

PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2012
6:00 P.M.

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

Approved
January 9, 2013

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Altman called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ben Altman, Eric Postma, Peter Hurley, Al Levit, and Amy Dvorak. Ray Phelps arrived after roll call. Marta McGuire was absent.

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

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

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, reported on November 19, 2012, Council:

- Held a TSP work session wherein the project lists were discussed. The Council presentation was not as effective as that given to the Commission as Scott Mansur was absent due to bad weather. Given the work session with Council, the TSP update process continued to be on track.
- Katie Mangle, Manger of Long Range Planning, presented the density issue and Staff received direction to begin the related Development Code amendment process with the Planning Commission. Articulating the density issue clearly would be important to receive the Commission's input when moving through the process.
- Approved the Zone Map Amendment to the Village Zone for the Piazza in the heart of Villebois during the regular meeting on first reading.

Commissioner Phelps arrived at this time.

Mr. Neamtzu continued, stating that on December 3, 2012, Council:

- Held a work session on the Kinsman Transmission Main Segment 3B for the waterline, which essentially follows the Kinsman Road Alignment between Barber St and Boeckman Rd.
 - A work session was also held on PDP 3 & 4 East in Villebois.
- During the regular meeting, the Piazza was approved.
 - Also approved was the 15-unit Fox Center Townhomes across from the Crest Center on the west side of the city, along with a Comprehensive Map change from commercial to residential.
 - Councilor Starr said he had a good dialogue with the immediate neighbors who supported the project. Others appreciated the number of changes the applicant team made. The resulting project is better in its final form.
 - Council also approved almost 300 single-family homes in Villebois on the east side, north of the Lowrie Primary School. There was no public testimony.

Commissioner Phelps inquired if the Planning Commission's work went directly to the Council.

Mr. Neamtzu clarified the agenda items were from the Development Review Board; the quasi-judicial applications were for site-specific development. These site-specific changes to the Zone Map were in line with the Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Commission addresses changes to the Zone Map involving more than a single parcel.

V. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

Commissioner Levit corrected the November 14, 2012 minutes as follows:

(Note: additional text shown in bold, italicized text)

- Amend the first sentence in the first bullet point on Page 5 of 9 to state, "...for future access as development occurs in Coffee lake Creek."
- Amend Commissioner Levit's last comment on Page 9 of 9 to state, "...good from a driver's perspective, **but not for bicyclists and pedestrians**, which he had discussed..."
- He noted the last sentence of the first indented bullet on Page 7 of 9 should be reworded.

Following discussion, the Commission consented to retain the sentence on Page 7 as written given that the audio recording was available if specific clarification was needed.

The November 14, 2012 Planning Commission Minutes were approved as corrected by a 5 to 0 to 1 vote with Commissioner Dvorak abstaining.

VI. WORK SESSIONS

A. Transportation System Plan Update: TSP Implementation Measures

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, suggested that the Commissioners articulate any concerns, observations, constructive criticism and comments, and then try to find consensus to provide Staff with direction in making changes to the policies. He noted it was important to recognize all the prior work done over many years by those on the Transportation Adjunct Committee and Advisory Committee on Master Planning to form the policies in the TSP. And, while that work must be respected, the Commission and Staff should work to challenge the TSP policies in order to make them fresh and current.

Katie Mangle, Manager of Long Range Planning, briefly reviewed some of the overall changes made based on feedback from the last work session in August.

The Commission and Ms. Mangle reviewed the Existing and Proposed Transportation Policies and Implementation Measures presented in the table beginning on Page 12 of 36 of the packet. Key comments, changes, or suggestions were as follows, with clarifications from Staff as noted:

[Note: added language shown in bold, italicized text; deleted language struck through]

- Policy 2. Policy 3.5.1 of the Comprehensive Plan was more of a broad introductory policy, but Policy 2 more directly identified the City's responsibilities in maintaining a balanced transportation system with a more proactive intent.
 - Timeframe references were deliberately excluded in the proposed language because many policies continue from document to document and including timeframes might suggest that the policies would cease to be meaningful after that point. Such dates also needed to be continually updated.
 - The current TSP update went through 2035, which could be included in the general adoption or introduction.
- Implementation Measure 2.b. Language regarding local impacts was carried over from the existing policy and likely referred to property owners and the broader neighborhood since regarded the impacts of the road alignment on the neighborhood.

