



**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 8, 2012
6:00 P.M.**

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

Approved
September 12, 2012,
with correction to
members who were
absent.

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Altman called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

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

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

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

III. INTRODUCTION OF NEW LONG-RANGE PLANNING MANAGER, KATIE MANGLE

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, introduced Katie Mangle and Nancy Kraushaar, the newest members to join City Staff, to the Planning Commission.

Nancy Kraushaar, Community Development Director, said she is a civil engineer with experience working as a consultant and then as an urban renewal project manager, city engineer and public works director in Oregon City. She added she is passionate about the engineering involved with planning cities, but maintenance is important to her as well. She expressed excitement about getting to know Wilsonville, where livability and aesthetics appeared to be important to the community. She is excited to move the Community Development Department forward and is happy to be part of the exciting things to be done. As a Tualatin resident, she was familiar with what Wilsonville offers, having come for its services, shopping, great parks, and bike trails.

Katie Mangle, Long Range Planning Manager, said she had been the Planning Director for the City of Milwaukie for the last six and a half years. She looks forward to be working with the Planning Commission and City Staff and being able to focus on long range planning and dive into project work after having to manage so many planning roles in Milwaukie. She has been working in the Portland region for about 15 years, which included work on the commuter rail project in its design phase. She noted she is believer in regionalism and the ways of coordination and thinking ahead. She witnessed a lot of urban sprawl taking over farmlands in her home state of Colorado, which motivated her to get into planning. She also believes in local solutions. She asked that the Commission tell her what she needs to know about the Wilsonville community.

The Commissioners introduced themselves to Ms. Kraushaar and Ms. Mangle, briefly sharing their civic and work experiences and a little about themselves.

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

V. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, reported no regular City Council meeting was held on July 16, only an extended work session where the following items were discussed:

- City Engineering Staff gave a presentation on rectangular rapid-fire beacons (RRFBs), which are similar to existing in-ground lights at pedestrian crosswalks. This new device is being utilized in different parts of the country and is very cost effective compared to the in-ground systems.
 - The City intended to use RRFBs at the OIT/Pioneer Pacific crossing at Parkway Ave. The presentation updated City Council about the RRFB product, prices, and on the proposed crossing.
- Safe Routes to School Open House at the Lowrie Primary District was also discussed. Staff had sent a mailer to every house in the school district to invite area residents to a presentation about the new safe routes. A map showing signs and crosswalks was presented, and vegetation has been trimmed to allow for better sightlines. The City's partnership with the school district has been exciting working to get Lowrie Primary connected to the rest of the city so children could walk safely to the new school. Staff was building a large model to give to the school to teach children how to walk on a roundabout, the best way to cross and make travel movements. A pancake breakfast was scheduled for August 24, 7:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.
 - Interim City Engineer Steve Adams was fine-tuning the map, and could send it to the principal to distribute to the families.
 - He reminded that Safe Routes are the walking and bicycling routes from neighborhoods to facilities, and have been part of the Transportation System Plan (TSP) discussion. Projects in the draft TSP would help improve bicycle circulation on school sites.
- Council also heard a detailed presentation of the Water System Master Plan. That public hearing was scheduled at City Council for August 20, 2012. The ordinance was being prepared and the packet would be out this week.
- The Chamber of Commerce audit, which was covered in the press, was also discussed at length.

Chair Altman reported the joint work session held with City Council on August 7, 2012 regarding the Economic Development Strategy Plan was good. There seemed to be consensus about the Plan drafted from the Advisory Committee. Various priorities were discussed, as well as how to proceed; however, nothing new came out of the discussion.

- The Economic Development Strategy Plan would be presented to City Council on August 20 with a resolution to adopt the strategy as it is drafted. This included such immediate action items as evaluating and dealing with incentives, and assessing the land supply in relation to what various business categories need. The base information from these items was needed to inform the other action items and was somewhat of an extension of the updated Economic Opportunity Analysis (EOA).
- After August 20, Staff would develop a more detailed work program that would include the city manager's assessment of existing capacity within the budget and staffing for this year.

VI. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

The July 11, 2012 Planning Commission Minutes were approved 4 to 0 to 1 as presented with Commissioner Dvorak abstaining.

VII. WORK SESSIONS

A. Transportation System Plan Policies

Chair Altman distributed a three-page handout dated August 8, 2012 that outlined his comments and concerns regarding the draft Transportation System Plan (TSP) Policies.

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, explained the material before the Commission was a compilation of all of the policies from various City master planning documents, including the Comprehensive Plan, Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, Transit Plan, Interchange Area Management Plan and the 2003 Transportation System Plan, which took almost seven years to develop and adopt.

- As those various individual modal plans and visions were compiled into one document, Staff and the consultants saw an opportunity to streamline some of the material, as well as implement the regulations required as part of the TSP update that related to the Metro's Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP). While numerous, most of the strikethroughs and additions shown were relatively minor because a lot of redundancy existed within each individual plan.
- Work was continuing behind the scenes on the fiscally constrained list to understand the City's cash flow and complete the financial analysis, which would be the next big piece of work presented to the Commission.
- He invited the Commissioners to send comments in writing if necessary, adding he would brief Commissioners Levit and Phelps. More time could be spent discussing the TSP in September if there was not enough time at this meeting.
- He confirmed the TSP would be discussed and reviewed by the Commission in pieces, providing the Commission opportunity for feedback as the public process progressed. A final, consolidated draft would be presented for review toward the end of the process. This was just the beginning of the conversation that would carry through to adoption of the master document.
- Consolidating the policies was a different approach than what has been done in the past. The reason for that new approach would be described.

Darci Rudzinski, AICP, Angelo Planning Group, confirmed the Wilsonville Transportation System Plan Update – DRAFT TSP Policies (Task 6.5) Technical Memorandum (Policies Memo) was just one piece of the TSP document. The memorandum was modeled after and took the format of the Comprehensive Plan chapter on transportation with all the policies coming from the City's different adopted documents. One objective of the TSP update was to bring all the transportation policies into one document. Housing those policies in different documents was fine, but the point was to eliminate any redundancies between documents, address any inconsistencies, and ensure the policies were all relevant and up to date. The memorandum would become a chapter of the TSP and could be adopted as policies for the Comprehensive Plan Transportation Chapter.

