



DOWNTOWN REVITALIZATION COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

FOR MAY 6, 2026

PRESENT: Chair Frank Bubenik, Vice Chair Christen Sacco, *Council President Valerie Pratt, Ben Richardson, Beth Dittman, Brian Carney, Cathy Holland, Chris Brune, Cosi Slider, Janet Steiger Carr, Janine Wilson, Kaiden Edwards, Kelsea Ashenbrenner, Steve Chao, Vy Chao.*

ABSENT: Armando Serrano, Christina George, Jilian Saurage Felton, Skip Stanaway, Susan Noack

STAFF: Aquilla Hurd-Ravich, Quin Brunner

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 Update – Quin Brunner, Urban Renewal / Economic Development Policy Analyst, distributed binder materials. These included a [summary of the next batch of recommendations](#) and the full [urban design study](#) from which they were derived.
2. Approval of Minutes – Chair Bubenik introduced the [minutes](#) from the CAC meeting on April 1, 2026. The minutes were distributed via email on April 29, 2026. There was no discussion.
 - **Motion to approve the minutes as written:** Cathy Holland
 - **Second:** Janine Wilson
 - **In favor:** Chair Frank Bubenik, Vice Chair Christen Sacco, Ben Richardson, Brian Carney, Cathy Holland, Chris Brune, Cosi Slider, Janet Steiger Carr, Janine Wilson, Kelsea Ashenbrenner, Steve Chao
 - **Opposed:** None
 - **Abstention:** Beth Dittman

REVIEW SCORED RECOMMENDATIONS

Quin Brunner displayed the [master recommendation and rendering list](#), reminding the group that all feedback was being captured in this spreadsheet and inviting additional comments. He shared that he observed some themes when digesting the feedback on the first eight renderings, which he summarized as:

- **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.

ARCHITECTURE DESIGN STUDIO ACTIVITY

Quin returned members to the small groups they were in at the last meeting, charging them with discussing [renderings 9-14](#). 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.

Project Nine

CAC members observed...

- All groups valued that this design leaves room for the pumpkin regatta while using more of the lake space. One group shared that this design would really make the lake feel alive. Another cited that it could further activate the veteran's plaza.
- Another universal valued attribute of this design was the improved pedestrian circulation. It shortens the walk and improves connections between businesses.
- Lots of thought was given to the uses on the lily pads. Some groups saw the kiosk structure as a great site for a retail incubator or event vending. The abundance of benches was well-liked. All groups cited additional shade as a desire, be it structured or from trees. The addition of a play structure and other permanent draws like a water-powered art structure or community art space were suggested as additional opportunities.
- The larger building on the north end raised some concerns, as it would likely block the view from condos and north-end businesses.
- Improving water quality was raised as a priority, with ideas including the addition of a water feature (which also adds sound), adding a circulation system to the lake, and automatic cleaning machines.
- Generally, members lauded this design as creating a destination. They liked the low-profile of the lily pads, which keeps the commons area feeling large and open. They described the curves of the lily pads as echoing the existing design of the lake. The natural materials were described as visually beautiful; selecting durable and low-maintenance building materials was raised as important.

Project Ten

CAC members observed...

- Multiple groups said this building felt out of place and did not look like Tualatin. It was described as too big, too dark, too modern, and CIA-like.
- Another concern was that these structures block the view from the businesses and condos behind them, creating a closed off space to the north.
- The plaza formed on the north end of the lake and improved pedestrian circulation were cited as positives of the design. The wicker chairs were also a positive.
- One member suggested adding a mural to the building.
- This reinforced one members desire for natural building materials, which were largely absent from this design.

Project Eleven

CAC members observed...

