

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

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

**Approved October 10, 2012
with one correction on page 4**

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

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

Planning Commission: Ben Altman, Al Levit, Ray Phelps, Eric Postma, Peter Hurley, Marta McGuire, and Amy Dvorak.

City Staff: Chris Neamtzu 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 REPORT

No report given.

V. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

The August 8, 2012 Planning Commission Minutes were approved with corrections to reflect that Ray Phelps and Al Levit were the only Commissioners absent with Ray Phelps and Al Levit abstaining.

VI. WORK SESSIONS

A. Basalt Creek Transportation Planning

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, stated that Chris Maciejewski of DKS Associates and Russ Knoebel, Capital Project Manager with Washington County Transportation, have led efforts regarding the Basalt Creek Transportation Refinement Plan with the cities, Washington County, Metro and ODOT for about 12 to 14 months. Two primary work groups, the Technical Work Group (TWG) and Policy Advisory Group (PAG), have been guiding the process. The PAG includes representatives from each municipality. TWG presents recommendations based on technical data to the PAG to inform its policy discussions. TWG finished its work in the early summer. PAG would hold its final meeting sometime in December to arrive at a consensus about recommendations for the Basalt Creek Area's transportation improvements. Concept planning for the Basalt Creek Area is expected to begin in 2013.

- Wilsonville's City Council was briefed on the Plan last Thursday night, and Mr. Maciejewski and Mr. Knoebel had already made presentations in Tualatin and other places, and had met with many property owners and citizens. The Commission packets included the PowerPoint presentation, City Council staff report, and Executive Summary as well as a link to the Basalt Creek website, which contained technical information and a background analysis. He sought the Commission's input on the Plan, as well as on the recommended East-West concept.

Chris Maciejewski, DKS & Associates, presented the Basalt Creek Transportation Refinement Plan (Plan) via PowerPoint, reviewing the background of the study, public outreach, the pros and cons of the alternatives studied, the costs of each alternative, and how the recommendation was determined at the TWG level. Mr. Maciejewski, Mr. Knoebel and Staff addressed comments and questions from the Commission with these key comments:

- The purpose of the intergovernmental agreement (IGA) between the Cities of Tualatin and Wilsonville, Metro, ODOT and Washington County was to establish a primary arterial corridor, essentially extending 124th corridor east toward I-5 to connect Tualatin-Sherwood Rd to Boones Ferry Rd. The framework plan would determine how that corridor would be aligned and function, the supporting facilities to make the corridor function well, as well as how to address access to I-5. Details such as local street connections, sidewalks, bike lanes, trails, etc. would be part of the concept planning.
- The split-diamond design option involved splitting the northern part of the Elligsen Rd interchange and connecting the proposed new road with frontage roads, which had been discussed. ODOT stated this option was a measure of last resort due to the unlikely approval by the Federal Highway Administration. Other bottlenecks in the system would break before the interchange would break, leading to other improvements before reaching the point of needing the split diamond. The split diamond option remained in the report so that ability is not precluded when overcrossings are designed in the future.
- In the Diagonal and East-West concepts, Grahams Ferry Rd would be upgraded to a three-lane road and Day Rd, between Grahams Ferry and Kinsman Rd, would remain a three-lane road, but would become five lanes from Kinsman Rd to Boones Ferry Rd.
 - Proposed Day Rd improvements were compatible with planned construction along Day Rd, as land use from Basalt Creek, Coffee Creek, etc. was taken into account in the forecasting.
- Improvements to the northern part of the Kinsman Rd extension were included in the financially-constrained package of the TSP, not as part of the Basalt Plan, but were not scheduled high on the priority list.
 - Chair Altman acknowledged the link was not important for local circulation in the planning period but would become critical when looking at the Basalt Creek and Coffee Creek Areas.
 - Links definitely exist between the TSP work and Basalt Transportation Refinement Plan. Though the tracks were parallel, outcomes of the Plan might not be ready in time to be adopted into the TSP and may be needed to be picked up in the next TSP update.
 - In this Plan, Kinsman Rd is assumed to be a three-lane, collector-level facility that would continue all the way through.
- Two crossings were planned in the East-West Concept, but the second overcrossing would occur based on the urban reserves.
- The location of the overcrossing, which would be a Wilsonville decision, would not change the projections regarding traffic impacts, only local circulation differences. The new overcrossing would function just as well with either crossing alternative. Traffic would be primarily shifted east to Canyon Creek Rd or Parkway Ave. Aligning with Canyon Creek would create more volume on Canyon Creek than on Parkway Ave.
 - Staff was uncertain whether the TSP included improvements for Parkway Ave, which was currently only a two-lane road.
 - With the turn lane improvement at the Boones Ferry Rd intersection, Day Rd could remain a three-lane roadway for the next 10 years and still meet capacity requirements. Costs on Day Rd involved improving the pavement.
- To account for anticipated development in areas like Coffee Creek, linear interpolation was used that calculated straight-line growth to 2035. The model suggested some of the Coffee Creek development, perhaps a third, would be in place in 2020, so a certain portion of the 25-year growth was included. This type of modeling has been done region wide for 2020, but no predictions were made about which properties would develop first.
- Clackamas County was not an active participant in the Plan, but was briefed on the East-West Option and that alignment's location. It is essentially a corridor option for Clackamas County to use for its urban