She briefly reviewed the memorandum, describing the purpose and process for the policies and implementation measures, and how they related to each other within the document. Her key additional comments included:

- As requested, a new aspirational vision statement was created to articulate the City's overarching vision.
- The goal of the new policies and implementation measures was to implement the programs and projects coming forward as part of the TSP update as recommendations the Commission would consider in the fall, and the new policies should reflect those.
- The consultants were charged with ensuring the TSP was consistent with the RTFP, which was handed out and essentially considered the code for implementing Metro's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Metro staff also provided a checklist of what must be considered from a regional standpoint when cities update their TSP. These documents were used as a guideline to address certain parts of the City's TSP.
- The draft document also included references about where the policies originated in the Comprehensive Plan. The highlighted strikeout version showed both new and existing language with new language underlined. Language that was outdated, redundant or just needed tweaking was struck through.

- Additionally, the document noted what suggested language came from a regional perspective and how it was tweaked to be consistent with a RTFP requirement.
- Many of the new policies came from the Technical Memorandum regarding Solutions Analysis and Proposed Funding Program (Task 6.4), which looked at all modes of transportation, including freight and transit and made specific recommendations. This technical memorandum was produced by DKS & Associates as part of the TSP update. Those recommendations were incorporated into the language as new policies or revisions to the City's existing policies.
 - Mr. Neamtzu clarified that technical memorandum was still being worked on, but was the next one to be discussed. That document included funding and the project lists, which would become the capital program going forward.
- She clarified the point was that all of the moving parts and pieces, everything would need to be reconciled and consistent as the Commission headed toward the implementation phase of the TSP update. The programmatic and project recommendations would need to be consistent with the City's policy framework to have policies to support the TSP's future actions.
 - Regulatory language changes to the Development Code would be recommended and needed to be supported by the policies being discussed at this meeting. Those changes had not been presented, so if a policy seemed out of context, the policy framework would be reconsidered to ensure that the Commission's aspirations were captured in the TSP projects and programs and carried forward through the Development Code. Taking this piece out of context was necessary to absorb the project in bite-sized chunks.
- The Commission had discussed having transportation goals that were multi-modal, comprehensive and not segregated by transportation type to provide a safe and efficient system for all transportation modes. The four overarching goals were listed at the top of Page 2 of 32 of the Staff report.
- From the overarching goals came more than 40 policies, so subheadings were suggested to break the policies up and highlight the important parts. She briefly noted the policy subheadings, noting that Land Development Coordination policies were oriented toward the City's expectations of developers who create new jobs and new housing to help the City make connections, provide transit service, etc.
- As noted, a lot of redundancy existed in the language. It might sound like some policies say the same thing, but she advised the Commissioners to consider the policy in light of the heading it was under because the language might be a bit different, depending on what objective the policy was trying to accomplish.

Comments and discussion from the Commission regarding the Policies Memo in general with clarifications by Staff and the consultants; Ms. Rudzinski, and Brad Coy and Carl Springer of DKS Associates, was as follows:

- The subcategories made the policies easier to sort out, but some redundancy still existed on some of them; wherever that could be limited was good.
- One concern regarded the Level of Service (LOS) standard and its affect on connectivity. LOS tended to drive everything, so capacity has been added at the sacrifice of connectivity to maintain LOS. Since Wilsonville Rd now extends from city limits to city limits and new capacity has been achieved with the improved interchange, the policy should focus primarily on connectivity rather than just LOS for the next Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).
- Knowing whether the changes made were simply a redundancy rewrite or affected other sections in the document would be helpful.
- Ms. Rudzinski clarified the City is required to consider the 'shall' statements of the RTFP and Clackamas Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Plan and work toward compliance. Many jurisdictions have relatively new TSPs. Some were being updated specifically for compliance with the RTFP. Jurisdictions are also expected to consider the new direction of the 2035 Plan and address those issues. Funding was also a consideration. In order to be eligible for Metro funding and participation in projects, jurisdictions must show they have made an effort to try to address these issues.

- Some of the ‘shall’ statements were qualitative, not quantitative, which creates issues when combined with ‘shall’ demands.
 - Ms. Mangle explained cities are required to comply within two years after a new regional policy, such as the RTP, is adopted. However, many different types of requirements exist, some relate to regional corridors and routes that must be coordinated, others regard street design, etc. so some choices exist amongst the different kinds of requirements.
 - Some of the more broad-based regulations are best professional practices where Metro has already done some of the research so cities do not have to start from scratch, which could be great. Further discussion would address any troubling areas.
- With regard to the redundancy of including Metro’s regional plan verbiage in the City’s TSP, the City must be able to explain how compliance is being met and that the requirements are included in the Code, Policy or TSP. It did not need to be a carbon copy; the City could use a local approach to being compliant, which was noted in a few different places. No efforts were being duplicated because while the verbiage must be included in the TSP, Metro does not make any local decisions. Metro would review what the Commission recommends and then make comments.
- If the City decided not to comply, there would be two major ramifications:
 - Metro controls all of the federal money that comes into the region. Without compliance, the City would not receive that funding.
 - Metro also has the authority to appeal and reverse any land use decision that relied on Code that is non-compliant with the region.
- The relationship between Metro and the City is collaborative, which was why they are in constant contact in the Plan development. The City could propose local solutions and provide rationale to support any solutions that veer from the RTFP but that work for the local community.
- Would citing the new policies from the RTFP be construed as a requirement or guideline?
 - Many of the policies are not that far off from what the City was already doing.
 - Citing the policies was an exercise of trying to demonstrate compliance by tracking how the City was getting there. Many of the policies involved just changing the language and updating terminology; very few citations from the Regional Plan were new, most were modifications.
 - The underlined ~~strikeout~~ Policy Memo version (in the meeting packet) clearly indicates where the new policies are located. One reason for such an emphasis on TSP updates around the region is because of the adoption of the 2035 RTP.
 - The RTP does not undermine any local aspirations, connectivity plans or solutions; the TSP was still Wilsonville’s Plan. Incorporating RTP policies would ensure the City was part of region and not proposing anything that negated regional plans.
- Brad Coy, DKS Associates explained that Clackamas County operates and manages the City’s traffic signals, and some projects in the Clackamas County ITS benefit Wilsonville Rd and possibly Elligsen Rd that involve installing fiber, which allows for communication between the signals and improved coordination and operations. Policies regarding the ITS recognize the coordination needed with Clackamas County.
- Mr. Neamtzu noted ODOT has some expectations regarding the TSP update as they committed \$175,000 to the project. No City funds were involved. A scope of work detailed the commitments the City made in order to meet Goal 12 of the ODOT Transportation Growth Management (TGM) Program.