- Other things like residents, businesses, streets, etc. could also be impacted. The Commission consented to leave the language more general as “local impact” to provide some flexibility in determining what the local impact might be on a case-by-case basis.
- Implementation Measure 3.a resulted from Commission discussion in August. The underlined text was meant to simplify long and complicated wording to clarify the policy’s direction, which was to facilitate the private sector’s exploration of alternative fuel technologies. Being new, all the proposed language should be shown underlined.
 - Identifying “fast charging stations near I-5” as natural gas and/or electric was discussed, particularly since the infrastructure was different.
 - Prior discussion focused on keeping the language more general because future technologies are unknown. Using language like, “such facilities” or “such as but not limited to” was suggested to note the named technologies as examples.
 - The currently underlined language was the controlling phrase; while specific items were listed nothing else was excluded.
 - The wording “near the City’s I-5 interchange” was vague and too subjective. How is ‘near’ defined?
 - Discussion noted federal programs that encourage the use of fast charging stations. The programs likely had some proximity requirements to federally funded interstates and the City’s language should be consistent with the federal code.
 - The Commission should consider the City’s position and determine whether the City should focus on the I-5 area, only the interchanges, or facilitate such technologies citywide wherever opportunity exists and let other programs define proximity according to the grant source. Grants could be pursued given the City policy would already exist.
 - Using “near I-5” was unnecessarily limiting; no need exists to state or define ‘near.’
- Policy 4. The phrasing “all modes...to all members” was overly broad and subjective; however no alternatives were offered.
- Implementation Measure 4.b. Deleting “bicycle and” was suggested. Bicycle riding on sidewalks is not encouraged in town; “bike lanes” were addressed elsewhere, so “pathways” could be used.
 - Adding language to state, “Fill gaps in the existing sidewalk **and bike facility** system” would be more inclusive.
- Mr. Neamtzu clarified that the County controls the signal timing on Wilsonville Rd and ODOT controls the access points to Wilsonville Rd a certain distance on each side of the I-5 interchange; up to the railroad or possibly Kinsman Rd on the west side. The City coordinates with the County regularly regarding the level of service (LOS). For example, the City talked to the County about the huge traffic back-up that occurred on Brown Rd at Lowrie Primary School in the morning when it first opened and how to calibrate the signal timing. The County refined the light cycles and within one week there was a vast improvement.
- Implementation Measures 10.a and 10.b use the words “promote” and “require”, respectively; Measure 10.a reflects the City’s attitude and provides Staff direction to advise and coordinate with developers and designers during the development process to promote a walkable neighborhood even when the Code may not explicitly require some items. Measure 10.b uses “require” because linkages are required in order to comply with the Regional Functional Transportation Plan (RFTP) and would be included in the Development Code as a requirement.
 - Concern was expressed because some connections are not happening, such as at O’Reilly’s in the Wilsonville Road Business Center. The pedestrian access is located between the two buildings, rather than having two access points to make it pedestrian-friendly. Because such things are overlooked, making Measure 10.a a requirement was suggested.
 - The Wilsonville Road Business Center was an industrial project and the first business was a retail use, which prompted different considerations.
 - While sidewalks exist for each tenant space within the project, access should be provided for employees who may want to walk to work.
 - Making Measure 10.a a requirement would require more specifics about what is not in the Development Code, which would lead to Code amendments. The process is very discretionary and a lot of room exists for discussion, so perhaps that was the intent.