reserves if needed, but the road would not to be built unless Clackamas County made land use choices that included it.

- Costs provided in the presentation were in existing year dollars.
- In planning the 2035 Overcrossings, the goal was to connect to a primary part of the Wilsonville transportation system while minimizing the number of Wilsonville businesses that would be impacted. Parkway Center Dr, Option A, would align with a major roadway, but the RV park, a Washington County business, would be impacted. While the design could be modified to avoid the RV park, connecting with Parkway Center Dr would still significantly impact access to the RV park and a portion of that site. Design details would be worked out later.
- The north-south piece of 124th Ave, which involved the big gravel pits, has been an entirely separate study.
 - Washington County is adding to its TSP a north-south, five-lane road to the west of the Knife River pit, which is currently outside the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). Tualatin's concept plan shows 115th Ave being extended from Tualatin-Sherwood Rd to where the existing 124th alignment was shown. The County believes 124th Ave could be built as an interim alignment and remain 124th Ave, or become 115th Ave in the future, when the new 124th Ave is built, assuming Knife River reclaims the gravel pit, the site comes into the UGB and everything falls in line.
 - Jane Hart, Metro's Tonquin Trail Coordinator, and others involved in this transportation process chose not to use the 124th Ave corridor for the Tonquin Trail. However, because the trail might not be built for 20 or 30 years, some type of improved pedestrian/bike system was requested along 124th Ave.
 - Three cross-sectional alternatives were proposed: the standard County two-lane cross-section with two 12-ft lanes and two 8-ft wide shoulders; a curb separation of the shoulder to physically separate bikes and pedestrians; and the preferred alternative by Boones Ferry Rd neighbors, a narrow 5-ft shoulder next to a ditch and then off street multi-use trail. Additionally, Tonquin Rd would be realigned to address the existing sharp curves, and potentially, part of the true Tonquin Trail would be constructed after that realignment.
 - East-West Option paralleled part of the Tonquin Trail alignment. From the regional perspective, Metro has said that the Tonquin Trail backbone is just as important as the proposed roadway backbone to this transportation network.
 - The recommended plan includes extending the Tonquin Trail along the identified East-West corridor, crossing the Basalt Creek area and I-5 toward the Stafford basin to connect both neighborhood areas.
- The maps shown on page 44 of 48 showed the 2035 road network and assumed roads have been built in the concept planned areas, such as the new road shown off Oregon St on the lower map.
- Specific public outreach was done to businesses in the north Wilsonville area, but not much feedback was received. The most vocal group providing citizen input has been property owners on residential uses along Boones Ferry Rd; those impacted by the proposed corridor. Concerns regarded the right-of-way acquisition process and the impact to land/property values, as well as requests to move the alignment elsewhere, away their properties. The East-West option provided the most neutral impact between the alternatives.
 - Protecting property values, the key theme, would be related to land use. Residential properties next to the new corridor would want to be up-zoned to maintain or increase their property values.
 - The majority of property owners do not want to be in limbo anymore and look forward to certainty and concept planning.
- City Council had asked about the impacts of Tualatin deciding not to remove the north arterial from Tualatin's TSP. Mr. Maciejewski and Mr. Knoebel explained that would put more pressure on the 124th Ave extension and Tualatin-Sherwood Rd. The I-5/99W Connector had three east-west corridors, which was now down to two, unless Tualatin could replace the capacity in north Tualatin
- The following discussion items referenced the Traffic Impact of East-West Concept to North Wilsonville slide shown on Page 13 of 44 of the Staff report:
 - Land use changes would determine what road segments are constructed. The eastern extension of Boones Ferry Rd would not be built if land use on the east side did not occur because there would be

