DOWNTOWN REVITALIZATION COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES
FOR JANUARY 7, 2026

PRESENT: Chair Frank Bubenik, Vice Chair Christen Sacco, *Council President Valerie Pratt*, Beth Dittman, Cathy Holland, Chris Brune, *Christine Tunstall*, Cosi Slider, Janine Wilson

ABSENT: Armando Serrano, Janet Steiger Carr, Jilian Sourage Felton, Kelsea Ashenbrenner, Skip Stanaway, Susan Noack

STAFF: Aquilla Hurd-Ravich, Quin Brunner, Sid Sin

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.

HOUSEKEEPING

1. Binder Distribution – Chair Bubenik confirmed that all members had received project binders as they entered the meeting. Quin Brunner, Urban Renewal / Economic Development Policy Analyst, asked members to update their contact information using a sheet distributed with the binders.
2. Approval of Minutes – Chair Bubenik introduced the minutes from the CAC meeting on October 29, 2025. The minutes were distributed via email on December 31, 2025, one member submitted an amendment.
    - **Motion to approve the minutes as amended:** Beth Dittman
    - **Second:** Cathy Holland
    - **In favor:** Vice Chair Christen Sacco, Beth Dittman, Cathy Holland, Chris Brune, Cosi Slider, Janine Wilson
    - **Opposed**: None
    - **Abstention:** Chair Frank Bubenik
3. Chair Bubenik announced that the group photo would be postponed, as multiple members were absent.

PROCESS RESET, 2026 PREVIEW

Process Reset – Remarks from Chair Bubenik

Chair Bubenik summarized the accomplishments of the CAC from the previous six months: staff collected nearly 200 responses to the downtown revitalization survey, maintained a consistent presence at community events, provided regular updates at CIO meetings, and held a series of conversations with business owners and developers. Michele Reeves of Civilis Consulting completed the Downtown Tualatin Identity Study, which Chair Bubenik noted the CAC would review in more depth at the February meeting. He also highlighted the completion of four of the eight classes being conducted in partnership with the University of Oregon's Sustainable City Year Program.

Chair Bubenik expressed gratitude for members' involvement, sharing that there remained a year-and-a-half of work ahead. He shared that he, Vice Chair Sacco, and Council President Pratt had heard feedback from multiple CAC members they wished to address. Two themes they identified were:

- A desire for clarity on the role of the CAC. Chair Bubenik reflected that the CAC members have been *receiving* a lot of information over the last six months and that the group will be shifting into a new pace of work that is a notch slower and broken into manageable chunks with regular opportunities for CAC members to provide input.
- A need to have better communication within the group. Chair Bubenik affirmed that CAC leadership values constructive discussion and disagreement among members, encouraging the group to speak their mind. To support his facilitation of meetings, he introduced the practice of turning table tents on their side to signal a desire to speak.

Chair Bubenik shared that CAC leadership had held multiple meetings to discuss how to incorporate these pieces of feedback. Before having staff preview the upcoming work plan, he asked CAC members if he had accurately summarized their feedback.

Process Reset - Discussion

One CAC member shared three pieces of feedback.

- First, they expressed a desire for the meeting structure to be more participatory. They flagged that there are real experts in the room whose perspective they want to hear, rather than simply receiving reports. They expressed dissatisfaction that the CAC did not have an opportunity to provide feedback on the Civilis report before receiving it in final form.
- Second, they emphasized the importance of involving developers in the downtown revitalization process. The member shared their understanding that developers were unlikely to participate in CAC meetings but expressed the importance of staff establishing these relationships now rather than waiting for the conclusion of the two-year planning process.
    - Subsequent discussion included staff sharing that they have been conducting extensive outreach over the last year while highlighting the sensitive nature of those conversations. Staff indicated that developer input would be formally incorporated

during phase three, through a developer forum and individualized opportunities for feedback on the urban design plan and design standards.

- Third, the member highlighted the CCIO recommendations presented at the October 29, 2025 meeting and asked to find a forum for ensuring these recommendations were advanced immediately.
    - While highlighting the consistency between these recommendations and a set of actions proposed in the Civilis report, CAC leadership clarified that no short-term actions would come out of this group. Another member expressed agreement with the need for updated signage while emphasizing the importance of ensuring these changes are consistent with the ultimate vision for downtown. Staff agreed to follow up individually with guidance on where to advance this request for immediate action.

The member concluded by asking if any CAC members disagreed with the points they had raised. Members who spoke after expressed general agreement, while offering additional perspective on specific items (outlined above). One member flagged that while they agreed on many of the items raised by the first speaker, they saw a difference in their understanding of the role of the CAC. They identified the role of the group *not* as advancing short-term priorities but *instead* listening to what staff has been doing and advising on key activities and decision points. They shared that they had seen the group get off track in past meetings when members shifted the focus to their priorities, pulling the group away from their core function of listening to and advising on materials developed by staff.