- Chair Altman noted the Aerial Photo of Town Center dated July 2011 with a 250-ft block grid he distributed showed that a lot of work was needed to improve walkability. He was not convinced the City knew enough about what they wanted to accomplish to make Measure 10.a requirement level, other than to make walkability better.
 - Measure 10.b addresses a specific known problem. Further discussion was needed to determine what should come back for Development Code requirements in the future.
- Implementation Measure 10.a. “Activity centers” include schools, parks and libraries; anything that is not a commercial business or residence with people coming or going.
- Implementation Measure 10.b. Concern was voiced about requiring bicycle and pedestrian linkages for all dead-end streets and cul-de-sacs because they may abut Significant Resource Overlay Zones (SROZ), for example. Using the word “all” put the City in a position of having to grant waivers because the City does not want linkages going through SROZs. Cul-de-sacs and dead-end streets sometimes exist for other reasons.
 - Changing the sentence to say “Require **the elimination of barriers to connectivity including consideration of** bicycle and pedestrian linkages for cul-de-sacs, dead-end streets...” was suggested.
 - Connectivity should also not be precluded. Mechanisms could be provided, such as done at Canyon Creek for connection to the path that would be built eventually, and the walking path in Villebois along SROZ.
 - Linkages are needed at the intersection of dead end streets for connectivity. Connectivity can mean providing the ability to go back to the intersection.
 - Like the activity center concept, the question to ask is what will the linkage be connected to?
 - Eliminating barriers should be the primary focus.
 - Briefly discussed were whether building cul-de-sacs should be encouraged and the potential development opportunities for development in the city.
- Policy 14. The new proposed language was improved, but still contained “that minimize single-use auto parking”. Having “regulated to ensure sufficient parking” was internally inconsistent to “minimizing parking.” Minimizing single-use auto parking was the issue.
 - Staff recalled the concern was not to minimize auto parking, but single-use auto parking. Auto parking is an expensive resource to create and should be used by the most users. The intent is to have parking used by all the different users, not just to minimize parking.
 - Removing the phrase would not impact whether Policy 14 met the regional requirements. The proposed language skirted the edge of those requirements, but was the right balance for Wilsonville right now. A parking management plan was not needed right now, but would be when major redevelopment occurred in the Town Center area.
 - The parking management plan was a new policy intended to manage, not eliminate parking, and would ensure the active management of parking as a resource.
 - The Lamb’s Thriftway site would provide for a lot of redevelopment and a lot of capacity exists for more people to live and work in the Town Center area; however there would not be enough roadway infrastructure and parking facilities to support that many single-use trips and there would be no room for buildings because of the size of the parking lots.
 - The parking plan would not subvert the market, but manage parking in different ways, such as making sure uses share parking where appropriate and that customers, including seniors, have access to the right kinds of parking.
 - While a parking management plan was not needed in Wilsonville yet, the policy was needed as a placeholder for the future regional requirement.
 - The parking management plan should be linked and coordinated with multi-modal system planning for enhanced accessibility across all transit modes; no mode should be excluded. Instead, Policy 14 minimizes one mode to gain another.
 - Following discussion, Policy 14 was amended to state, “...prepare parking management plans that ~~minimize single-use auto parking and~~ manage supply and demand for ~~public~~ parking areas.” Further comments included:

- Retaining “public” in the policy language was discussed; new streets could have public on-street parking and parking structures could be built; however, “public” kept the focus only on public parking.
 - “New development” in Town Center did include redevelopment as the area changes.
- Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney, confirmed that references to the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) could be removed because the City must comply with most administrative rules anyway. The OAR gets renumbered periodically, so removing the references would also eliminate such future adjustments.
- Implementation Measure 17.a was modified in response to Council’s discussion of the TSP projects to call out the Boone Bridge as a specific example to acknowledge the vulnerability the City has regarding its reliance on I-5. Council wanted a policy or implementation measure to address the issue and calling it out would be helpful to put pressure on ODOT when needed in the future.
 - The Boone Bridge was a difficult project due to structural limitations.
 - Including Clackamas County and Metro, rather than just the State, was suggested.
 - The French Prairie Bridge should also be called out as an example because support from the State, Clackamas County and Metro would be needed. The French Prairie Bridge is on the County’s list, so specific reference in the City’s plans would be beneficial.
 - The language stated “improve”, but the French Prairie Bridge has not been built. This measure was not the right place to reference the bridge.
 - The French Prairie Bridge is currently in the Bike and Pedestrian Master Plan and adding it to the Fiscally Constrained List would assist in obtaining support and ensure it remained active on the County’s list.
 - Discussion continued about where to place the French Prairie Bridge within the policies and implementation measures. Staff would work to determine the right placement.
- Adding a new, broader measure about working with other jurisdiction on regional connectivity with regard to trail systems and bike paths that extend beyond the city was suggested. This coordinating with other jurisdictions on regional trails was already in the Bike and Pedestrian Master Plan in some fashion.
- Policy 21 was written as a statement in fact. The City has no control over the airport but would be impacted by its expansion.
 - The Economic Development Commission considered the airport’s development to be positive; however the City did not want impacts to I-5, agriculture, or the environment as a result.
 - Key discussion regarded adding stronger language to encourage the State and airport to consider Wilsonville’s input; recognizing the airport was a component of the State system, but a vital economic asset for Wilsonville’s business community; and the importance of considering the impacts of any expansion.
 - Retaining the proposed language enabled the City to take multiple positions as needed, and provided the City flexibility to make whatever argument was needed to advance its position at the table. The policy announces the City is paying attention and has the right to participate.
 - The policy should be worded like the other policies where the City is the active subject, not the airport. Changing the wording to state, “The City will actively encourage...”, for example, would feel more like a partnership between the City and airport.
- Implementation Measure 36.a. “Improve the balance between...” was a substantive statement and could be different for everyone. Changing the wording to “~~Improve the~~ **Encourage a** balance” was suggested.
 - The balance did not equal providing more transportation options; Staff would consider further wordsmithing.
- Implementation Measure 36.b. Concern was expressed about language regarding increasing densities and intensities of development; however, this was reflected in the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code. Amending the policy would be a big change.
- Implementation Measure 36.d. The Willamette River should be included and the French Prairie Bridge could also be incorporated by adding “(i.e. French Prairie Bridge)”.
- Implementation Measures 36.e, 36.f, and 36.g should be included in the Transit Section or reworded to relate to pedestrians and bicycles.