less traffic on the system. The system was evaluated and 2035 scenarios were studied, and the interchange area would have about the same amount of traffic with or without that land use growth. Without the northern extension and land use, the traffic impacts shown on the map would be the same.

- With the additional Day Rd Extension/Overcrossing, the I-5/Elligsen interchange would handle future development in Basalt Creek, Tualatin, and Sherwood that wants to access I-5.
 - The model showed about a third of the traffic would not access I-5, but would travel through the interchange to access future growth in Wilsonville and Sherwood. The overcrossings provide routes for those not needing to get on I-5.
 - The ultimate objective is to have the northern alignment extend to Stafford, providing drivers a better option to access I-205 than fighting congestion from I-5 to I-205.
 - The proposal would also enable Sherwood access to the interstate system to develop their own industrial activity, which was an objective of the I-5/99W Connector. The East-West Arterial to Stafford/I-5 would keep that traffic out of Wilsonville.
- Reconfiguring the 65th Ave/Elligsen Rd/Stafford Rd intersection is included in Wilsonville's TSP.
- Stafford Rd would be improved as the thousands of acres of urban reserves were developed.
 - Clackamas County's TSP was being updated now. The County has been briefed on the Plan and could *include* it in their TSP, if desired. The Basalt Creek Transportation Plan would not show a specific line to Stafford Rd, only an arrow crossing I-5 to indicate a connection point.
- A completely new interchange could not be built if additional I-5 access is needed by 2035 due to distance restrictions for interstate ramps. However, the Elligsen Rd interchange could be split, moving the north ramps to either the Day Rd Extension or East-West Arterial overcrossing. The ramps would be connected with collector/distributor roads.
 - Connecting to East-West Arterial would be harder to get approved, due to substandard spacing from Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) perspective between I-205 and the N. Wilsonville interchange. The Day Rd overcrossing would be the one most likely to be approved.
- People wanting to access I-5 from new development in the Stafford area had three options: use the Elligsen Rd interchange, use the Stafford interchange to access I-5 via I-205, or use 65th Ave to the Nyberg interchange in Tualatin.
- The East west corridor would be a principle arterial with very limited access points. Tonquin Rd, Grahams Ferry Rd and Day Rd would be more standard arterial streets with collector streets connected and placed according to County and City standards.
 - The local street grid system and circulation would be addressed through concept planning efforts. The Plan provided the backbone for the transportation system. Getting the line on the map would keep it from being precluded by land use choices.
- The proposed configuration moves toward a solution for the significant amount of traffic wanting to go to the coast without needing to go south first. The data clearly shows a strong connection from I-205 to Tualatin Sherwood Rd.
 - Without a direct extension of I-205, the East-West Concept would provide a parallel facility to carry east-west traffic, resulting in a huge improvement in traffic flow.

