.
- Responded it would still be a "shall" because it is subsection 2.

Chair Altman noted it was still a matter of defining reasonably direct as a "shall."

- Ms. Mangle noted "shall" was a way to get things done and an important word in code writing. She, Ms. Rudzinski and Mr. Neamtzu had thoroughly discussed the concern and concluded that the section had a lot of flexibility on how the requirement was met and how it was implemented and applied to specific sites. Without a "shall," it would not belong in the Code.

Commissioner Postma confirmed, "and crosswalks" would be inserted at the end of Section 4.154(.01)(B.)(2.) on page 18 of 71 of the Staff report after "public rights-of-way".

- In Section 4.177(.06)(A.) on Page 26 of 71, he noted the Commission discussed removing subsection (A.) and inserting that paragraph immediately after "transit improvements," and then renumbering (B.), (C.), (D.) and (E.) to (A.), (B.), (C.), and (D.). He believed that would provide clarity and go back to the notion of paying attention to transit improvements and adjacent developments.

Chair Altman closed the public hearing for LP13-0004 at 9:32 p.m.

Commissioner Postma moved to amend the Staff report as follows:

- **Include the changes specified in Exhibit 1, excluding the Note indicated on Page 1 and the table on the final page.**
- **Revise the end of Section 4.154(.01) (B.)(2.) on page 18 of 71 of the Staff report to include, “public rights-of-way *and crosswalks*”.**
- **Include the content of Section 4.177(.06)(A.) on Page 26 of 71 immediately after (.06) Transit Improvements as one paragraph and renumber Subsections (B.), (C.), (D.) and (E.) accordingly.**

Commissioner Millan seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Commissioner Postma moved to adopt Resolution LP13-0004 as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Millan and passed 4 to 1 with Chair Altman opposed.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. 2013 Planning Commission Work Program
- B. Commissioners' Comments

Commissioner Phelps distributed a handout regarding the Oregon Passenger Rail about which he had attended a meeting, noting he was now on an advisory committee regarding the project. His comments regarding the project were as follows:

- The handout was an exhibit that was passed out at the meeting. Another sectional discussion group was covering southeast and then all the groups/information would be reassembled to discuss the project again. The schedule was provided within the handout.
- His frustration with the process was that they were discussing the best alignments. The committee was told that the time it would take to get from Eugene to Vancouver, WA was not available. Being a high speed rail, they stated it would probably take two hours, so the train would move at about 150+mph. He stated that they do not want to beat the time it would take for a car to make the trip, only match it.
- He was also frustrated that no stops were indicated so determining the alignment seemed futile at this point. If no stop was planned for Wilsonville, for example, why would he care what alignment was used?
- A man spoke who recently retired from TriMet was very knowledgeable and did not think having the rail stop in Oregon City would work at all due to the topography and turns required once leaving the I-5 corridor. He also questioned where the right-of-way would be if the rail line followed McLoughlin Blvd.
- He noted the Commission's Work Program included ODOT Passenger Rail in July, adding the project was a long way from being a reality.

The Commission briefly discussed other passenger rail lines in the county. Faster rail line options were much more expensive. Some rail lines ran higher speed options in the morning and evening, and then offered more of a station to station option during the day.

Commissioner Phelps would be gathering more information while in Chicago to show the rail line could be used for different reasons.

Commissioner Postma believed Chair Altman's point valid about having to access extra documents when developing. The Economic Development Plan indicated that the City needed to readdress its Code provisions to make it more streamlined and friendly for those developing. In his professional

experience, it did slow the process down and added expense and time for developers. If the City was going to be development-friendly, they needed to be application-friendly as well, and making the changes referenced by Chair Altman would get that result. While such a minor change would require a lot of work, it was something the Commission should address as soon as possible to be competitive with other communities.

Commissioner Phelps noted the Chamber had a good presentation by Councilor Starr, Councilor Fitzgerald and Urban Renewal Manager Kristin Rutherford. He noted a man who recently retired after working the last 20 years for Pride Oil in Brazil stated that during a board meeting, comments were made about what a terrible place Wilsonville is because Pride could not put their logo on their facility because it had more than one color. Commissioner Phelps noted such comments in board rooms were damaging because they could remain forever the truth.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Altman adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 9:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

By Paula Pinyerd of ABC Transcription
Services, Inc. for
Linda Straessle, Planning Administrative
Assistant