- Implementation Measure 36.i. Include bike corrals, which occupy a vehicle parking space for bike parking in front of a store.
 - The TSP should direct the continual enhancement of bicycle and pedestrian systems. The measure was amended to state, “Consider increasing requirements **and methods** for bicycle parking to ensure.....”
- Additional items for implementation were suggested as follows:
 - Wayfinding signage should be improved overall throughout the city for cars, pedestrians and bicyclists, which could include having specific destination signs and route numbers, so people know how to get around the city.
 - A policy statement is needed for Staff to require, not just encourage and promote, that bike and pedestrian facilities be more of a priority in site design, which ultimately must be supported by the Development Code.
 - Bike and pedestrian facilities are often inadequate or overlooked in development projects. Developers include bike and pedestrian safety and circulation elements only when required.
 - Stronger language must direct Staff to lead preapplication discussions with developers about the importance of multi-modal system planning and connectivity issues.
 - Public Works Standards and Development Code amendments could be tools to address the issue, but a policy statement was needed to guide such actions.
 - Staff would review what Code amendments might be needed to implement the TSP implementation measures, such as requiring a 5-foot thruway, so somebody would verify such requirements are met.
 - Several policies and implementation measures in the section touch on the issue. A new policy could be created, but may create conflicts by pitting the different modes against one another.
 - A new implementation measure was needed to address SMART services within developments. Site plan approvals consider access for trash pick-up and the fire department but not for SMART buses necessarily.
 - SMART would not go into the Town Center area even though a bus loading area sign is in front of Starbucks. A SMART bus stop was designed within the Fred Meyer development.
 - Policy 41 was amended to read, “Develop more transportation options within the city, increasing demand by transportation demand management programming ~~and supporting the development of and access to alternative fuels in addition to improvements to~~ **improve** walking, biking, and transit facilities.”
 - Omitting the language would not affect any focus on regional trip reduction strategies.
 - Implementation Measures 42.i and 42.n. address eliminating or consolidating private accesses within a quarter-of-a mile of the I-5 interchange, not intersections like Town Center Lp.
 - For example, the private driveway into the former Cravens’ Bar and Grill on Wilsonville Rd would be affected as well as several businesses on Wilsonville Rd west of the interchange.
 - The Interchange Access Management Plan (IAMP) identifies all the existing driveways on Wilsonville Rd that would be closed under a redevelopment scenario, forcing a shared condition and providing less penetration points on the street. The accesses were being controlled, not the street itself.

Ms. Mangle concluded that the goals, visions and policies have been included in the virtual open house, adding that about 76 people had already viewed the policies page. The implementation measures were not included because they had not been reviewed by the Commission yet. The next step would be to have the Commission review the updates made to the implementation measures and then the entire updated TSP, inclusive of all projects, would come before the Commission in April.

Chair Altman commended DKS & Associates for the Executive Summary which conveyed the idea of the TSP update plainly and simply, so anyone could read and understand the project without reading the entire 400-page Plan.

The Commission took a brief recess and reconvened the meeting at 8:10 p.m. Commissioner Hurley did not return to the meeting.

