



DOWNTOWN REVITALIZATION COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

FOR APRIL 1, 2026

PRESENT: Chair Frank Bubenik, Vice Chair Christen Sacco, *Council President Valerie Pratt, Ben Richardson, Cathy Holland, Chris Brune, Christina George, Christine Tunstall, Janet Steiger Carr, Janine Wilson, Jilian Saurage Felton, Kaiden Edwards, Kelsea Ashenbrenner, Skip Stanaway*

ABSENT: Armando Serrano, Beth Dittman, Cosi Slider, Steve Chao, Susan Noack

STAFF: Aquilla Hurd-Ravich, Quin Brunner

GUESTS: Tudor Berteau

Italicized members are alternates. Alternates are invited, but not required, to attend every meeting. Alternates are listed when present but not when absent.

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Bubenik called the meeting to order at 6:00pm.

INTRODUCTION – NEW MEMBER

Members provided brief introductions. Ben Richardson, representing the Aging Task Force as an alternate to Susan Noack, joined the group.

HOUSEKEEPING

1. Binder Update – Quin Brunner, Urban Renewal / Economic Development Policy Analyst, distributed binder materials. These included an [updated roster](#) and a [summary of the architecture design studio renderings](#).
2. Approval of Minutes – Chair Bubenik introduced the [minutes](#) from the CAC meeting on March 4, 2026. The minutes were distributed via email on March 27, 2026. There was no discussion.
 - **Motion to approve the minutes as written:** Cathy Holland
 - **Second:** Christina George
 - **In favor:** Chair Frank Bubenik, Vice Chair Christen Sacco, Ben Richardson, Cathy Holland, Chris Brune, Christina George, *Christine Tunstall, Janet Steiger Carr, Janine Wilson, Jilian Saurage Felton, Kaiden Edwards, Kelsea Ashenbrenner, Skip Stanaway*
 - **Opposed:** None
 - **Abstention:** None

3. Group Photo – The group stepped outside and took a group photo in front of the Tualatin City Services building.

REVIEW SCORED RECOMMENDATIONS

Quin Brunner displayed [the repository](#) of recommendations, scores, and comments, reminding member how input provided during scoring activities was being captured and stored. He flagged a handful of additional comments added by members since the last meeting (in green), emphasizing that the repository is a living document designed to capture the varied perspectives represented by the group.

ARCHITECTURE DESIGN STUDIO ACTIVITY

Introduction

Quin Brunner introduced [the renderings of downtown](#) developed by students in the University of Oregon's architecture design studio. CAC members who were at the students' final presentations on March 13th offered comments, praising the students' work and highlighting specific ways these projects add value to our process. Quin summarized their comments, framing the renderings as *visual reference points* from which we can draw inspiration. He charged members with identifying design themes, concepts, and elements they would like to see further developed, sharing that their input would inform the urban design framework developed during phase three.

Quin split members into small groups to discuss the first eight renderings. A member of each small group took notes, and when the full group reconvened members shared high-level observations. Both sets of comments are aggregated below.

General Takeaways

- **Defining the Tualatin style.** Throughout our activity, CAC members described design concepts and elements as “looking like Tualatin,” “meeting the Tualatin standard,” “not representing our community,” and similar. In referencing an amorphous community identity, some common themes are beginning to emerge about what is/isn't consistent with the Tualatin style.
 - Natural building materials and landscaping features were near-universal hits. Biophilic design principles were referenced. Renderings that showed natural elements extending into the site (project 1's gardens, project 2's corridor tree plantings, project 3's greenway alley, and all of project 8) were highly regarded. Exposed wood was recognized as an aesthetically appealing building material, but one with limited durability.

- Prioritization of the human scale and pedestrian experience appeared in several unique forms. Project 4, for example, broke up building mass with variable heights and a wide pedestrian corridor framed by sun sails. Other designs (projects 2, 3, and 5) included larger setbacks, which may make taller buildings feel less imposing.
 - Structured parking, wrapped in an active use, was a popular design choice for both students and CAC members. Projects 2 and 7 offer examples of parking structures that simultaneously add capacity and activate the streetscape.
 - Downtown should feel timeless. Visually stunning design elements (like project 5's façade and project 8's use of glass) were generally well-received.
- **We are creating a neighborhood.** Students working on the catalyst site mostly envisioned self-contained developments in which residents and visitors could live, work, and play. This design concept was lauded as European and celebrated as a draw for young professionals. It was observed that this aspiration can extend beyond an individual development and is in fact the premise of a neighborhood.
 - **Connecting the sites.** Connective elements (the corridors in projects 3 and 4) and community spaces (large setbacks in projects 2, 3, and 5 plus the entirety of project 8) were some of the most exciting. Further developing pedestrian connectivity through all four sites, and the rest of downtown, will be just as important as defining a unified design style.