Commissioner Phelps was very impressed with the recommendations. The proposal involved more far reaching thinking than the I-5/99W Connector discussion and made more sense in how to move traffic. His biggest concerns had involved Kinsman Rd, which seemed to have been addressed. The impacts of 124th Ave extending south would still be an issue.

Chair Altman said he liked the Plan, noting it answered questions that had not been addressed earlier. The Plan focused on east-west circulation, which has always been a concern and a major issue to address for long-term circulation.

Chair Altman confirmed that the Planning Commission agreed with the recommended East-West Concept.

B. Transportation System Plan Policies (Mangle)

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, presented a Prezi diagram that depicted the Transportation System Plan (TSP) Planning Process, identifying how regional requirements and resources, the City's Comprehensive Plan and City Codes and Standards influenced the process, which would result in the updated TSP document and supporting appendices.

- The Comprehensive Plan involved many foundational documents now in place following many years of very good work done by the community. The vast majority of the goals and policies of the TSP policies reviewed at the last meeting came from these work efforts guided by the Commission.
- The goal was to create a TSP that addressed all the rapidly changing conditions on the city's periphery, including urban reserve areas and urban growth boundary (UGB) expansions, and integrated the City's individual modal plans into the transportation system, which was critical.
 - Implementation Measures, which were not included in the meeting packet, were often found in a Development Code requirement for new development or a Public Works Standard.
- Staff sought the Commission's input on the revisions made to the policy document.

Commissioner McGuire believed the Prezi presentation was an excellent briefing tool that put all the elements into context, especially for the public. Understanding how the different codes, regulations and planning documents relate to one another could be difficult. The diagram would also be a great tool to use in training new Planning Commissioners and DRB members.

Commissioner Phelps agreed, adding the small print could be challenging for some citizens.

Katie Mangle, Manager of Long-Range Planning, presented the Staff report, highlighting the changes made in response to the Commissioners' comments from the August meeting.

The Planning Commission and Staff discussed the TSP Draft Policies document, which was provided in the meeting packet. Key comments and discussion about the document's components were as follows with further revisions from the Commission as noted:

- Vision Statement: No changes.
- Goals: Attachment 1, Page 4 of 20. Three additional goals were added, derived from last month's discussion and Comprehensive Plan policies.
 - The added goals made the list more comprehensive as a vision and reflected the work done within the economic development strategy. All the policies should relate to the goals.
 - Specific terms should not be used in the last two lines of Goal 6, as new things tend to come about, like skateboards or the golf cart trend. The last two lines could be deleted.
 - Specific terms were removed from Goal 2, indicating that access would be integrated and no exceptions made when facilities were built.
 - In Goal 6, the purpose of the term, "balance" was questioned; it seemed overreaching.
 - The language was taken from a Comprehensive Plan goal; Staff would review it.
 - While transportation is mostly funded with gas tax, the TSP accounts for development driven transportation improvements, which are funded by private development. Given gas consumption, it was important not to over commit, thinking a revenue source was available when it was not.
 - Several suggestions for changing the language to eliminate "balance" were discussed, including, "...moving people *in order to avoid principal reliance on any one mode of transportation*".
 - Because America would always be car centric, using "avoid principal reliance" would not work.
 - "Balance" should remain. People would continue to be dependent on their cars, providing continued opportunities to elevate other transportation modes, the City should always try to balance other options collectively with vehicle use.
 - The language could get more specific within the policies.

