



PLANNING COMMISSION

**WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14, 2012
6:00 P.M.**

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

**Approved
April 11, 2012**

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Altman called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ben Altman, Ray Phelps, Eric Postma, and Peter Hurley. City Councilor Scott Starr arrived after Roll Call. Marta McGuire, Al Levit and Amy Dvorak were absent.

City Staff: Chris Neamtzu, Barbara Jacobson, Eric Mende, Mark Ottenad, Dan Knoll and Daniel Pauly.

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. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

The February 8, 2012 Planning Commission Minutes were unanimously approved as presented; however Mr. Neamtzu later corrected the minutes to reflect his absence at the February 8, 2012 meeting.

V. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT

Councilor Starr stated this would be his last meeting as liaison to the Planning Commission. He has been assigned to the Development Review Board (DRB) and Councilor Hurst would replace him as the liaison to the Planning Commission. Councilor Starr reported that City Council:

- * Approved the Storm Water Master Plan. The next stages would include defining some of the costs for the System Development Charges (SDCs), etc.
- * Would hear more over the next month about plans for a bike/pedestrian crossing of the Willamette River and consider whether to use grant funds for that project or something else. The crossing is in the Transportation Plan, but City Council would consider whether the bridge would remain in the Plan and where the bridge might go, or whether a ferry might be viable.
- * The bridge has been proposed by some to cross from Boones Ferry, but it could cross at several different places. Another consideration was whether making an addition to the Boone Bridge could provide a safe crossing, and possibly at less expense. He understood that the Canby Ferry may not be viable and the advocates who shut down the Canby Ferry might not want a new crossing, so many questions needed to be addressed.
- He said he had attended the Beauty and the Bridge open house at the high school and was amazed by the 7,200 tiles that would go on the walls along both sides of the road. He was proud to see how many people were involved and the uniquely beautiful art made by students of all ages. Pictures cut from aluminum plating will go along the pedestrian handrails. The aluminum is triple powder coated to prevent graffiti. The project appeared to be on schedule.

VI. WORK SESSIONS

A. Water System Master Plan (Mende)

Displayed before the Planning Commission was a map indicating Priority Improvements Water Facilities Master Plan 2011, which was also included in the meeting packet.

Eric Mende, Deputy City Engineer and Project Manager, Water System Master Plan, stated the initial draft of the Master Plan was now complete and ready for the review and approval process. The goal was to present an introduction to the Master Plan as well as the key findings and get the Planning Commission's input on the scope and timing of the public involvement process.

Peter Olsen, Keller Associates, presented a brief overview and key findings of the Water Facilities Master Plan 2011 as presented in the meeting packet.

Key comments and questions from the Commission and responses by Mr. Olsen and Mr. Mende were as follows:

- Due to improvements to the billing database the City did nearly 10 years earlier, the water usage by individual meters could be tied to the hydraulic computer model that allocates where the system is being stressed by the water demands. This enabled the consultants to allocate 85% of the demands more accurately as opposed to spreading out water system demands based upon land use demands. This new method produced a much more accurate model. Demands were overestimated in the previous Master Plan. The 10 years of usage data allowed them to calculate averages and figure out how to allocate the demands and project them into the future, preventing the rates paid by ratepayers pay as well as SDC usage from being overestimated.
- The City began drawing water from the river in April 2002.
- Pump tests conducted on the City's eight wells to see what they could produce revealed that only one of two wells in the Charbonneau District could produce what it was reported to produce, meaning the wells may not be able to perform in an emergency.
 - * Problems with the well stemmed from a combination of the pumps not working properly and the aquifer being low. Tests of the well casing would be needed to get more information about each specific well.
- The storage reservoir and pumps in the Charbonneau District cannot provide water capacity for emergency and operational demands back to the system. Charbonneau receives water from a 12-inch line coming across the bridge. The water does not go back. Once that water gets into the Charbonneau system, it stays there and either provides to the current demands or dumps into the reservoir to provide storage and operational emergency water capacity to Charbonneau. If there were a break in the line above the bridge, emergency capacity would still be available to Charbonneau, but the Charbonneau pumps and reservoir could not provide water north of the water line.
 - * Mr. Mende noted that going into the study, City Staff assumed the Charbonneau District would need additional emergency water from the B Level across the bridge in an emergency. They found that the combination of the Charbonneau wells and tank made Charbonneau self-sufficient in any type of emergency, which is a good finding, because it would reduce the amount of capital improvement necessary to build an emergency supply system for Charbonneau.
- Unaccounted for water is the difference between what is produced by the treatment plant and what is sold. There is an approximate 15% to 17% of unaccounted for water and the industry standard is 10%. The main contributor for the large percentage of unaccounted for water is meter discrepancies from both large and small meter users, which include turnout meters, where water is delivered from the treatment plant, as well as individual meters. Other possibilities include water theft and leakage. The City has a good program for finding and addressing leaks, so leakage would not be a major reason for unaccounted for water.