The Commission, consultants, and Staff discussed the topical headings of the Policies Memo with the following key discussion points:

- Vision Statement

- The Vision Statement should be future-oriented and aspirational; focusing on what the City was trying to maintain and to create, not on what had already been created. The statement should be forward looking, rather than retroactive.
- Using only the second sentence and changing its verb tense was suggested.
- Changing the verb tenses would provide consistency with how the Economic Development Strategy is framed.
- Like the Economic Development Strategy, the vision statement is a declaration of the desired outcome, but also of what the City was currently doing and what the City had been doing. The current system has been collaboratively built, emphasizing the City is not alone and that the system should be maintained.
- Connectivity should be a major focus.
- Transportation System Design
 - Concerns about LOS regarded more about the implementing side when building the capital improvement policy. Having LOS as a design standard is functional, but if the objective is to maximize efficient use of the system, LOS D actually leaves reserve capacity at peak hour, which is not maximizing the use of the system. The system should be maxed out at peak hour and work relatively well the rest of the day.
 - There needs to be a way to articulate the balance between connectivity and not putting all of the City's resources toward solving LOS problems. With the connectivity policies, there is a basis but no link between system design and the policy to provide connectivity.
 - Priorities mandate the addition of capacity over connectivity; something else was needed to allow/require the City to do something different.
 - The gaps analysis indicated the lack of connectivity, so the basis existed, but a policy structure is needed to provide the framework for making even short-term changes within the CIP.
 - Connectivity would address some LOS issues and would add another element to add or maintain capacity if an alternate route exists.
 - Another concern about LOS was the never ending widening of roads.
 - Wilsonville Rd. was intentionally held at three lanes to maintain the residential character as it extends into the community. If the system is designed solely on LOS, some day Wilsonville Rd will be five lanes wide outside of the interchange area. Was this something the community wanted?
 - The policy could say that if capacity is a concern, options like connecting roadways to reduce trips through problem areas, or transit, pedestrian and bicycle options should be considered before moving toward widening roads or other motor vehicle options.
 - The policy pieces seem to exist, but without being tied to anything related to system design, the connectivity measures would be lost.
 - For example, the original idea in the 1980 TSP of having concentric loops was lost because the idea was not anchored in the policy structure and then LOS began driving the system.
 - The concern seemed to be that the LOS D forces design choices that may not be the right standard, and there needed to be a way to build in policy backbone to allow for more discussion later.
 - The LOS was originally a CIP scheduling tool. Scheduling would begin at D level to allow time for items to get in the queue and get built to maintain capacity. Then, a state law was passed requiring the City to have clear and objective standards, and LOS became that standard.
 - The implications of having LOS as the permit standard were never thought through. The City still needs a permit guide, but it also needs some direction about alternative choices.
 - Perhaps language could be added about examining alternative choices, because changing the standard seemed to be a significant shift.

- Language could simply state that when LOS D is reached, the analysis should consider other connectivity routes or options to alleviate capacity issues.
- Mr. Neamtzu explained the City's concurrency policy was one of the fundamental underpinnings of why the community operates as it does and is tied closely to the quality of life; how people get around town, etc.; there needs to be a strong relationship there.
 - It seemed that a more holistic approach was being suggested. More thought needed to go into balancing mode choices. Origin and destination information was needed to consider where cars travel. Staff was not predicting seven lanes for the growth horizon. The City should go back to the gaps and deficiencies memo that showed a well-operating system over the planning horizon.
 - The TSP project list includes a lot of connectivity and widening projects, a couple intersection projects and several ITS management pieces to maximize the efficiency of the existing system. Less expensive projects should be first priority, like left-hand turn improvements that allow for additional capacity within the existing system. Massive projects should not be pursued just because of a standard.
- Mr. Coy noted the City could be doing things that improve the system without building capacity, like transportation demand management. The City has already agreements with many larger employers to have their shifts earlier in the day so traffic demands are lessened on critical parts of the system during peak hours.
 - Including bicycle and pedestrian safety and connectivity as a high priority would allow bike and pedestrian commuters to be more likely to travel along major routes other than those with sidewalks. This would reduce some of the motor vehicle needs.
 - Before concentrating on capacity, be sure to have many different connectivity options so that huge roads are not necessary. Big roads can create barriers to travel and add congestion through some areas. This was how the region is directing things now. Implementation is the key issue.
 - LOS provides some concrete quantitative measurements, which makes it very valuable. Additional quantitative measures in the policy would add cost as additional data would need to be collected.
 - By having master plans in place, the City is letting developers know they will be responsible for building certain facilities that run through their property, such as pedestrian or bicycle paths, in addition to mitigating for LOS.
 - The City needs to continue to work toward items in the master plan to complete the system while also working towards LOS.
 - The City also had System Development Charges (SDCs). The City put a lot of money into the Wilsonville Road Interchange because money had been collected from developers over time. State law no longer precludes cities from building bicycle projects. In the past, only motor vehicle roadway capacity could be built.
- The issue was that LOS easiest to measure. This process was introducing a wide array of performance measures regarding connectivity, etc that are difficult to measure and to exact at the time of development.
- The key is to have choices about different kinds of solutions during the development review stage. Until now, because of the concurrency law, the City's choices have focused on increasing capacity.
 - There needed to be a way to have tradeoffs or options, not just require a developer to build a second left turn lane on an intersection that was busy only one or two hours a day. Perhaps a trail could be an option that would be used more consistently. Other options could provide safety benefits, rather than just reducing one's time at a traffic signal.
 - While multiple options were discussed in the policies, they were not tied in to guide development permitting as alternatives or considerations in addition to the LOS. The

LOS has worked well as a standard, but if nothing were added, the City would not achieve the system it really wanted.