Additional discussion included praise for the work conducted by the University of Oregon and Oregon State University students during the fall term, recognition of the vast technical expertise available in the design and engineering realms, and expression of a concern that this committee was unequipped to advise on some questions better addressed by technical experts. This discussion further clarified the role of CAC members, which involves representing what their fellow community members want to see downtown, reviewing ideas developed by technical experts and assessing the extent to which they are consistent with the community vision.

2026 Preview – Remarks from Staff

Sid Sin, Urban Renewal / Economic Development Manager, shared an infographic summarizing the timeline and deliverables of the full two-year process. He outlined the primary work of each phase and discussed how the work products build on each other:

- Phase one, which has been completed, resulted in the Downtown Tualatin Identity Study produced by Civilis Consultants. This phase involved surveying community members, collecting input at community events, and conducting one-on-one meetings with business owners and developers. The recommendations in the Civilis report were based on these

inputs, generating a written narrative of how downtown is currently perceived and what the community wants it to be in the future.

- Phase two involves asking the University of Oregon's Architecture Design Studio to translate the narrative from phase one into renderings of the built environment. These renderings will enable CAC and community members to identify aspects of the built environment they like and dislike, which will be a foundational input for the development of downtown design standards in phase three.
- Phase three, the Community Design Master Plan, is where the CAC will shape the three final deliverables of this process:
    - An urban design plan offers a blueprint for future development, defining the boundaries of downtown and identifying districts, design features, and connective elements.
    - Design standards protect the investments of developers by ensuring all future projects are built to the same standards. It also offers visual cohesion, connecting downtown through shared design themes.
    - The consolidated recommendations report will summarize and prioritize the recommendations generated through phases one and two.

2026 Preview - Discussion

In response to member questions, Sid shared that urban renewal plans are often produced *after* urban design plans, explaining that this enables the overarching vision of the urban design plan to inform the list of projects required in the urban renewal plan. He explained how, in this instance, the Tualatin Development Commission (TDC) made the strategic decision to open the urban renewal area first to begin generating increment for the district.

Sid and Council President Pratt spoke to the relationship between the TDC and the CAC, outlining how the CAC's work products would be delivered to the TDC as recommendations, which the TDC would ultimately vote to adopt or modify. This discussion highlighted the need to reconcile the CAC work products, CORA plan, and TDC direction at the conclusion of the process to ensure all are consistent.

2026 Preview – Remarks from Staff

Quin Brunner forecasted the CAC's workplan for the next six months, first describing how the group's role changes in each phase. In phase one, he reiterated that the CAC was largely receiving information. In phase three, by contrast, he shared that the CAC would largely be creating new knowledge – weaving together their understanding of what the community wants downtown to be, input from developers, and expert perspectives to guide the consultant team and ensure final work products are consistent with the group's shared vision.

In phase two, where the CAC is at this time, Quin framed the group's role as digesting information – saying "thank you for this idea, here is what we think about it." In practice, he described three different meeting activities to structure this phase:

- Creating a shared set of evaluation criteria. Quin alluded to the first two-thirds of the Civilis report, crediting it with turning the community input received in phase one into a high-level description of what our community wants to see downtown. He described the task of today's meeting as further distilling the community narrative into five distinct priorities for downtown.
- Scoring projects using criteria. Using the evaluation criteria generated at today's meeting, Quin described how the CAC would score the Civilis and Sustainable City Year Program recommendations, beginning at the February meeting. He described this as a preliminary review, an intake process, not final decision-making.
- Conducting deep dives on specific topics. After the CAC scores the bulk of the project recommendations, Quin described how similar projects would be grouped together and presented to the CAC for reconciliation. This process will help ensure all recommended projects fit together and are fully assessed.

Quin described these three activities as a steady and methodical approach to digesting the incoming project recommendations. He added that the group would occasionally need to break from this rhythm to provide input to the four Sustainable City Year classes operating concurrently.

Attendance & Membership Changes – Remarks from Chair Bubenik

Chair Bubenik acknowledged recent attendance issues and reiterated the importance of the CAC. He shared that each member was selected to serve because CAC leadership valued their opinions, their community connections, and their vision for the community. He announced a new attendance policy, sharing that if CAC members exceeded three unexcused absences they would be asked to resign, with counting beginning in February. A member suggested that staff administer an exit survey to those asked to resign, to provide feedback for continuing to improve the functionality of the group.

Chair Bubenik reminded members to contact staff if they will miss a meeting. He also encouraged communication between voting members and alternates, to ensure alternates are present when members are absent. Discussion clarified the voting privileges of alternates: they do not have an official vote when the primary member is present but do have a vote when primary members are absent. Alternates are always encouraged to attend meetings and participate in discussions and activities.