- * The major meters include the finished water meter at the water treatment plant, three turnout meters at various connections to the distribution system, and a range of individual water meters. Unaccounted water is an issue that has been investigated in the past. The 15% to 17% calculated as part of the 2011 Water Facilities Master Plan is high. The issue has been investigated in the past without any resolution. At one time, the City was selling more water than what the meters said it was producing, so it has gone both ways. Staff continues to investigate the situation and is working to recalibrate meters at the water treatment plant, and investigate other sources. For example, the turnout meter at Brockway shows zero at the water treatment plant monitoring screens, but the City has not determined whether the totalizing meter, which is difficult to access, is actually showing a reading. Staff is currently focused on investigating the turnout meters and meters at the plant.
- * Staff did not believe theft was occurring. Public Works Staff keeps track of theft.
- * Staff did find that the water meter for the middle school on Wilsonville Rd was not working for about a year. Large water users have two different meters, both a domestic and irrigation meter. The domestic meter is used for sewer billing as well as for water billing. The irrigation meters are not used for sewer charges, because they are for consumptive use such as landscaping, and that water does not go into the sewer system. The irrigation meter was probably broken or not read at the middle school.
- The Master Plan shows no major pressure or volume deficiencies; overall, the system is operating and performing well. Every system has a capital improvement plan and required maintenance. The Pipeline Replacement Program identified that only 1,700 linear ft needs replacing each year, which was a more than feasible amount of pipe to replace each year. Other systems require much more than that.
- Policy issues regarding the Water System Master Plan were noted as follows:
 - * The new method of calculating future water demands based on households for residential users and projected usage per acre is more accurate than Metro's forecasts based on population and employment projections. The Master Plan now projected 2.9% annual growth for residential water use and 3.5% annual growth for usage per acre.
 - * Metro's methodology of assigning growth rates based on population and employment increases influences zoning issues, the City's Comprehensive Plan, Transportation System Plan and how Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs) are designated. Many communities use Metro's methodology to determine future demands for their water systems. The City of Tigard used a straight increase in population multiplied by per capita water usage in order to calculate future demands. The same methodology was also used in the City of Wilsonville's 2002 Water System Master Plan; however, that methodology overestimated the future demand from 2002 to 2010 by almost double of actual usage. The City believed that calculation was too conservative to use in the 2011 Master Plan, which would be used to develop the Capital Improvement Program, which in turn would be used to determine what rates would be charged for SDC calculations and user rates. For the 2011 Master Plan, the City believed that using household growth and growth in developed acreage were much more accurate and more easily monitored over time. The new methodology results in a less conservative future demand calculation. Some conservative assumptions were built into the water demands, but taking this different approach in calculating water demand would be a big policy issue as the Master Plan moved forward.
 - * Determining what the City would do with its wells was another important policy issue. Improving the wells' supply capacity to make them usable for emergency purposes is a policy decision due to the costs associated with upgrading the wells. At this time, only one of the eight wells could provide water at the water right levels. The tradeoff to abandoning the wells is that the City would need much more water tankage for fire flow demands. Tanks are more expensive compared to the operation and maintenance O&M costs for upgrading wells.
 - * Another issue was the amount of money needed for the general O&M of the water system. A number of [inaudible] in the system need improvements, which translated into about 1,500 linear ft per year needing improvements. This was not consistent with what the City has been doing, so building additional operational costs into the annual budget might be required.