Project-Specific Comments

Project One

CAC members observed...

- Very eye catching and nicely rendered. However, we would like to see a more distinct "Tualatin style" (not sure exactly what that looks like just yet). The wood pillars mimic trees, like wooded areas that are all throughout Tualatin.
 - The building materials are aesthetically appealing, but we have some concern about the maintenance of wood.
- We like the mixed-use style with this level of density.
- The scale is good. The variety of building structures and heights break up the mass.
- Placing commercial uses on outward/busy streets, with residential uses in quieter (and elevated) areas, seems balanced.
- We like the elevated community spaces and how it brings nature into space on all floors. It has a park feel.
 - Maintenance of vegetation could pose a challenge.
- This would be a draw for both residents and visitors.

- Neat idea that the pillars material could be built up in phases to grow structurally with the community's needs.
- This design could be more inviting / better connected to the streetscape.
- There are some concerns about the shade cast by the taller buildings, as well as temperature regulation from east/west windows.
- There may be access issues created by the varied planes of activity.
- There may not be adequate parking for the Robinson Crossing development.

Project Two

CAC members observed...

- Our group enjoyed seeing the green space close to the street (larger setback). We also liked the trees in the interior corridors.
 - Some wanted to see more designated open space and greenery.
- The elevate plane is an intriguing strategy to deal with flooding and parking.
- Underground parking ensures short walking distances, which benefit seniors.
- There were concerns about visibility/access for businesses located in the interior corridors.
- The building style was airy but not inviting or eye catching in a way that would draw a passer-by in. It felt a little dated and didn't flow well into the next lot.
 - Others described the style as institutional, prison-like, and resembling a high school.

Project Three

CAC members observed...

- We liked (or loved) the pedestrian alley.
 - We did feel that the walk-through needed to be a bit wider with more design features to draw you in.
- We like the different roof heights and shapes, as well as the light brick.
- The building setbacks with large green spaces were appealing in this design, too.
 - Should we allow setbacks this large in some parts of a downtown development?
- One group asked if business/tenants will want to be here. Another commented that the building seemed to be largely residential, potentially supporting more affordable units at the ground level up to more lux at the top.

Project Four

CAC members observed...

- This one was a hit for many. The big positives were the curved exterior brick, the use of multiple walk-through spaces that cross one another, height differential in the buildings, as well as the shade sails.
- The curved corners are inviting, but the curve could be pushed further by adding an art element or making it curved glass for more dramatic appeal.

- We like Joyful Design, with one group discussing how our brains are mapped to seek out curves and soft flowing lines which could help to make these spaces “magnetic” and pull people to our downtown.
- The elevated buildings, with underground parking, solve multiple challenges.
- The shade sails over the wide inviting path offer scale to the open space, providing room for people to move around. The shade sails, particularly, are visually stunning and practical, offering protection from both the sun and rain.
- The interior corridor has a festival street feel. We should integrate some of the strengths from project 3’s pedestrian corridor into this design.
- This design has the best flow to the Commons, it’s inviting! We need a corridor/path like this to connect through all project areas (sites 1-4).
- The design style is somewhat dated; we are looking for timeless design.

Project Five

CAC members observed...

- They did a really great job pulling inspiration from nature and rain in Tualatin and representing those elements in the exterior building facade. Really like the façade, it has an aquatic feel.
- Don't like. We have concerns about how the texture will wear and need maintenance over time and with weather. Polka dot screens are not timeless, but their use for shading is a cool idea. Is this compatible with the Tualatin look?
- The many ramp structures leading you up from street level to the center buildings were a great way to make it super ADA and family friendly. The gentle ramps are an accessible design, could be senior living.
- The variety of levels may be hard for seniors.
- As this is a good-sized lot and there’s a need for housing it felt that there should be more structures for housing potential. One comment reflected the choice for a deep set back from the curb should be combined with a higher building to address the loss of usable structure space.
- Don't think the big building with plazas is the way forward for our space. The other models that bring people in and through the space seems far more inviting.
- The mass of buildings in the center provide a great event space around the margin. The green spaces were such a nice touch. The farmers’ market spaces might be redundant.
- Like the parking spaces below the buildings.
- What are the imaged uses for the smaller outer buildings?