Chair Bubenik previewed a handful of membership changes effective in February:

- Brian Carney, 2026 Chair of the Chamber of Commerce, is joining the CAC as an alternate to Skip Stanaway.

- Aaron Welk resigned and CAC leadership are actively recruiting new downtown business owners to join the CAC.
- Another high schooler will be selected to serve as Cosi Slider's alternate.

CREATING EVALUATION CRITERIA

Quin Brunner introduced the activity, recalling that he had asked members via email to prepare three responses to the prompt:

*At this meeting, our goal is to generate a set of **shared evaluation criteria** that will guide our review of potential projects (like those recommended in the Identity Study). I have an activity planned to help us identify shared priorities. To prepare, please write down three characteristics you would like to see define our future downtown. Grammatically, use the lead-in, "I want downtown Tualatin to be…"*

1. *[ex. oriented around pedestrian connectivity]*
2. *[ex. aesthetically cohesive and visually distinct]*
3. *[ex. welcoming to people of all ages]*

To get you started, I have aggregated the survey responses (from nearly 200 community members, this summer) identifying words they would like to hear describe downtown. This is just a jumping-off point, you may borrow phrases directly from the submittal list or create your own. Also useful, our Downtown Tualatin Identity Study.

Quin described the goal of the exercise as distilling the input received from community members throughout phase one into a set of five shared priorities for downtown. He described how these priorities would serve as both a north star (what are we building toward?) and a scoring tool used to evaluate recommended projects (to what extent does this project advance our shared priorities for downtown?)

To begin coalescing around shared priorities, Quin asked CAC members to pair-up, share the three priorities they each generated independently, and work together to decide on three shared priorities to advance. Four groups formed.

After all pairs indicated they had successfully completed this task, Quin asked each group to combine with another and repeat the exercise, this time producing four shared priorities to advance. Two groups formed.

To conclude the exercise, both groups shared their priorities with the full room. Vice Chair Sacco shared that group one's priorities were:

- Sustainability. Examples they identified included making sure downtown has green spaces, plenty of trees, dark-sky compliant lighting, pervious sidewalks, and that new projects use green building materials.

- Easy to navigate and move around. Vice Chair Sacco shared that the group had originally focused on walkability but shifted their language after discussing the many ways people move through downtown other than walking, and their desire to ensure downtown is navigable for all people.
- A distinct place. Group members want people to know they are in downtown Tualatin. They spoke of downtown Tualatin as being a known place, someplace compelling, and they identified places to gather as a critical aspect.
- A vibrant mixed-use area that is accessible and welcoming to all. Vice Chair Sacco described 18-hour activation of a district populated by small businesses, large businesses, shopping, restaurants, and a wide range of housing options. A key characteristic of downtown is that there is something always going on.

Council President Pratt shared group two's priorities:

- A distinctly interesting place that attracts local community members and tourists of all ages and includes events. Council President Pratt shared that 'distinct' in this context refers to something that would make people pull off the road, something different than other towns.
- A place that is supportive of new and existing businesses and their longevity.
- An environmentally friendly place that is safe for walkers and bikers and supports sustainable practices.
- A place that includes additional multifamily housing units, both market rate and affordable, along with retail services to support the growing population.

Together, they combined items until there were five priorities remaining. Quin committed to word-smithing the five shared priorities, sending a draft for review/comments via email, and having a final version ready for approval at the February meeting.

DOWNTOWN UPDATES

Sid Sin shared three project updates and answered related questions from CAC members:

- The TDC acquired two parcels adjacent to the site designated for the 18970 catalyst project.
- The four winter term Sustainable City Year Program classes began this week. They include a(n):
    - Architecture Design Studio (University of Oregon; winter term only)
    - Floodplain Study (Portland State University; winter and spring term)
    - Stormwater Study of Hedges Creek (Portland State University; winter and spring term)
    - Boones Ferry Road Connectivity Study (Portland State University; winter and spring term)
- The Riverfront Park project is progressing, with demolition of the existing structures recently completed and a process underway to hire an owner's representative.

WRAP UP, LOOSE ENDS, PREVIEW OF NEXT MEETING

Chair Bubenik reiterated that Quin would prepare a draft of the shared evaluation criteria and circulate it for review, with comments due back to him by January 25th. At the next meeting, he shared the group would spend the bulk of their time evaluating recommendations from the Downtown Tualatin Identity Study. Chair Bubenik invited CAC members to meet the architecture students on Friday, January 9th, when they are at the library for their project introduction and site visit. He also shared that architecture design studio midterms will be held on Friday, February 6th.

Chair Bubenik asked for comments on the meeting structure. Members shared positive feedback about the interactive exercise and robust process preview.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 7:54pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Quin Brunner
Policy Analyst