- An open house is planned for April 2012, and April 11 was suggested because that was the next Planning Commission meeting. As in the past, the open house could be held upstairs, and the Planning Commission could attend during a break in their meeting.
 - * Planning Director Chris Neamtzu reminded that the Sign Code public hearing was targeted for April 11, but he would work out the logistics with Mr. Mende because it was important to have the Commission attend the open house. Chair Altman suggested starting the open house at an earlier time.
- Staff intended to have a website on the Water Systems Master Plan available by the end of March. Mr. Mende and Steve Munsterman of Public Works were reviewing the initial draft of the Master Plan for typos and other problems, and would send the Plan to Keller Associates by the end of the week. Keller Associates would make the formal draft of the Master Plan, which would be the document available to the Planning Commission and at the open house. The notice timeline required for the public hearing was reviewed.
- The Water System Master Plan was not controversial and the water system is in good shape, so Staff had not planned any unusual or aggressive public outreach other than the website. No specific plan existed for outreach to the business community or large water users, such as Coca-Cola.
- In developing the Master Plan, an intense hydraulic model was run on both the existing system and on future demands. The main pipeline that services the Coffee Creek area is an 18-inch diameter line that goes to the prison. That line has a lot of capacity. Based on the hydraulic analysis, there should not be any water demand issues in Coffee Creek.
 - * In addition to the normal demand estimates from any business, three large users with an extra 1 MGD water usage were also built into the model for the Master Plan's demand estimates. Two of the users would be at 0.25 MGD and another at a 0.5 MGD. The Plan did not designate where that large water use would happen in the system, but it would probably be within the city's commercial or industrial areas.
- The City had not calculated a dollar value for the lost water because Staff did not know whether the lost water was actually lost or resulted from an error in the meter readings.
- Staff did not know how the Master Plan would affect water bills and SDCs at this point. Staff made a conscious decision not to do a rate study as part of the work of the 2011 Water System Master Plan. Staff first wanted to do the technical basis study to establish the needed operational and capital improvements for the system, and then determine cost estimates. The next task would be to develop water system rates, which would be done under a separate contract and probably not involve technical consultants. Rate studies are typically done by specialized firms. Galardi Consulting has done rate studies for the City in the past. The rate study would be based upon the data and information in the Master Plan.
- Mr. Mende confirmed that 2011's total water usage was less than 2010.
- He acknowledged that Staff was also concerned about how the conservative data of the Master Plan could drastically skew what the potential rate study would determine, which was why the methodology for calculating projected water usage was changed. The use of low-water appliances, irrigation monitors that do not turn irrigation systems on during rain and other technological improvements play a role in reducing water usage. Higher water rates also reduce water usage. One big reason for lower water usage has been economic conditions. Even without new growth, water use will go up if some of the vacant buildings are filled. Staff is confident that the reasons for the lower water usage had been accounted for in the Master Plan without being overly conservative, which would result in not generating revenues needed to fund the system.
 - * In light of the low water usage in recent years, Staff used the 2005 to 2009 average, noting water usage peaked in 2007, as the water usage basis in the Master Plan.
 - * Using actual household data was another way Staff tried to moderate the conservative data of the Master Plan. Typically, it is assumed that number of people per household decreases as a city's population grows older, however, the opposite was found when developing the Master Plan; as Wilsonville's population has aged, the number of people per household actually increased to 2.48.
- Staff should keep the audience in mind when drafting the Master Plan, perhaps including a glossary of terms so the general public could more easily understand the document.

- Staff was satisfied that the change in methodology had not skewed the data. No one industry standard exists for projecting demand, although industry standards for calculating water demand are changing. The methodology used for the new Master Plan was one of the accepted industry standards and was discussed thoroughly, including any effects on user rates and SDCs.
 - * Staff did apply the new methodology to the numbers from 2000 to 2010, and the new methodology did prove itself and was much closer. However, the City would not know with any certainty how accurate the forecasts were until a few years have passed. Staff was comfortable relying on the new methodology to take the City in the right policy direction.
- Staff should make an extra effort to get information about the Master Plan to the business community, even if that just meant getting business people to the open house. Steve Gilmore at the Chamber of Commerce has email addresses for about 500 businesses in the community and could probably send them the Master Plan information. The City also has data on the top water users that could be contacted.
- Aquifer Storage and Retrieval (ASR) was investigated as part of the 2002 Master Plan and found not to be viable for Wilsonville's wells, so the City did not pursue any filling of wells in the 2011 Master Plan. It was uncertain why filling the wells was not considered viable, but many factors are often involved, such as water quality. Other communities, including Tigard, did look at ASR and rejected it. Water must be treated before storage in wells, and then treated again prior to use.
 - * The aquifer has recovered well since Wilsonville's wells were turned off in 2002; in fact, the Nike Well at Memorial Park has become artesian again.
- The timeline for adopting the Water System Master Plan included the open house in April and Staff briefing City Council on March 19, 2012. A formal hearing on the Master Plan would occur at Planning Commission in May and at City Council at its second meeting in June.

B. Sign Code Revisions (Pauly)

The following additional exhibits were distributed to the Commission at the dais:

- Email discussion between Ben Altman, Al Levit, and Daniel Pauly, final message dated March 5, 2012.
- Notes from Field Sign Light Measurements dated March 8, 2012 from Benya Lighting Design.
- Email discussion between Al Levit, Ray Phelps, Ben Altman, and Daniel Pauly dated March 7, 2012.

Daniel Pauly, Associate Planner, presented the Sign Code Revisions via PowerPoint, providing an overview of the work done at previous work sessions and reviewing the changes made since February. The public hearing on the Sign Code Revisions is planned for the April Planning Commission meeting.