Project Six

CAC members observed...

- There wasn’t a lot of excitement with this design. It didn’t read Tualatin for us.
- We liked the green area in the center courtyard.

- This feels like a throwback to architecture from a bygone era. It looks a bit like dorms and is not particularly visually enticing.
- We prefer various height buildings.
- The corner of 84th feels like wasted space.
- We have concerns about the quality of light reaching the interior of the landmark building.

Project Seven

CAC members observed...

- Looks quiet, which is ideal for housing.
- We liked the windows and terraces.
- It resembled row houses, which is potentially appealing.
- I like this just fine. Feels similar to existing downtown housing options - curious how it will integrate with that?
- The buildings conform with Tualatin standards.
- Mixed reviews on this one. Some wanted the buildings a lot higher for a better view of the lake and overall downtown area. The balconies were a nice touch. The lake on one side and the sloped walkway on the other side hiding parking underneath was a good thought.
- Unsure if the parking structure is adequate.

Project Eight

CAC members observed...

- We really like this design. The greenhouse style would be easy to implement and adds non-retail use to the Commons.
- Excellent synergy with the Grange.
- Popular one! Many said it felt European. We loved the sightline through to the lake. Open and airy. The community garden would be nice.
- The open use garden and the use of glass/garage door helped make this design feel permeable and light.
- LOVE the nursery and the glass walled buildings. Who would operate/be responsible for the nursery?
- Could be a fun extension of the lake and, if run by the City, used in various ways to engage with the community and visitors: indoor/outdoor farmers market, add garage doors for more flex space to spill out, flex space for art shows/wine pop ups/yoga, etc.
- Transparent buildings are perfect for civic events, art shows, farmers market.
- We like that buildings scale down as they get closer to the lake.
- The new structure imagined on the Commons would require lots of signage to find.
- Similar to Seattle Spheres: businesses, food carts, coffee shops, utilize garage doors access to outdoors in warm weather.

PREVIEW OF SUMMER COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PLAN

Quin Brunner raised the possibility of sharing these renderings more broadly to solicit additional feedback. He asked CAC members, based on their engagement with the materials today, if they felt there was enough information on the summary sheets for someone unfamiliar with the project to be able to meaningfully respond. He also asked whether CAC members could see value in asking members of the public to complete a survey, or to respond quickly while visiting a table at an event, or if engagement on this topic needs to be in a more supported setting like a focus group. CAC members shared:

- The renderings aren't enough information, we should include more content from the students' wall, like site plans, cross-sections, etc.
- This material will be challenging for people to engage with in passing. Focus groups may be better.
- We should lead with the evaluation criteria, so respondents are all guided by the same principles.
- We should narrow focus of questions:
 - First, do you feel drawn to this design?
 - Then, specific prompts asking respondents to articulate why.
- What is it about each site that we want feedback on?
- We should do outreach in levels:
 - Does this look like to Tualatin to you? (everyone, survey)
 - What about it is Tualatin style? (dive deeper in focus groups)
- We should frame the asks as "define Tualatin style."
- The model was a really strong draw, showing how the different parts of downtown can flow together. The key to all of this work is connectivity and we should have the model at future focus groups.

Quin shared that he would take the feedback received from the group today, confer with Sid Sin, Urban Renewal / Economic Development Manager, and prepare a draft community engagement plan to share with the group at the next meeting.

DOWNTOWN UPDATES

Quin Brunner shared that the architecture design studio was officially complete, and that we would be receiving a full report with all of the student-produced content by the end of June. He offered an update on the City's application to Metro's 2040 Planning & Development Grants, thanking Community Partners for Affordable Housing and the Chamber of Commerce for providing letters of support. He also thanked the Commercial Community Involvement Organization for providing letters of support for two additional grants related to the riverfront park project. Quin invited CAC members to an event celebrating the completion of our partnership with the Sustainable City Year

Program, scheduled for May 29, 4-5:30pm. Finally, he shared that the City Council had reviewed alternatives for the Tualatin-Sherwood Road grade-separation project, narrowing the options for further study to two.

WRAP UP, LOOSE ENDS, PREVIEW OF NEXT MEETING

Chair Bubenik previewed the CAC meetings through August and members expressed satisfaction with the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 7:54pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Quin Brunner
Policy Analyst