- Another concern is that LOS guides capital improvements planning, which is outside of development review, but works to complete the systems that development does not provide.

The policy needed to be tweaked so that a thread runs through every subcategory that would be considered as part of the package.

- Ms. Rudzinski believed policy language about the idea of performance measures and tradeoffs, and the City developing its system not solely based on capacity could probably be included in an implementation measure under Policy 2 (page 3 of 32).
- Policy 1, Implementation Measure X.a. (page 3 of 32);
 - The second half of the sentence seemed to be an opinion-weighted statement, implying that people coming to Wilsonville from other parts of the metro area could not do so from a single-occupant vehicle.
 - Ms. Mangle clarified the statement was intended to be the opposite of a heavy-handed approach and say that in designing a thorough system, the City provides people with choices with regard to transportation options.
 - A substantial number of people travel in single-occupant vehicles for work, so choices do need to be provided. However, the statement is exclusive, not inclusive as it implies that single-occupancy vehicles are a negative option. The statement excludes one portion of all road users.
 - Actually, the statement implies that opportunities exist so people do not need to use their cars by themselves, which is why connectivity and alternative modes of transportation were being discussed.
 - Increased traffic is a concern and is generally caused by cars.
 - Accessibility and diversity are referred to in the rest of the document, but excluding single-occupancy use vehicles was not inclusive.
 - Opinion-weighted statements were problematic throughout the document. One troubling aspect was the number of times bicycle is used and how infrequently automobile is used.
 - However, although the document did imply an opinion, it did not seem to be overly exclusive. It was not problematic to announce an aspiration encouraging people to limit the number of single-occupant vehicles.
 - Carl Springer, DKS Associates stated that work trips are less than a quarter of the trips in the system, which is designed to handle all kinds of trips. The idea is that people have options to take alternate routes and modes of transportation.
 - The first half of the statement reflects that idea; the second half was not discussing choice, it implied that Wilsonville, as a city, did not think using single-occupancy vehicles was right. Leaving it as a choice for no matter the number of people that was fine.
 - Overall, the City should be trying to reduce emissions and look for alternative modes of transportation. This statement would also build in a performance measure for this particular implementation piece.
 - A table in the RTP addressed the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. The State of Oregon has a statutory requirement to reduce green house gas emissions. The impacts associated with different modes of transportation can be calculated.
 - At this time, the City was not technically under a mandate by the State to reduce emissions yet, however the State and the region were already under the mandate, and the City would be soon. From a policy perspective, the City would have to consider vehicle miles, travel modes, and single-occupancy vehicles in its emission portfolio.

- The Commissioners discussed their differing philosophical opinions about the statement. Although the statement was being interpreted differently, the goal was to provide facilities so citizens have choices and can make decisions about what to do.
- Mr. Neamtzu stated Staff had heard the discussion points and would consider the language.
- Chair Altman noted that in his handout he commented that he did not like BMT as a measure.
- Transportation System Design, Implementation Measure X.g (Page 4 of 32). The document needed to define green street and complete street.
- Policy 6, Implementation Measure X.a, (Page 5 of 32) the last sentence might be missing the word “with”. Another typo was noted in Chair Altman’s handout.
 - Commissioners agreed to submit any further typo or grammatical corrections to Staff in writing.
- Policy 4 (Page 5 of 32) should include verbiage that allows for future technology that no one currently knows about. If the City was being supportive to the businesses, the businesses should decide what they want the City to help them facilitate, whether it was CNG, electric or hydrogen. The implementation measure seemed to be incomplete.
- Connectivity Policy 11 (page 6 of 32)
 - Implementation Measure X.a. “Identified destinations” refers to activity centers, schools, employment, etc., and should be defined in the document.
- Transportation System Management Policy 15 (page 7 of 32):
 - Implementation Measures X.c and X.d. Parking management should be linked to the use, particularly in the Town Center. While discussing the Economic Development Strategy, potential mixed uses around the WES Station were suggested. Town Center is across the freeway and the City was not linking those two places very well.
 - In terms of connectivity and the overall strategy, parking management has to do with the mix of uses and how the space works, but also the circulation system for both transit and pedestrians. Town Center is horrific for pedestrian circulation.
 - The focus of these two measures was too narrow and needed to be more system wide.
 - The parking management plan would address pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular circulation within Town Center parking lot, as well as the needs of the existing or planned uses.
 - More specificity and direction could be added as far as what the Town Center parking management plan should consider, such as an inventory, pedestrian pathways, transit circulation; the entire connectivity issue.
 - The City would be missing something long term if connections between Town Center and the WES Station were not seriously considered.
 - Adding a linkage between Town Center and the WES Station did not involve system management, and would probably be addressed elsewhere, which was why the statement was hard to deal with in this document. The statement seemed to be providing aspirations for what the City wants to do with another part of the City’s Code or Plan.
 - Many people in the commercial realm have indicated they would like garages or multi-level parking to be considered in Town Center. The TSP might not be the place to make these announcements and request that these types of decisions be made.
 - This implementation measure sets the City up for a refinement plan to the TSP and was instructive about what the City believes is needed. The region is having jurisdictions look at parking and land use, and solutions to using precious land within UGB efficiently, so this measure was in line with that regional direction. Metro was working to develop tools to show jurisdictions how these things are possible.
 - The implementation measure is about planning for new development. If Town Center redevelops, the City would not want a sea of parking. Parking is a scarce resource and is expensive to provide. Therefore, parking management should be defined. The measure essentially states that the City should plan for parking management in the WES Station and

Town Center areas. Nothing was triggered by the measure, and the City was not required by Metro to do it one way or another at this time.