- Staff agreed to wordsmith the different choices of “balance” and “avoid” and return with a suggestion.
- Goal 4 was too narrow; it addressed cost, but not funding, which was a gap. No goal discussed seeking adequate funding, which was the true challenge. The City needed to take a stance.
 - Adding the goal “Stable” could discuss the stability of the transportation system and need for continued funding. Cost effective was different from getting funds for new development or improvements.
 - A policy was needed that said the City is committed to working with other jurisdictions to promote adequate funding.
 - The Clackamas County TSP was also considering this issue, trying to find creative ways to fund road projects.
 - While the policies addressed funding, a goal statement was needed that addressed funding.
 - Chapter 6 of the TSP would address funding sources.
 - The last sentence of the Vision statement did not seem to fit, but could be used as goal language to address the concern.
- The Commission consented to adding the new goals. Staff would continue work on Goals 4 and 6.
- Figure 1 on Page 2 of 20: Chair Altman explained his intent regarding the flowchart, which stemmed from the discussion and confusion at last month’s meeting. Originally, the early Comprehensive Plan was a policy-only document and directed people to the Development Code, Public Work Standards, etc. Now, the City had a pile of various master plan documents that include goals, policies and implementation measures and morph the Comprehensive Plan with the working document, diluting the effectiveness of the Comprehensive Plan as a policy document. In addition, old master plans remain in place indefinitely, which also creates confusion.
 - The master plans were more Staff level working documents and the Comprehensive Plan contained all the policies and directed people to the master plans.
 - Many implementing measures are one-time actions, but are buried in the Comprehensive Plan and continue forever. These measures should be in a work plan. A majority of the implementation measures should not be in the TSP, but perhaps listed and referred to in the working documents.
 - After working through the goals and policies, the implementing measures should either direct development in the Development Code, Public Works Standard or other City administrative functions, like operations, budgeting, etc.
 - Implementation measures are not part of tonight’s discussion. The Commission would work through the policy structure to arrive at consensus on the overall policy direction. That list of policies would then determine how staff refines the implementation measures..
 - Added comments were as follows:
 - The diagram seemed to need another line to indicate what happens to the other master plans. The TSP was similar to the Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan, although much of that plan was in the TSP, just not all the details. The flow from this to the other master plans should be indicated.
 - The outputs from the TSP goals and policy discussion have not been completely determined yet. The Prezi diagram showed the master plans as appendices, which was one way to do it. Some implementation measures could end up in the TSP as action items within specific chapters or project areas. Some implementation measures were Code amendments and belonged in the work plan.
 - It was important to agree on the policy framework before addressing the implementation measures, which are much more detailed, which had created some confusion.
 - Once adopted, the TSP should direct that the master plans be edited/revised to only be working documents, because essentially the Commission was consolidating the collective policies and goals into the TSP, which is a primary element of the Comprehensive Plan. The master plans were more for the City to work with on an ongoing basis.
 - Doing so would mean massive work for Staff, the Commission or whomever.