Key items of discussion regarding the changes since February included the following these comments:

- Additional language to differentiate between architecture and signs. One sentence was added to the end of Section 4.001.1 shown on page 9 of 68. If a feature contains protected speech or a trademark, then it is a sign. This seemed like a reasonable, clear line to draw in deciding whether to regulate something as a sign or regulate it through site design review.
 - * Section 4.001.1.(D) Building Graphics on page 9 of 68, did not address murals and similar items that are art that go on walls but are not signs.
 - Mr. Pauly reminded the Commission discussed murals early in the Sign Code Revision process and the topic was tabled.
 - * Mr. Neamtzu noted that "mural" meets the definition of sign. If an applicant wanted to use their allowable sign area for a mural, the City would regulate the mural under the Sign Code.
 - The Beauty and the Bridge paintings and other similar items could be considered signs. The Cornelius City Council decided such artwork would not be regulated as signs. Murals or similar art could be address through a waiver.
 - * "Building mounted sign" is clear, but "building graphics" had an undefined aspect and would open the door to regulate murals under the Sign Code. Murals are not signs, but are something the City would

want to review, perhaps as an architectural component, but not under the Sign Code. For example, an historic mural in Old Town would be art, not a sign.

- One of the biggest hot-button issues for communities is strip clubs, which are considered an art form in the State of Oregon, and therefore protected under the First Amendment. Similarly, would something more mundane, like a mural depicting someone harvesting hops, be considered art that could not be regulated because it is free speech?
- * Perhaps, murals were something to define out of the Sign Code.
- * Mr. Pauly believed enough flexibility existed in the Sign Code with waivers to accommodate murals on a case-by-case basis with a community conversation. He clarified that only certain requests/applications with very objective criteria would not go through the DRB.
- * Section 4.156.02(.01) on page 16 of 68 states ". . . no sign, permanent or temporary, shall be erected in the City" without a permit. This language did not capture murals; perhaps "erected" should be replaced with "displayed" or "installed."
- * Expanding the definition to capture things like murals and put them through the Sign Code process would ensure the proposal would go to the people who can make such determinations, rather than someone going to City Staff and saying their proposal was not a sign and should not be regulated as one. Capturing such items within the definition would prompt discussion with Staff about a permit and then a review.
- * Architectural elements go to DRB for review. A mural might be considered an architectural element, which would be still reviewed, but excluded from Sign Code regulation. If a mural is not a sign, the DRB can make findings to require different materials, colors, and so on under site design review.
- * There is a tendency to look at content when reviewing a mural. The waiver process does not allow the City to consider content, which would protect speech if something were considered a sign, and protect artistic expression if it were a mural.
- * The question was whether the City would want to include murals as signs. Generally, art is considered free speech, so the City could not regulate the content, but it could regulate size and other things not related to the content.
 - Vice Chair Postma noted a sign is speech when the sign is wanted, but it is not speech when it is not wanted.
- * Mr. Neamtzu suggested that Staff discuss the matter further and return with a proposal.
- New requirements for brightness of electronic changeable copy signs. Mr. Pauly reviewed the two proposed changes, noting that he and Lighting Consultant James Benya took brightness readings of several signs in Wilsonville, including signs that could be converted to electronic changeable copy signs, existing signs at gas stations, and other standard channeling signs. The recommendations are as follows:
 - * Mr. Pauly clarified that brightness during daytime hours could be an issue. Sign industry professionals know that a sign can become unreadable if it is too bright. The requirement would ensure all signs were readable and functioning well. Including daytime brightness standards in sign codes is common.
 - * The requirement set the standard for the applicant from the beginning. The City would either take a reading of the brightness or call someone to take the reading if a complaint about a sign were received.
 - * Lighting technology is evolving very quickly. Every sign in the city could easily meet the proposed standard, which would prevent future signs from being overly bright. At this time, brightness or the amount of light emitted by signs is not regulated.
 - * Mr. Pauly confirmed the lit Toyota wall was 77 candelas per square meter, compared to a typical sign of 300 to 400 candelas per square meter. Color can make a difference in brightness; a white sign is about 10 times brighter than a red sign. The new Mattress Discounters sign was also within the proposed brightness standards.
 - The proposed standard would enable the City to address complaints by reading the candelas of a sign and confirming whether the brightness fell within the standard.
 - * The Commission confirmed the recommendations regarding an overall brightness level addressed issues regarding a glare definition.