- The implementation measures implies that the City is going to do it, not just think about building it into a long-range plan. How could the City complete a parking management plan in a vacuum? It seemed to be the wrong place to start talking about that.
- Changing “prepare” and “adopt” to “consider” in both implementation measures might work to alleviate concerns about it being a mandate.
- The Development Code already implements the parking standards and pedestrian pathways, so links within these policies might not be necessary. Wilsonville already complied with Metro’s parking policies. This policy acknowledged that Wilsonville was looking at parking more closely and would plan accordingly. It was a refinement to the TSP and a more detailed look at a specific area of the transportation system.
- The Commission wants the TSP to give clear and specific direction. Both areas would be impacted by future growth, particularly Town Center with the economic development strategy. It made sense to call that out in the TSP to set the City up for future steps.
- As stated, the two implementing measures were incomplete and did not tie together what was needed to actually deliver a parking management plan. Doing so might be asking a lot of a policy statement, although adding considerations, like the use of land, might address the concern.
- Adding a supporting implementing measure under Land Development Coordination was suggested. Should the document single out these two pieces of land, especially since one was privately owned?
- Both areas were already singled out by virtue of their designations as a town center and a station community, which have special meaning for the region as well. The RTFP addresses these categories as they relate to the 2040 Concept Map. These designations are activity areas. If the City expected these areas to be prosperous and more active in the future, parking was one item for which the City needed to plan.
- The Commission was reviewing the implementation measures in isolation because they had not heard of many of the other supportive documents.
- Land Development Coordination (page 8 of 32):
 - Many of the policies are altered from what the City already adopted. Some new policies regard connections to transit and having new development plan for and provide for that choice. Policies 20 and 21 were new.
 - Policy 21 was a concern. The City recently limited mixed uses in industrial zones in order to meet other objectives. A station community type of land use around the transit center could solve some problems, since the transit center was in the middle of an industrial area. Actions could be taken to enhance activities around that area. Mixed use and alternative zoning issues came up during the Economic Strategy as well.
 - This policy would enable the City to consider some supportive uses in industrial land, like restaurants, daycare, and dry cleaning, to allow citizens to get services closer to their job without converting industrial to commercial land.
- Agency Coordination (page 9 of 32):
 - Policy 23 Implementation Measure X.a was currently in the Comprehensive Plan. It seemed to be written more as a motive rather than an effort. The word “frustrate” could be changed to “hinders,” “limits,” or any word that seems less angry.
 - Policy 25. The word “maintain” in the first line should be changed to something that reflects the capacity increases over time. Maintaining flow capacity might be the objective, but would not address capacity increases.
 - The words “enhance,” “support,” or “sustain” was suggested because ODOT would interpret “enhance” to mean money.

- The policy regarded what the local jurisdiction could do to provide different routes and transportation choices on the local system for residents to relieve pressure on the state system.
- Through the Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP), Wilsonville and the County control access around the interchange, and they should work to not exacerbate capacity issues on I-5.
- Adding something about supporting and encouraging air travel was suggested. The Aurora Airport is considered potential asset, even though it was not within the city limits and was discussed as part of the Economic Development Strategy.
 - Perhaps language from that document could be borrowed and placed under Agency Coordination.
 - Being too specific should probably be avoided due to the necessary freeway crossing that is in ODOTs jurisdiction.
- Goods Movement (page 10 of 32):
 - Policy 27 Implementation Measure X.b. should be expanded to include driveway design, not just street design. Without an appropriate curb radius at the driveway, trucks are forced to exit the site into oncoming traffic in order to make the turn.
 - Policy 27 regarded designing truck routes in the public realm. Driveway width was more about design standards for private development and might not be appropriate in this section.
 - Implementation Measures X.a, X.b, and X.c of Policy 27 discussed setting standards, which was good. It was necessary to have quantifiable items for qualitative desires.
- Active Transportation, Policy 32 (Page 11 of 32):
 - The first sentence was not liked for reasons similar to those discussed in Policy 1, Implementation Measure X.a.
 - “Active transportation” did not seem like the right term as a section title. More work might be needed in the definition overall. Actual physical activity by a person implied only biking and walking, not transit or those trying to carpool, which did not seem cohesive as far as the idea of the section.
 - “Single-occupancy vehicle” and “vehicle trips” seem to be used interchangeably to refer to the same thing or a similar idea in multiple places.
 - One solution would be to break out transit. Transit was included in this section because it is not a door-to-door service; people typically have to park and ride, or walk somewhere, or call Dial-a-Ride. Refinements were being made to the terminology to reflect how the region looked at these types of transportation choices.
 - This was also a bit of an experiment to see if the policies could be rearranged underneath that umbrella. If awkward or not useful, transit could be moved out of this section.
 - People were moving away from the term “alternative” because these types of transportation should be viewed as normal or average options.
 - Active is what is being used, but a new term might be more clear, or the language could break out the different modes.
 - Defining the term “active transportation” was suggested. Policy 32 regarded everything except single-occupancy vehicles.
 - Multi-modal was suggested as a topic heading.
 - Policy 32 needed to be clearer and options for the title would be explored. The easiest option would be to include those modes.
 - Separating transit out might make the policy more intuitive, since the City has its own transit agency and this was a very long section.
 - It was not about single-occupancy vehicles; there needed to be a way to explain all the different modes of transportation available to those who do not want to drive.
 - Using “Active Transportation, Bike, Transit,…” could be used as a way to bridge into new terminology, though it would be a long way to do it.
 - A phrase other than single-occupancy vehicles was needed.