- The various plans must be coordinated and maintained, and changes should not be made to serve one's own purpose. The French Prairie Bridge was removed from the Old Town Master Plan because it was thought to be in the TSP and should not be in the neighborhood plan. Yet, the bridge project was a critical part of the neighborhood. The master plans should not be tinkered with.
- Currently, the implementing link was being lost, no clear line existed from the goal to all the implementing pieces because they were spread into all the other master plans.
- The role of the numerous master plans was not clear and the flowchart was created to better explain the relationship between the TSP, and incorporation of its goals and policies into the master plans.
- Attachment 2
 - Policy 10: Gaps and dead ends are a problem in the existing transportation system and City policy should encourage developers to eliminate gaps and dead ends not only for new development, but also for existing infrastructure that was not functional.
 - Add language to Line 2 stating, "to improve access, *fill gaps in the existing system*, serve new development, and..." It was suggested that *and redevelopment* be inserted after "new development"
 - Policy 17 was not consistent with Policy 17 on Attachment 3 because this policy was split into Policies 17 and 18 in Attachment 3, also resulting in a different number of polices between Attachments 2 and 3.
 - The term, "etc" should not be used.
 - Policy 28: Include a statement about alternative fuels for the SMART system, which related to the livability goal.
 - Policy 29: Correct typo, deleting "adopt standards for" in first line.
 - The breakout of subcategories was not a big issue, but did break the flow and lead toward redundancy. One system design policy was reworted but repeated in another category, such as transportation management or connectivity.
- Attachment 3: The Commission reviewed the changes between the existing and proposed policies, noting needed revisions and providing additional comments as follows:
 - Attachment 3 should be included in the TSP, perhaps as an appendix, to show how the Commission transitioned to the newly adopted polices. Having the history of the changes being made would be helpful to future Commissioners, Staff, etc.
 - Policy 2: No changes. Concern was expressed about the use of "balances," which could be subjective.
 - In this context, "balances" helped ensure that development and land use potential are considered as well as transportation needs. Development, development impacts, transportation, and circulation must all be considered at the same time, as being done with Basalt Creek.
 - The Commission agreed balance worked in this context.
 - Policy 3: Discussion regarded how to include the earlier comment about identifying SMART in Policy 28, Attachment 2. "Vehicles" was a broad term that did not preclude public transit or school busses. Rather than naming specifics, a concern discussed earlier, a more general policy to support alternative fuels should be used. Originally, the policy seemed to apply to private vehicles.
 - Concerns were expressed about the City's costs given that "provide" was used. However, the City would provide infrastructure with regard to SMART vehicles and provided charging station in the City Hall parking lot. The language also stated, "Provide or support".
 - The Commission agreed to amend the language to state, "...needed to support ~~vehicles that~~ *the* use alternative fuels." Eliminating "vehicles" made the policy all encompassing.
 - Policy 5 was too long and too detailed. The goal was LOS D, yet the policy included exceptions.
 - Originally, the policy had been amended after a long discussion to enable City Council to lower the LOS standard through the Wilsonville Rd interchange.
 - This policy was editing what was already in the Development Code. Some standards need to be in the TSP, but do not necessarily belong in the policies.
 - The language could be edited/shortened to still require LOS D and allow City Council to change the performance standard when Council deemed it necessary.

- The detail in the existing adopted policy should be moved elsewhere so to keep from eliminating the result of the previous lengthy discussion that amended the policy. Retaining Attachment 3 in the TSP as a reference was important.
- Policy portions of the TSP should direct its implementation and not be buried in the Comprehensive Plan.
- Policy 6: Amend language to state, “~~Evaluate and m~~Minimize and *mitigate*...”
- Policy 7: Stormwater management is not the same as LID, which should be added to make the policy more encompassing.
 - This policy connected to the Stormwater Management Plan because transportation project designs consider the impact on storm drainage, etc., and made the system multifunctional.
- A list of acronyms was needed in the document.
- Policy 8: “Identify targets and improvements” seemed like an implementation measure; the policy seemed more detailed than others did.
 - The idea was to retain the policy statements and move implementation actions where they belong.
 - Changes would be made to simplify or move the last part about identifying targets elsewhere.
- Policy 9: No changes. Concerns about filling gaps in the existing system were addressed in Policy 10; the implementation measures addressed details regarding development and redevelopment. The concept of filling gaps in the system was not lost as Policy 10 was the needed policy link for the implementation measure(s).
- Policy 10: Include language added to Policy 10 in Attachment 2, “*fill gaps in the existing system,*”
- Policy 11: The proposed and existing language did not seem related. The proposed language was good, but should perhaps be separate. Staff would research how the inconsistency occurred.
- Policy 14 regarded active management, acknowledging that parking is a system that needs to be managed just like any part of the transportation system. Parking is expensive and takes up land, a scarce resource. The City needed to discuss parking, especially as Town Center redeveloped. While trends were trying to reduce parking ratios, this policy did not drive performance standards/outcomes.
 - The policy could be used to drive outcomes if used as a tool by those wanting to reduce parking ratios. The document should acknowledge that the policy was not setting a goal for parking counts in development applications, but discussing management plans so the City could encourage business owners and vehicle users to minimize their uses.
 - The policy was a requirement of the Regional Functional Plan (RFP), which had a specific list with regard to parking to ensure the City was encouraging more walking in these areas than parking and driving.
 - The phrase, “minimize single-use auto parking” was bothersome.
 - The policy needed more depth to be complete. It did not reflect the multimodal component the general goals tried to provide. The City should be managing parking to encourage alternate modes, but no qualifier stated the City wanted to ensure that parking was adequate.
 - The City also must balance new development with parking and other mode choices to allow for more development while also facilitating travel for citizens.
 - The City would still require meeting parking requirements for new development applications, but would also work with property owners to develop parking management plans to reduce parking. Both functions would still exist.
 - The City was required to develop the plan, which would include enforcing parking ratios, but also specifying users for certain parking lots, for instance.
 - On the other hand, the management plan should consider alternative modes and not preclude less parking in Town Center. Developers should not always have to meet the requirement, but have flexibility for their applications to balance less parking with alternative modes.
 - A good balanced plan is needed; no one wants to see a sea of cars or a developer kill business due to inadequate parking.