- In Section 4.001.1, clarification was requested about the definitions of (F.) Changing Image Sign and (G.) Changeable Copy Sign on Page 6 of 68. Both signs had the same frequency of change standard of not exceeding once every hour; which blurred the distinction between the two sign types. [1016]
 - * Mr. Pauly clarified that signs with replaceable plastic panel signs are considered changeable copy signs. Digital signs that show time, temperature, scrolling stock prices, menus, etc. are considered changing image signs. The current Sign Code prohibits changing image signs unless granted through the waiver process. However, the revised Sign Code defines the changeable copy signs and makes them prohibited unless permitted through a waiver and outright prohibiting changing image signs.
 - Changing copy signs should not be the type that needs to change more often than once per hour. No waiver is proposed for applicants to increase the frequency of change on a changing copy sign to more than once per hour. The idea was to have a similar rate of change as plastic panel-type signs. School announcements could be put up in morning and then changed in the afternoon. Viewers should not notice movement or changing copy.
 - The only exception to the change in frequency would be in an emergency, such as an Amber Alert.
 - A business could not have a scrolling sign featuring prices of items like milk, cigarettes, etc.
 - * A waiver or method should be considered to allow a different standard for the frequency of changing copy based on specific information provided by the applicant.
 - * Vice Chair Postma questioned why the one-hour time limit was included in the changing image sign definition if such signs were prohibited outright. The Code could state, "any changing movement that is not defined as a changing copy sign as indicated below." Anything other than changing copy would be prohibited.
 - Mr. Pauly suggested setting a relatively low minimum and giving some flexibility to DRB by defining how often a change could be allowed under the waiver process. Staff could research timeframes for frequency of copy changes, which varies from every hour to every couple of minutes or seconds.
 - * Chair Altman explained that he wanted to build in some flexibility but still maintain control by the DRB. The DRB set the interval for each sign. Setting one time interval would not work.
 - * Streaming signs that display time and temperature create problems for drivers. It seemed the City was trying to prohibit LED billboards where the entire image changes frequently.
 - * The Sign Code needed to make the distinction that changing image signs are not allowed. The Code language creates confusion because it gives the impression that some prohibited signs would be allowed if the interval for changing images were once per hour.
 - * Vice Chair Postma suggested replacing the added, redline language at the very end of Section 4.001.1(F) with "*which is not otherwise defined as a changeable copy sign in Section 4.001.1(G) below.*" In other words, if a changeable copy sign changes its image or text at a rate of greater than once per hour, it would be a changing image sign, and thus prohibited.
 - * Chair Altman added that under "changeable copy sign," the Code could set a timeframe or add language such as, "or as set by the DRB."
 - Adding language to include some sort of minimum interval for changing copy could set up differential treatment and throw predictability out the window. Mr. Pauly responded an applicant would change their sign based on their mode of operation, not because they were permitted to do so more frequently by the DRB.
 - * Chair Altman stated if the changing image language were clarified, he could live with the time limit on changeable copy signs.
 - * The "changing copy" and "changing image" sign definitions should be clarified. The intent was to continue to prohibit changing image signs under Section 4.001.1(F) but allow changeable copy signs under Section 4.001.1(G).
 - * Section 4.001.1(BB) on Page 8 of 68 provided a very short definition of video sign. Staff's research found video signs are an emerging technology that the City may have to deal with soon. Video technology moves faster than lighting technology. Projected image signs were another consideration.

- Chair Altman and Vice Chair Postma suggested combining the language in Section 4.001.1(BB) with Section 4.001.1(F), changing image sign.
- * Commissioner Hurley expressed concerned about the one-hour interval for the changeable copy signs. A business or school might need to change its signs more frequently without having a constantly flashing or moving image. He believed a middle ground could be found to accommodate promoting events or selling goods.
 - Mr. Pauly explained that signs with frequently changing copy have not been allowed in Wilsonville. The scope of the Sign Code Revision project was to maintain the same level and pattern of signage that exists today, but clarify confusion and make the Code reasonable so that fewer waivers would be required. The changeable copy section was to provide for the replacement of plastic panel signs that can look bad with clean, modern signage.
- * Schools with multiple programs to promote would need to evaluate the cost and design of a larger sign to be able to display more information given the limit on frequency of change.
 - Mr. Neamtzu understood the new Tualatin High School sign was controversial; many neighboring residents complained about that sign application. The City of Tualatin had to create performance standards for that sign, which he believed addressed the brightness and curfew of the sign.
 - Mr. Pauly confirmed he had that case file and could look up what intervals were set for the changing copy on the Tualatin High School sign. He added that schools are often in residential areas, and Staff was recommending that school signage remain at a Class III review because neighbors are often concerned about signage in residential areas.
- Updated waiver criteria. Mr. Pauly briefly reviewed waivers, which are a fundamental tool historically used in Wilsonville's planning and development process to allow for innovation. Waivers are vigorously scrutinized by decision-making panels such as the DRB. A waiver is not a watered-down variance, although a waiver is perceived as a way to get around the standards that is easier than requesting a variance. A waiver is not typically used for a unique circumstance, but instead is used in situations when the applicant is being proactive as part of the comprehensive design of a project. Waivers are not treated lightly, automatically granted, nor designed to avoid community standards. The purpose of waivers is to improve upon objectives and community standards.
 - * Mr. Pauly explained the language in Section 4.156.02(.08)(A)(3) on Page 20 of 68 was meant to directly implement one of the Sign Code objectives, which discusses fairness and equity for different businesses and applications in the city.
 - * Vice Chair Postma was concerned that making that the goal that we are going to give waivers based on precedence; that rather than changing the Code legislatively, the Code will be changed based precedence.
 - Mr. Pauly replied Staff was trying to address how to appropriately consider signage for a large warehouse versus a big box retailer. A warehouse with smaller tenants would have smaller signs, versus big box stores, like Fred Meyer, that tend to have larger signs, and given the different architectural elements, it made sense to have larger signs. As discussed, Fred Meyer's sign package would require a waiver, no matter how the standards were written.
 - * Vice Chair Postma stated that applicants would absolutely consider Fred Meyer's signage as a precedent for having a reasonable amount of signage for a big box retailer. His goal was to increase predictability for applicants; if they fit the parameters, they should get their permit. But if a competitor across the street got a larger sign with a wavier, the applicant must compete, so compatibility with that business gives the applicant a bigger sign, and so on.
 - Mr. Pauly replied he initially thought it would be the opposite, that the smaller, approved signs would set the precedent and if an applicant wanted something larger, a specific finding would be needed to show why the requested signage did not follow the standard established by the Sign Code.
 - * Vice Chair Postma noted he had never seen a DRB waiver for a sign smaller than what the Code allowed. The provision was an invitation to see an upward spike in signs that would grow exponentially over time if precedent was part of the waiver equation.