- Active transportation is perceived as something a person is physically doing or acting on for transportation that did not include transit. However, people often have to be more active to get to and use transit than getting into a car in the driveway.
- The policy attempts to make up for decades of focusing on car transportation. As a result, cities have somewhat overbuilt systems as well as air quality and health issues. The emphasis was to try to reduce vehicle trips and promote active transportation, which is an issue for the region, state and nationally, particularly in regards to the health issues related to transportation choices.
 - The concept is clear, but Policy 32 seemed to go far overboard. It should be pared down to have more focus. There were measures to coordinate multiple modes and transit policies and this threw everything else on the table.
- Implementation Measure X.a. (Page 11 of 32) referred to housing balance, but the Economic Strategy rejected that concept, concluding that the City did not know how to balance housing with employment and should provide housing as alternative. People would live where they live, and work where they work. The City could only provide density choices. This measure conflicted with what had been set in motion in the Economic Strategy. Not all Commissioners agreed.
 - These were the City's current policies. The existing language had been updated, such as removing language that tied parking to Metro as a requirement. The City has been using these measures for sometime in some form. It was good to get feedback that this was causing some difficulty and possibly overly long Staff reports and decisions.
- Implementation Measure X.b. seemed to be outside the realm of the TSP; it seemed to read like a mandate. Beginning with "Consider increasing densities" could solve the issue. The TSP was the wrong document to be providing policy about how Town Center should be developed.
 - One suggestion was to shift the focus away from increasing density and intensity to developing and supporting multi-modal transportation system that could support changes to Town Center or growth in Town Center to make it more about transportation.
 - This measure relates back to the parking management plan and discusses things that need to be considered in developing a parking management plan, but they are disconnected in this document.
- Implementation Measure X.i.
 - This language was very problematic, especially with regard to the Development Review Board (DRB). Every development application that wants less parking would cite this language. The aspirational statement is fine, but the wording was a concern. Every development application would request more square footage for the building and less parking, which was not good.
 - This was already an issue for the DRB. There are already many situations outside of Town Center where parking was inadequate after the development had been approved.
 - The key word is "consider", which was the DRB's role.
 - The DRB's role is different from the Planning Commission. The DRB is not able to discuss what they would like to happen; it was a question of whether the application met the Code already on paper. This language could be a loophole for a developer wanting what they were not entitled to, such as decreased parking in their development.
 - The statement was a good idea, but the language was terrifying given one's experience on the DRB. The DRB would see this repeatedly, but they did not have leeway to dismiss the language.
 - In Wilsonville, the current Development Code refers to the Comprehensive Plan and requires demonstration of compliance with policies in the Comprehensive Plan when the Code is supposed to implement the Comprehensive Plan.
 - Concern was also expressed that the language might get used to justify under-parking. The City was forced to reduce parking in the Village at Main due to the concept of transit orientation and it was a total disaster. The area was under-parked and not compensated for by

- transit service. The policy needed to be structured in a way that requires transit availability to be demonstrated.
- The City should not reduce parking just because transit exists in a particular area because the transit facility may not adequately serve the demand, so it may not be used. The reduction of parking based on the assumption that transit or other modes of transportation will compensate has not been proven, except in very intense, transit-oriented centers.
 - Transit entails a bit of the chicken and egg concept. The City must restrict availability of parking as well as provide services. Restricting parking and making it costly encourages people to ride transit. Downtown Portland is a classic example.
 - The City has aspirations of having more transit choices in its station community and Town Center areas. It is difficult to envision Wilsonville becoming a transit hub like Portland but there is a balance to consider. Making parking available in a transit area, may delay the use of transit because people would continue to use the parking.
 - When considering what Wilsonville looks like in the future, Wilsonville is at the edge of the UGB. People move to Wilsonville to be in the suburbs. Implying that Wilsonville needs to be like downtown Portland is a disservice to residents who have moved to Wilsonville in the last 10 years or so.
 - Some people move to Wilsonville because it has amenities similar to the city.
 - Removing the mandates and using words like “encourage” or “consider” was suggested.
 - The key word is “consider”; the reduction of parking should definitely be considered.
 - Commissioner McGuire disagreed. These implementation measures give specific direction for the future. The word “consider” would be okay for some measures, but others need to be active directives because they have already been prioritized in other planning documents or the City has been given regional or state direction to do so. Vague language would leave no real direction for how to implement the Plan.
 - Many of the implementation measures fall outside of the TSP, although a component of it. Density in Town Center has an impact on the TSP, but it is not supposed to be decided and determined through the implementation measures of the TSP, which was the struggle.
 - Implementation Measures X.a. and X.b. should be addressed in the Comprehensive Plan or Zoning Plan. The TSP was meant to provide direction.
 - This debate was about existing language, as a number of these were already existing policies. The direction was still to increase density at Town Center, which was where it should be.
 - When updating the TSP, reviewing what the City has been doing was appropriate to ensure consistency and see if refinements were needed.
 - Like the Comprehensive Plan, these policies should lead to other actions. The difference was that the TSP sometimes leads to capital projects and Zoning Code changes. If the City did amend the Code on parking ratios, for example, there was still room for debate in that process. This measure alone should not be driving the development process.
 - Questioning whether this belongs at this level was fair; the goal was to clean some of this up. It could go to back up to the policy level without being a directive. In concept, the policy makes sense, but it would not be tied to a direct implementation measure.
 - If someone presented a quasi-judicial amendment, “consider” would give the City room to make changes in light of whether the Comprehensive Plan policy was met. This has a lot to do with one’s perception and direction of where the City wants to go.
 - In hearing the discussion, some TSP policies, especially in the Active Transportation section, are aimed at what the City will do and some are aimed at what development needs to do or consider. It would be helpful to reorganize the document so the two are separated. The Comprehensive Plan and Development Code create a loop where developers must list policies, but note them as City action policies and therefore the developer does not need to take action.
 - It would be helpful to structure the TSP so that policies and implementation measures lead back to the Code standard. The Development Code can be reviewed for revisions later. Other