B. Density Discussion

Ms. Mangle described and illustrated conflicts in the methodologies used for calculating density in the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code via PowerPoint. Staff had developed and presented an action plan for addressing the issue to City Council, who directed Staff to discuss the action plan with the Planning Commission. She reviewed the Staff report, which identified the issues and proposed solutions to address the incompatibilities between the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code. She addressed clarifying questions from the Commission with these comments:

- The intention was not to change the development standards by downzoning existing properties, which would create nonconforming properties, so proposed changes would not affect existing properties or the owners' property rights for future development. Instead of focusing on which existing properties might not conform to the standards, the focus would be to have more flexibility to decide which zone actually implements a Comprehensive Plan district. The idea was to work within the machine, not to jump to changing the standards.
- Staff was not planning to retain the average lot size standard at this point. The same goal of encouraging flexibility and creative site design could be attained without using that standard to move it towards a more traditional approach. The calculations of how density would be done should be in the Development Code, but because as a PDR process, it is discretionary, so other ways of encouraging flexible site design were available.
- She would draft specific amendments to implement the proposed adjustments to the Development Code and return to the Commission for a work session review in the spring with the intent to go to public hearing within six months.

Commissioner Postma:

- Inquired whether Council's direction was crystal clear about giving precedence to the Comprehensive Plan rather than defaulting to standards of later legislative intent that actually expanded the Comprehensive Plan or made it different.
 - Ms. Mangle cited Baker vs. Milwaukie, which established that in Oregon, the Development Code implements the Comprehensive Plan and it is the City's responsibility to modify the Code.
 - She assured that while different projects might address the issue, such as rezoning or redoing the Comprehensive Plan, Council specifically endorsed tweaking the current machine and maintaining the current Comprehensive Plan as the driving policy document.
- Agreed some might try to turn this into a different project, so being crystal clear about the intent to the master document was critical in order to avoid getting into other conversations and changes.
 - Ms. Mangle stated that addressing the density issue was an urgent project for Council, and would come up again. She would enlist the Commission's help to ensure the focus stays on this particular density issue and outcome. If other issues are noticed, they would be put aside for another project.

Chair Altman noted that open space requirements have never clearly addressed whether gross or net acreage should be used to calculate the 25% requirement.

- Ms. Mangle replied certain adjustments could be considered. She confirmed the intention was not to amend the Comprehensive Plan Map, but to make those densities work in the Development Code.

Commissioner Postma:

- Asked whether the Commission could get to that point quickly and easily without understanding Council's intent regarding the fundamental question of gross versus net.
 - Ms. Mangle replied part of the issue lay in researching when the word "gross" was removed and "net" added to the Code to try to determine the historical intention and discuss what choices the Commission should make.
- Commented that historically, the intent might have been one thing, but the question is what the intention is today. Making current policy match history would only force a rediscussion about whether the Comprehensive Plan should be changed.

- Was concerned about going through the entire process and then learning that Council had not understood that gross versus net was an issue, which would affect whether the City would want to remain with the Comprehensive Plan versus the other numbers.
- Believed the Commission needed an answer to the fundamental question about whether Council wanted to change the Comprehensive Plan.
 - Ms. Mangle stated the ramifications for the historical decisions would be discussed and the Commission could obtain direction from Council at certain decision points before moving forward. Having a detailed conversation with Council about net and gross acreage was not the best way to move forward at this time.
 - Many policies have been in place for decades, which provided a lot of stability; only a few specific things were not working.

Chair Altman recalled that net acreage was introduced because of the minimum density requirement.

Commissioner Phelps:

- Inquired whether the issue regarded the prevailing process or the math calculations not being compatible with people's expectations about a certain number of units being approved per acre.
 - Ms. Mangle clarified that the current process for calculating units per acre is fraught with disagreement and potential for challenge. Most codes have a clear process for determining the number of units per acre, but not Wilsonville's Code.
 - She reiterated that the project defined with Council was to clarify and fix the methodology in the Development Code, not to change the densities in the Comprehensive Plan and to make the current Zoning Map and the current system work in a way that follows the Comprehensive Plan.
- Noted that the Zoning District in Table 1 on Page 3 of the Staff Report identified the required density, so no math was required.
 - Ms. Mangle explained that the issue arose when rezoning; which zone is the appropriate one to implement the Comprehensive Plan and when determining how many units can be built when planning development. Both questions occur at both phases, but the rezoning question creates a lot of the problems.
 - She agreed the issue was very complex and very confusing and it should not be, which was why Council wanted the issue addressed.

Chair Altman noted the numbers on Table 1 do not match the numbers on the Zoning Map, which was the problem. When a project is designated 6 to 7 units per acre, four different PDR zones could make that density work, so how does one decide which PDR zone should be used; the numbers come out completely different.