- * Chair Altman shared Vice Chair Postma's concern, but noted Section 4.156.02(.08)(A)(3) may not be needed since the revised Sign Code provided added flexibility and improved proportionality per elevation which addressed many of the issues.
 - Mr. Pauly replied the section was easy to remove; his concern was that an applicant could get a huge sign that is out of proportion with other signs of similar uses in the city.
- * Would removal make a difference since equity was still in the purpose provisions? Criteria had been added to the Purpose Statement about the objectives of having equity, so an applicant could use that as a basis for requesting a waiver without the Code giving them a "free ticket."
 - Mr. Pauly responded the idea behind Section 4.156.02(.08)(A)(3) was to better implement the specific Sign Code objectives. An applicant requesting a waiver would need to be able to perform better on the objectives than the sign standards. Consistency was one of the Code standards, however consistency talked more about the process, not necessarily the signs.
- * Chair Altman suggested revising the section to emphasize justifying the basis for the waiver being due to specific circumstances, whether due to the site, location etc., rather than simply wanting a waiver to be equal to someone else's signage. Mr. Pauly agreed that was a good point.
- * Vice Chair Postma still advocated for the removal of Section 4.156.02(.08)(A)(3) because it gave a broader and different standard than what was in the purpose section, which does not discuss precedent, but equitable and consistent application. He preferred pointing applicants to the Purpose section than giving them purpose plus.
 - Mr. Pauly explained that Sections 4.156.02(.08)(A)(1 through 5) were for ease of reference. Pointing an applicant back to the purpose and objectives would allow for a lot of interpretation. Including those sections was to rewrite the objectives as a criteria or basis for applying for a waiver. An applicant would need to justify a sign much larger than a comparable use elsewhere in the city.
- * Chair Altman believed that a variance, not a waiver, should allow a reduction in the standard setback 10 ft from right-of-way. He recalled the Holiday Inn's new sign encroached into the right-of-way and blocked a nearby Chevron sign because the measurement was taken from the back of the sidewalk, but in that location, the right-of-way is 6 ft behind the sidewalk, so the sign encroached into the right-of-way.
 - Mr. Pauly explained the recommended setback is between 2 ft and 15 ft from the right-of-way. The current standard in the Town Center is 2 ft to 15 ft for signs directed toward the right-of-way for wayfinding. The Code stated that setbacks are for buildings, and by definition, buildings have to cover something. A sign is not a building, but a sign outside the 2 ft to 15 ft setback standard should probably require a variance.
- * Chair Altman stated as long as the process allowed for notice and provided an opportunity for input it would be fine.
- * Mr. Pauly explained on a two-dimensional site design, a pole sign might be allowed closer than 10 ft to keep the sign within the required landscaping buffer between the parking and street to avoid having a sign overhanging parking or replacing a parking lot tree.
 - The Holiday Inn sign was one reason that so many sign applications/administrative variances were changing from Class I to Class II Administrative Review. New signs can certainly impact adjacent property owners.
- * Vice Chair Postma clarified that he did not necessarily approve of the language discussed in Section 4.156.02(.08)(A), but he would let it stand. While Section 4.156.02(.08)(A)(1) would allow for a lot of interpretation with regard to aesthetics and functionality, providing such was unavoidable because the Code is trying to address compatibility for the overall site. Some subjectivity was necessary since objective definitions could not be included to address every situation that could arise.
- * Chair Altman added he was okay with the other criteria and the Class II process because it allowed an applicant to make the argument for a waiver.
- Updating method for determining the maximum allowed height and area for freestanding and ground-mounted signs. Because many possible circumstances exist, the Code must accommodate and anticipate a

variety of scenarios with objective standards. Mr. Pauly reviewed the proposed method, which addressed single- and multiple tenant business signage according to whether or not the business was located near the freeway. He noted the low, monument-style signs were retained in Town Center and Old Town which is in keeping with the pedestrian nature of those areas along Boones Ferry Rd.