- policies are the responsibility of the City and SMART provide direction about, route design, adding new routes and improving and expanding services, which are not development related.
- Active Transportation, Policy 35 (Page 13 of 32):
 - Implementation Measures X.a. and X.b. seemed redundant because most of these policies were guided by public feedback, which has always been part of the City’s processes.
 - This policy was very specific to getting feedback on the public transit system. Because the City has a transit provider, a special system is needed to get input from the public. This system is not yet fully developed or utilized. The policy could be made less specific while retaining the implementation measures for now.
 - The policy sounded like it was referring to open houses and public input methods that the City already utilizes. If different, perhaps there was a different way to explain it to avoid confusion.
 - The policy provides a more robust way to address criticism or needs. When a transit route goes through a neighborhood and a few people oppose having the route in their neighborhood and complain, SMART has removed the route. However, this did not give other neighbors, who may want the route, the opportunity to provide input.
 - The Commission has discussed how to do outreach better, so just having a process was not the issue. The policy could reflect that this was more robust, or different from what has been done in the past.
 - Implementation Measure X.a develops the process for responding to citizens concerns, which goes beyond what Policy 35 is suggesting. Implementation Measure X.b. refers back to Measure X.a. It would be difficult to get more specific, but Measure X.b could describe that a transit specific public feedback process was being discussed.
 - Active Transportation, Policy 40 (Page 13 of 32):
 - “Mode share” refers to the percentage of people traveling by bicycle. The policy is like a performance measure to determine whether the pathways that are required to be built are successful, or being used, to see if more people are biking.
 - Using a capacity metric rather than saying the City will increase mode share regarded a policy decision and where the City wanted to put its energy. As part of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, the measure regarded only that part of the system. The Commission would need to determine how specific to keep the measure when incorporating it into the more global TSP.
 - Recent studies have shown that the more people who bike, the safer biking is; the measure was not about increasing bike share just for the sake of increasing it.
 - The City needs to encourage bicycle usage, but cannot make people ride bikes. The City could only implement measures that encourage bike use.
 - Much of the policy language already in the section would lead to an increase in bike use.
 - If a tool is needed to determine the progress or success of the system, the policy should be broadened to include all of the modes to monitor how the system was performing relative to multi-modal use.
 - As a Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, this must be a goal or objective of that policy, so it should have that linkage and be related to the overall objectives of the TSP.
 - The concern was that it was a mandated increase. Using the word “facilitate” opened the door in this document for the requirement to be addressed in more restrictive documents. This TSP policy was the mission statement saying the City will do what is needed to facilitate mode share, but it is addressed in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

Discussion regarding the overall Policies Memo continued with these key comments:

- The purpose of the entire document was unclear; was it supposed to dictate the future of Wilsonville or simply put forth the City’s belief on all these different aspects?
 - Policy 33 (page 13 of 32) uses the language, “so that individuals can make informed decisions,” which is great. Giving people options and allowing people to make decisions should be the

driving force on each policy, which was how the draft was perceived. The term “shall” should be used in the Development Code.

- Chair Altman understood the document was consolidating all the various City master plans developed over the last ten years, but more consolidation was necessary. The document was not cohesive or complete.
 - Policy 33 only focused on transit, but should increase public awareness of all transportation modes.
- There was a lack of continuity with all the different pieces being included. The document did not flow. One could go through the minutia of the measures but the draft chapter’s objective was uncertain.
- An organizational chart showing the connections of all of the different City policy documents might be helpful to show how the guiding principles are related when implemented through Code.
- There was definitely a benefit in consolidating all the different master plans, and Staff and the consultants did a good job, but the Commissioners were not experts in transportation planning so perhaps the draft made less sense to the Commission than to those who would carry it forward.
- This draft was a good first step as far as the general organization, but more condensing was needed.
- Condensing must be balanced with not ignoring the priorities set forth in all of the other planning documents, which have their own planning processes and citizen input. The Commission could not just remove the information because there was too much.
 - A lot of work went into those other documents and the priorities still need to be maintained. After 30 years of citizen involvement and debate and discussion, losing too much information without fully understanding the legislative intent of the existing language was a sensitive matter. Too much compression was an area of concern because of the prior processes and the citizens that have given years of their life toward those processes.
- Many people have said please do not forget the hard work that has already been done because some of the policy was created for a good reason. Commissioner Levit could probably provide the rationale for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.
- Deciphering repetition from actual or needed policy was a fine line. Community discussions should be held about the Commission’s disagreement on major themes.
- The Comprehensive Plan has not changed very much over the years. Recent planning efforts for the Bicycle and Pedestrian and Transit Master Plans were new visioning processes that were guided by citizen involvement, which has not occurred in this process yet.
- Allowing for public discussion was preferred to just taking the liberty to make sweeping changes. Some policies were based on prior citizen input. The Commission should focus its next discussion on the major themes, allowing time to get more information and come to some agreement.
- Discerning what belongs in which master plan and how specific it needed to be was a challenge. More discussion on this concern during the next meeting would be helpful. References in the coming revisions about what pieces of other plans made sense to keep and why, as well as what level of granularity in terms of the specific policy or implementation made sense would probably make the Commission more comfortable. Explain how those distinctions were made.
 - Not all policies have the same weight. Implementation measures are very active. In some areas, it might be appropriate to back off the action items and still keep the policy level or concept. The directive was to eliminate having to go to multiple plans to find out what the transportation system should look like.
 - One of the organizing principles was to come up with four goals that were integrated and looked at the functionality of the entire system, which included pulling in all those policies so some implementation measures will be specific, for example, create a good transit feedback loop. While this might not be implemented right away, the Commission might believe it is a

good idea. It could be pulled back to the policy level to simply work with SMART to develop a better system.