Commissioner Postma:

- Questioned whether the Commission was starting from the right base point; whether it was Council's intent to match the Comprehensive Plan Map based on gross versus net. It was a very fundamental question that could have very different answers. He did not want the Commission spinning its wheels to make the densities work on one approach, only to find Council intended that the other be used.
 - Ms. Mangle believed that based on the direction Council gave Staff at the work session that density should be based on the Comprehensive Plan Map. The first key question was whether density would be based on net or gross. If needed, the Commission could get further direction from Council following that discussion.
 - She confirmed that the specific direction was to work with the Planning Commission to begin crafting
- Understood Council was allowing some leeway for the Commission but the first question regarded what the density should be and his determination would likely be different than others.
 - Ms. Mangle replied the implications of that would be discussed, not in the abstract, but by reviewing specific sites within the city and only a limited number of sites were involved.
 - Discussed how the calculations were applied in the past matters. The City knows how many units per acre have been built in most of those areas.

- Said it matters only to the extent that Council would not like to change that, and he was uncertain that Council agreed on the initial determination of how the numbers should work out.
 - Ms. Mangle replied they could go back and have that conversation with Council, but the work would begin with the Commission.

Chair Altman believed if the Commission matched the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code, the Zoning Map would change later if they did not like how density is allocated throughout the city, which was an entirely different issue. However, the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code should still work.

- Ms. Mangle added the process and the methodology should still work.

Ms. Mangle agreed to explain why the densities presented in the PowerPoint illustration were incompatible.

Commissioner Levit:

- Asked if the amount of land required for roads, sidewalks, etc. would depend on the type of development proposed.
 - Ms. Mangle explained that most cities have clear calculations for how gross and net acres are calculated; some cities use different percentages for multi- and single-family dwellings. The amount of land required for roads, sidewalks, etc. could depend on the type of housing, which was a topic for the Commission to discuss.
- Discussed how calculating fewer dwellings would be required depending on whether the gross or net acreage was used, given the same amount of land in the same PDR zone. Many factors and a lot of different outcomes could result from the current density calculations.
 - Ms. Mangle confirmed Staff had a good idea about how to eliminate the density gaps without too much trouble.
- Suggested having the PDR zones correlate to the number of units required.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2010 Planning Commission Work Program

B. Commissioners' Comments

Chair Altman stated that once the TSP moved to adoption, he requested a clear explanation of how the existing master plans carry forward in time and how they would be used since the TSP essentially merged the master plans and some dangling pieces exist that should be clear in the administrative record.

- He acknowledged the July 2011 Aerial Photo of Town Center with the 250-ft grid he provided was related to the Parking Management Plan issue, but added it was an extension of previous talks about Town Center and what the Commission intended to accomplish there over time. It was a graphical representation of the Town Center and how to move around within it. Overlaying the grid format on parking would result in a completely different design, providing for pedestrian circulation on a grid basis with parking spaced accordingly.

Commissioner Levit asked when the odor from the wastewater treatment plant would stop.

- Mr. Neamtzu believed the odor might be reduced with the trucking of the sludge to Salem. Rebuilding the plant and keeping it functioning on such a small site was difficult. Part of the problem was maintaining the filtration process during construction. City Council had entered into an agreement with the City of Salem to accept and treat large amounts of sludge on Wilsonville's behalf.

C. Good-bye to Commissioner Dvorak

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, thanked Commissioner Dvorak for her four years of service on the Planning Commission.

VIII. PLANNING DIRECTOR/CITY STAFF COMMENTS

A. WWTP Quarterly Update

Mr. Neamtzu reported that the Policy Advisory Group (PAG) on Basalt Creek Transportation Refinement had arrived at a unanimous decision to support the east/west network for the Basalt Creek Area, which was presented to the Commission by DKS Associates. Many neighbors from Boones Ferry Rd addressed the panel and gave passionate testimony about the taking of houses, real property and their lives being negatively impacted.

- Concept Planning for Basalt Creek would begin in the spring. In theory, the transportation system should be set and they would be dealing with land use infrastructure and governance issues. He agreed to send a map reflecting the final decision.
- He confirmed that those featured in the write-up in the Community Section of *The Oregonian* were present.
- He reviewed some of the engineering challenges, noting that the bridge height was lowered from 1500 ft to about 600 ft high, which was a significant decision point.
- Currently no design or exact alignment existed, so it was uncertain whether the wetlands would be impacted.

Commissioner Levit commented that references in the TSP to the Tonquin Trail should reflect the new name, The Ice Age Tonquin Trail.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Altman adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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