- Updated method for determining maximum allowed building sign area.
 - * Section 4.156.08(.02)(A)(2)(b)(4) on Page 36 of 68 seemed to allow an applicant to calculate the sign area allowed for the largest building on a campus setting and use that size for every building on that campus regardless of the building's size. The phrase "which may then be used throughout the campus" indicated that a huge sign could be used for every building on that campus.
 - * Deleting the phrase and putting a period after "largest building" was suggested.
 - * Mr. Pauly clarified that one sign would be sized according to the largest building, but could be put anywhere on the campus, such as Mentor Graphics or Xerox. He would refine the language in that section.
- Concerns about conflicting language in the measurement and minor adjustment language regarding descenders on letters such as "g" and "y" had been addressed. The measurement language would be appropriate for new sign plans and not measure the descender. However, many existing sign plans still measure the descenders, so the minor adjustment language allows existing master sign plans to take advantage of the minor adjustment, but the language has been changed to differentiate between the measurement language and minor adjustment language.
 - * Mr. Pauly clarified that language regarding descenders is in two places in the Sign Code, under sign measurement and under minor adjustments.
- Chair Altman stated that he liked the update regarding how to measure irregularly shaped and L-shaped buildings.

Chair Altman opened the floor for public comment on the Sign Code revisions.

Doris Wehler, 6855 SW Boeckman Rd, Wilsonville, commented that the Chamber looked at the interval time for changing signs and had recommended the City use a 15-minute interval rather than an hour. She asked why the interval could not be 15 minutes, which was long enough to prevent people from stopping traffic to read a sign. She asked if the Code allowed people on sidewalks to wave handheld signs as long as they follow rules about distance from intersections, etc.

Chair Altman stated allowing people to hold signs was a free speech issue. He confirmed that signs are allowed on cars as part of interstate commerce.

Ms. Wehler noted that the panhandling ordinance did include language about not obstructing sidewalks. She understood that a vehicle with a sign could not be parked somewhere for a length of time as an advertisement.

Mr. Neamtzu replied signs in the bed of a pickup truck could be parked as an advertisement for a certain time period. Human billboards are not an issue as long as they are not obstructing citizens' movement.

Ms. Wehler confirmed the same standard applied to a person that is a sign, such as Ronald McDonald.

The Commission revisited the discussion about a shorter change interval for changeable copy signs, as 15 minutes seemed reasonable. Vice Chair Postma suggested approaching the issue from what the City was trying to avoid, which was having signs that change very frequently. He suggested choosing an interval time and then make sure that number is vetted throughout the approval process.

Chair Altman confirmed a public hearing for the Sign Code Revisions was scheduled for April 2012.

Mr. Neamtzu thanked the Planning Commission for its work on the Sign Code and praised Mr. Pauly for his work. He also confirmed that Mark Pruitt was on the mailing list for the notice of the upcoming hearing.

C. Transportation Systems Plan Update (Neamtzu)

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, highlighted the slightly revised goals and evaluation criteria related to the Transportation Systems Plan (TSP) update as noted in the technical memorandum included in the meeting packet using the new Prezi presentation software. The TSP update was necessary to thread the disparate Master Plan goals together into a series of new goals that encapsulate the previous goals, but treat the transportation system, which include all travel modes, as one complete system.

Chair Altman:

- Noted the *Sustainable Transportation Networks* document he distributed in February discussed the idea of the integrated transportation system. He was intrigued about the method of valuating different components, for example, an arterial versus a collector street might not have the same connectivity for all modes. A collector street might be more conducive to bike and pedestrian traffic, where it is difficult to allow multi-modal transportation on arterial roadways without making them too wide. Table 1 Project Evaluation Criteria and Scoring on Page 3 of 26 of the Staff report showed the scoring was equal no matter what mode or part of the system was being used. How would the City evaluate each multi-modal piece and factor in where the City might not want one mode of transportation emphasized?
 - * Mr. Neamtzu replied he did not have a solution to that problem.
 - The Commission had not discussed the document regarding the evaluation criteria ratings being different dependent upon the type of street and mode of transportation. He wanted the Commission, DKS Associates, and Angelo Planning Group look at the attachment and give feedback.
 - * Mr. Neamtzu said he could have DKS read the 2008 document. He recalled very few places had actually used the evaluation criteria, which would be something to follow up on. He was also concerned that the article discussed not using Level of Service (LOS) standards.
- Confirmed that the criteria were moving away from using LOS as the base standard, partly because LOS is only measures vehicles and not other transit modes. The idea was to create evaluation criteria to blend or rate the other modes. Table 1 seemed to assign the same score to each component, which did not seem to be the appropriate measure.
 - * Mr. Neamtzu noted that certain criteria apply to specific modes of transit, most criteria apply to all modes. In the upcoming solutions memorandum, the criteria were applied to the various projects, and the rating from the criteria versus the projects and costs was discussed.
- Noted that City Council was considering the pedestrian bridge issue, but the current LOS standard would not address a pedestrian bridge. How would that be measured consistent with the rest of the system?
 - * Mr. Neamtzu agreed that concept was not being integrated to the point where developers would get credit for eliminating half the parking in a project because people would be walking or biking. He acknowledged that mode splitting worked better in a dense, downtown urban setting than in a suburban setting.
- Understood the document discussed complete connected systems for each mode of transportation would not have to occur on all elements of the transportation system. For instance, a completely connected bike system could exist on collector and local streets, but with fewer connections on arterial roadways.
 - * Mr. Neamtzu responded that street classifications throughout the community was being looked at. Some unique street sections, such as on Town Center Loop, have no ability to accommodate on-street bike lanes. While Town Center Loop serves as an arterial, it would never meet the true arterial cross section in the TSP, so the City has tried to get an off-street bike lane that is wider. He believed exploring different evaluation criteria could dovetail into the work being done regarding unique street sections around town.