- Members generally supported the aim of creating a connected pathway along the north end of the lake. They liked the combination of a sitting area with the corridor and found the integration of nature along the pathways/ramps appealing.
- Multiple groups likened the configuration to an amphitheater, suggesting it could make the lake a great stage for outdoor performances (potentially combined with the lily pad idea?) The unprogrammed space under the ramp was flagged as a concern, with members describing it as sketchy and unsafe.
- The potential to increase use on the north end of the lake was appealing but some members commented that this design would not add much usable space. Members raised concerns about tenanting, both attracting interest and ensuring the building has active use tenants. Someone suggested using the structure as a community space.
- The use of glass was applauded for reducing the visual weight of the new structure on the commons.
- Other comments described this design as very modern and not practical.

Project Twelve

CAC members observed...

- The pedestrian trail connecting downtown to the riverfront park was a widely praised idea, as were the natural elements and building materials used in this design.
- The path feels much safer to move through than the current parking lot. The trail lights were specifically identified as a high-value feature.
- The major concern with this design is the loss of parking. One group said that while there is too much parking now, we also don't want to take too much away. Others asked about how we can reduce parking without damaging existing businesses.
- One group said this design rebalanced the distribution of hardscape and natural elements in the lot, which is currently all asphalt. Another pointed out that people are more willing to walk in pedestrian friendly and visually interesting spaces.
- Ensuring there is well-placed senior and ADA parking was listed as a priority.

Project Thirteen

CAC members observed...

- Members liked the blend of commercial and natural elements. They described this design as visually appealing and timeless, and the proposed mix of businesses and housing as cool.
- The elevated design was recognized as a creative solution to both the parking and flooding issues. There is, however, a new mobility challenge posed by the stairs, which is both actual and perceived accessibility.
- The trees growing through the parking structure were well liked. They were also cited as a potential maintenance challenge. In general, members appreciated the trees and greenery in this design.
- The limited vehicular access to the structure poses a potential circulation challenge.

Project Fourteen

CAC members observed...

- Most comments on this design focused on the retail incubator / food cart pod. Members liked the introduction of small local vendors to downtown and the way this design creates a node of activity along a pedestrian corridor.
- Members raised concerns about vacancy, start-up time, impact to existing businesses, and sequencing -- suggesting it may make more sense to get people downtown first.
- There were also questions about whether this would be the right location for food carts, as the design offers somewhat limited visibility.
- Some of the spaces seemed dead, leading members to suggest finding a better balance between commercial and natural elements.
- This one also may require too much walking to get to/from parking, and leaves some flooding concerns unaddressed.

SUMMER COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE

At the last meeting, Quin Brunner solicited feedback from the group on how to most effectively share the architecture design studio renderings with the public. A piece of feedback that stood out, he said, was the need to clarify the ask – to develop pointed questions directly related to design standard decision points. Quin shared his perspective that we need to get a bit further down the road to execute this correctly and that a visual preference survey was included in the scope for phase three. This summer, he shared the goal would simply be to provide general updates on the project, previewing the renderings but not seeking in-depth feedback. CAC members expressed general support for this strategy, with one suggesting that the renderings brought to the public be modified to reflect the feedback already provided by the group.

DOWNTOWN UPDATES

Quin Brunner told the group that the downtown building recently acquired by the City, the former dentist office and radio station known as the Matthias property, was demolished last week. He shared that the Metro 2040 Planning & Development Grant application was submitted, and that a decision was expected in late June. He invited CAC members to two upcoming events: the Sustainable City Year Program celebration on May 29 from 4-5:30pm and the PSU Engineering Project finals on June 4 from 3:30-5pm. Finally, he previewed the *draft study area map* for phase three. Discussion from the group focused on the difference in boundaries between the draft study area and the Core Opportunity and Reinvestment Area, as well as the importance of considering how to connect downtown and Bridgeport Village.

WRAP UP, LOOSE ENDS, PREVIEW OF NEXT MEETING

Brian Carney, Chair of the Chamber of Commerce, shared that the Chamber is transitioning between CEOs. Chair Bubenik previewed the CAC meetings through August and members shared that they enjoyed working in the small group format.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 7:40pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Quin Brunner, Policy Analyst

Downtown Revitalization CAC
Draft Meeting Minutes
May 6, 2026