- Developers would latch on to “minimize single-use parking” and build their project with no parking, claiming that the City’s goal had been met.
 - The policy was not the only basis for a decision and would not be an approval criterion for an application. The policy should drive any Code amendments that might involve approval criteria.
- The DRB would determine through a public process whether a lower parking standard is appropriate to meet all the goals. The Commission did not want to provide a mechanism to side step the public process used when determining whether a lower parking standard was appropriate.
 - Detailed discussion now would help minimize lengthy discussions at DRB, where parking is a big issue.
- The policy should acknowledge that approval criteria still need to be fulfilled or a waiver granted in order to get around the criteria, which would cover the gaps.
 - Any waivers must address the alternative modes. How would the developer accommodate access to the building if parking is being reduced?
- Qualifiers were needed. What are the qualifiers for getting a management plan? The City could develop a plan, but it would not meet anyone’s needs.
 - Technically, the City is supposed to do the management plan and adopt it into the TSP. The goal was to create a policy that directs the City to do so when it is right for Wilsonville and resources are available. It was important to have a parking management plan that was local, and that would be meaningful to Town Center.
- How to justify a waiver was missing from the policy flow to the Development Code. The existing Code leads back to the goals and objectives of the Planned Development section, which does not discuss parking management plans at all.
- The policy needed to inform what was needed in a parking management plan and in the Code. What is the City trying to accomplish by managing parking?
 - The City wants to accommodate development with adequate parking and promote alternative multi modal options, none of which was included yet.
- Because of the opportunity that exists, Town Center should be prioritized for redevelopment. The City must be thoughtful about how to continue the vitality of Town Center given all the development on the other side of town. It was important to elevate Town Center in the TSP because so much of it was parking lot.
- Providing predictability for those coming to the City with applications about what is expected to get through the process is also important.
 - Policy is supposed to provide guidance and direction.
- Policy 16: The policy seemed a bit redundant to Policy 15. The goal was to develop connectivity.
 - Strike “if needed”; the language was more fitting for an implementation measure. The need for protected street crossings would be evaluated, regardless. How the crossings were installed would be an implementing piece.
- Policies 17 and 18: As discussed under Attachment 2, Staff would review splitting/separation of the policies and address the use of “etc.”
- Policy 19: No changes. Adding the word, “funding” was discussed; however, funding was indirectly addressed. “Actively encouraging” provided the important policy direction that was missing before.
- Policy 20: Included under “Coordination” because the Aurora Airport is outside the City’s jurisdiction
 - The airport agreed to the policies adopted by City Council that recognize the need to coexist.
 - The Economic Development Strategy identified the airport as a vital component of the transportation system that supports economic development, particularly corporate mobility
 - The language should be less tentative; more positive.
 - Council’s policies/criteria and the economic development component should be reflected in the TSP, along with the need to address neighborhood impact issues. The policy should support work that has already been done.
- Policy 21: No changes. Use of the word “requiring” was briefly discussed.