- The policies were also being used for different reasons, including to guide the current system update as well as small tweaks that might be done in the next five or ten years. These policies also guide decisions not clear cut in the Code, which was development specific.
- Opinions would differ as to how the TSP should be organized how specific different parts should be or the language used for transit versus development requirements, for instance. The Commission could simplify or use fewer policies or implementation measures; determining that balance was up to the Commission.
- There seems to be a general consensus that the vision and how this draft memo came together did not quite gel as a comprehensive plan yet, which is fine since this was just a draft.
- Color coding areas of the draft memo so signify which items related to compliance with the RTP and RTFP and which master plan the policy came from was suggested to help better understand the flow of the document. Red could be used for items that met a mandate, for example.
 - The citations were used to trace the origin of the policies. Color-coding the policies would be complicated because of the number and various types of changes involved, resulting in a rainbow of colors in the document.
 - The implementation measures are one area where the City is expected to act; however, no timeline for doing so was set. When an implementation measure is put on a work program, a timeline is generally given and the policy would then be used to support the City's action.
- A question was raised about how the categories and subcategories were split up. Some issues in Chair Altman's handout regarding transportation system design had to do with connectivity, and it was not clear why those were separate since connectivity was part of the system design.
 - Many of the integrated policies could be placed under one or more different subheadings, which often leads to a bit of redundancy. Subheadings as an organizing principle was not cut and dried. Some could be helpful, such as with funding or freight, while others were somewhat unclear.
 - Keeping connectivity separate illustrated that it was a priority in the community, so it was nice to call it out.
 - He understood the goal was to consolidate master plans, but it sounded like they would remain. He asked if each individual master plan, such as the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan or Transit Plan, would remain separate from the TSP. The TSP update would not consolidate all the master plans in one document.
 - Not all the background work from those plans would be included in the TSP. The maps that describe the system, the projects that describe the system and any relevant policies would be carried forward into the TSP. The master plans would still be living documents, but with a lot more detail that would not be published as part of the TSP. The goal was to have a cohesive TSP document of the whole system and all of its pieces. People who use these plans could go to one place as a common starting point, then more detail could be found in the modal plans.
 - Any updates to the individual master plans would be mirrored in both the TSP and the master plan. Updates would be made to the TSP through a special amendment or during the next update.
 - The implementation measures were really a to-do list. The community could choose not to implement policies, but in order to act on them, the implementation measures were necessary.

Chair Altman said it was appropriate for the Commissioners to provide any additional comments to Staff.

Ms. Rudzinski said Staff and the consultants would use the specific direction about improving the draft memo and would return with that language. Direction was still sought on some larger global issues as choices still needed to be made, particularly with regard to whether the implementation measures were proper or should be more reflected as policy.

B. Virtual Open House discussion for the next round of TSP public input.

Katie Mangle, Manager of Long Range Planning, explained the City was starting to think about the next major step in public involvement for the TSP, which would be an open house in the late fall. There was not a lot of attendance by the public at the last brick and mortar open house in May. In an effort to be more accessible to the public and get more feedback, the City was considering a virtual open house.

- Virtual open house presentations vary. Links to various open houses to view as examples were included in the packet. Clackamas County's TSP virtual open house was very good and included many videos and was very easy to digest. Others were more like online PowerPoint presentations.
- The City of Wilsonville has some pretty impressive in-house video capabilities, which would enable the open house to be more conversational with the community about recommendations, projects, and questions. A mixture of video, lists, and maps would be used. It would also be good to have Commissioners participate in the videos as a way of appealing to the public and addressing concerns.
- Advertising for the virtual open house would invite citizens without Internet access to meet with Staff.

Mr. Neamtzu said he was not sure of the logistics involved in using email addresses from the water system database to help advertise the virtual public house, but that resource was worth investigating and he would look into it. Currently, several hundred emails were sent out, and the Boones Ferry Messenger was sent to 11,000 households. Social media would also be used to advertise the open house. He hoped to get other volunteers to voice their comments about specific transportation modes on camera, including kids.

- He confirmed the Commissioners would be involved in making some video clips for the virtual open house. A script would be provided. He anticipated having material to share at the end of the month and begin shooting the footage early next month to be ready by September or October.

Commissioner McGuire suggested offering an incentive to get citizens involved, such as raffling off a gift certificate.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. 2010 Planning Commission Work Program
- B. Commissioners' Comments

IX. CITY STAFF COMMENTS – None

X. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

- A. Planning Commission/CCI letter to City Council

Mr. Neamtzu said he had hoped to schedule an hour-long work session with City Council, possibly in September or October; however, he questioned the timing of diving into the issue in light of the upcoming election when the Council's direction might change. He suggested waiting until February.

Chair Altman suggested approaching the issue both ways. While no real issues existed that needed to be sorted out, the conversations should continue. After the election, another joint meeting should be scheduled. The hard part was that new Council members would need time to assimilate into their positions and may not understand where some issues are coming from. Having City Manager Cosgrove supportive of having regular joint meetings between Council and the Commission was helpful.

Mr. Neamtzu noted he sees a different process evolving than what has been done in the past. Mr. Cosgrove also supported getting Council's direction about the Commission's work program and getting Staff's priorities set collectively. This was important because Council was talking about high profile

issues that need to be discussed and some projects would take a long time. He was not sure how to proceed short-term with Council

- The Basalt Creek Transportation Plan and recommendations would be presented to the Commission next month. He noted some interesting dynamics happening with the Tualatin citizens, who were going to the Tualatin City Council to ask that the roads be moved as far south as possible.

Chair Altman believed the sooner the Commission could get together with Council on the sustainability/CCI issue the better since it was on the table; any changes with Council could be addressed later.

Commissioner McGuire stated if the Commission got face time with City Council, it would be more important to focus on the Planning Commission work program, as the CCI was secondary. The work program seemed to be full into January, but there might be benefit to meeting with Council to briefly review the work program and promote holding joint meetings regularly. She questioned the timing as well, because it would be done all over again in January.

Chair Altman noted that no major shifts were expected with the economic strategy, but some work program priorities could change, which might be an important conversation to have with Council as far as guiding Staff's work schedule and City resources. He suggested coordinating with Mr. Cosgrove about having a joint session with Council when the Economic Development Strategy was presented.

Commissioner McGuire said it would also be a good opportunity to consider the work outlined in the economic develop strategy in the context of the priorities that have already been established for the Commission.

Mr. Neamtzu agreed the conversation could be expanded to include some other issues. He would work with Mr. Cosgrove to schedule that joint session.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Altman adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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