- Explained the key issue in the document was moving away from a strict LOS standard. In most cases, relying strictly on LOS resulted in diminishing bike and pedestrian routes almost consistently. As with the interchange, as vehicle capacity increases, the desirability for other modes decreases.
- Commented that discussion about the document valuating different components within integrated transportation systems would fit in with the Evaluation Criteria Comparison Table on Page 25 of 26 to evaluate the City's accomplishments.
 - * Mr. Neamtzu said the evaluation criteria would result in recommended improvements for all the various transportation modes, and Staff would consider how to thread all that together.

Mr. Neamtzu reviewed the next steps and proposed schedule for the TSP Update. He invited the Planning Commissioners to the April 16 City Council work session and offered to send the Prezi presentation link so the Commissioners could review the information and submit input via email for him to take to the City Council.

- The joint Planning Commission /City Council work session, now tentatively rescheduled from April 16 to May 7, would focus on solutions. He would notify the absent Commissioners about the new date. A memo about solutions would be sent to the Commissioners for review before the work session.
- He noted the website is being built and he was working to address comments received via the City website and from the open houses.

Chair Altman opened the floor for public comment.

Scott Starr, speaking as a citizen rather than as a City Councilor, stated that the transportation system goals appeared to be political, as he was seeing agenda all over this. He did not see any financial considerations in the five revised transportation goals on Page 2 of 26 of the Staff report. He urged the Commissioners to review the goals to see if any were missing or inappropriate and contact City Council about any suggestions regarding the goals. There were areas where the Commission would not want to put a car or truck on a bike path, or a bike lane in a certain area. While it all needed to be integrated, it could not be 100% of everything. He urged the Commission not to assume this was the gold standard. As mentioned, this might come from more of a highly dense populated area, which Wilsonville is not. The City needed to define what worked for Wilsonville.

Chair Altman stated that was his point with the idea of moving away from a strict LOS rating standard.

Mr. Neamtzu responded that Goal 5, regarding the stewardship of the City's economic resources, was intended to address financial conditions and the sustainability of the system.

- He clarified that Areas to Consider for Additional Goals and Policies on Page 14 of 26 were the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Goals from Metro.
- The City's goals must to show compliance with and support of the RTP Goals. The five new TSP goals are intended to comply with the RTP Goals.

Mr. Starr asked if the City's goals had to be 100% in line with the RTP Goals, since they seemed to be designed for densely populated areas. Metro needed to be reminded that Wilsonville is a more rural, less populated area. The City is its own advocate and must protect itself first.

Chair Altman:

- Believed that sometimes the key was in the art of explaining how the City is compatible.
 - * Mr. Neamtzu agreed, adding that ODOT has relentlessly reminding the Staff and DKS of the RTP requirements. There was room for wordsmithing and applying the unique Wilsonville twist, however. The TSP goals presented were an attempt at a concise approach that bridged many different gaps. He encouraged further discussion as finalizing the update would continue over the next couple months.
- Confirmed the Commissioners need to determine whether the TSP goals on Page 2 of 26 blend with the additional RTP goals on Page 14 of 26.

- Noted Regional Transportation Goal (RTP) 7 was “Enhance human health”. While he understood the concept, he did not particularly support social engineering that required people to bike or walk to work for their health.

As the adjournment time that was stated on the agenda had passed and people were waiting for the Committee for Citizen Involvement meeting to start, it was suggested that the PC continued this discussion after the CCI meeting.

IX. ADJOURNMENT TO THE COMMITTEE FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT MEETING

Chair Altman recessed the regular Planning Commission meeting at 8:45 p.m. to reconvene after the Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI) meeting.

Upon adjournment of the CCI meeting at 9:36 p.m., the Planning Commission reconvened and adjourned without comment at 9:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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