- Policy 22: No changes. Regulations for the Willamette River Greenway regarding access to the river were discussed. Staff would research how the laws might affect public access.
 - The policy addressed maintaining the two, City-owned, river accesses, not increasing access.
 - Greenway provisions in the Comprehensive Plan discuss promoting public river access.
 - The new added language resulted from material received from the property owners at Wilsonville Concrete who have discussed developing a port(s) on the Willamette River to use the river for more freight distribution, including garbage. The property owners provided a lot of research and have been coordinating with the City Attorney’s office. This was the last undeveloped parcel of riverfront in the current city limits.
 - The site is near the intake for the water system.
- Policy 23: No Change. The policy acknowledges that the railroad is part of the transportation system and is valuable for businesses. It also reminds Staff to keep rail in the conversation when development occurs near a railroad line.
 - The Economic Development Strategy discussed promoting more use of the railroad.
 - Implementation could involve rebuilding old systems and crossings, development that encourages building docks along the railroad lines, ensuring road crossings that do not limit railway speeds unnecessarily, etc.
- Policy 26: Place a period after “options” and delete the rest of the sentence, which would be addressed via implementation.
- Policy 28: No change to the proposed policy. The existing policy should state, “...citizen *involvement*.”
- Policy 29: Include alternative fuels as this was in the Public Transit section.
- Policy 30: No changes. However, the use of “single-occupant automobile” was troubling to some.
- Safe Routes to Schools should be included, possibly as its own policy, within the document. Staff would determine where to include it.
- Policy 33: No changes, but place as the first policy within the Active Transportation: Pedestrians and Bicyclists section.
- Policy 34: No changes. The policy seemed redundant to Policy 16, which was in a different category.
- Policy 35: The policy was confusing, and the proposed and existing policies did not seem equal. Local and regional participation was dropped and the policy mixed demand management with alternative fuels.
 - Trip reduction strategies are the equivalent of transportation demand management.
 - The policy seemed redundant as the concepts were addressed in other areas.
 - The existing policy seemed to be more active in participating as a local and regional partner or collaborator.
- Policy 37: No Changes. Concerns were expressed about including qualifiers in a policy, which reduces a policy’s value.
 - The policy addressed the Dolan requirement, while allowing for deal making should needed improvements exceed the Dolan requirement and the City decided to contribute toward those improvements due to the public benefit.
- Policy 39: No changes. Text of the proposed policy should not be red; no changes were made to the existing policy.
- The previously proposed new policy on Page 20 of 20 was deleted because “high levels” was subjective and the concept was already required by the Development Code.

Ms. Mangle said she would return with the entire TSP Update for the Commission’s review. The Draft Policies would be included as a separate chapter of the TSP.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2012 Planning Commission Work Program

Mr. Neamtzu noted that an October 1 joint work session was scheduled for 5:00 p.m. with City Council. Dinner would be provided. Staff was working to develop a more comprehensive work program that incorporated some of the big planning items expected in the next few years, like UGB expansions, Frog Pond, etc. The work program would be emailed to the Commissioners. Key topics of discussion at the meeting with Council would be talking about whether Planning Commission tasks would be developed from the top down or from the bottom up, the role of the Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI), and the Planning Commission work program.

B. Commissioners' Comments

Commissioner Phelps noted that lights at Boones Ferry Rd and 95th Ave would need to be recalibrated following the construction due to heavy back ups occurring on the right turn lane off the interstate ramp trying to get into the left turn lane from Boones Ferry Road to 95th Ave. It was an unsafe situation.

Commissioner Hurley inquired whether Council had discussed adding fluoride to the water system.

- Mr. Neamtzu replied the topic had come up at Council. Adding fluoride would require capital improvements. Nothing related to adding fluoride was included in the Water System Master Plan.

Chair Altman stated that the Wilsonville Road Interchange was the best-looking interchange in the state.

VIII. CITY STAFF COMMENTS

Mr. Neamtzu announced that "Beauty and the Bridge" is scheduled October 7 to celebrate the new interchange. Information regarding the event was provided to the Commissioners.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Altman adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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