



PLANNING COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 14, 2023

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the May 10, 2023 PC Meeting Minutes



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

May 10, 2023 at 6:00 PM

City Hall Council Chambers & Remote Video Conferencing

Draft PC Minutes are to be reviewed and approved at the June 14, 2023 PC Meeting.

CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

A regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission was held at City Hall beginning at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, May 10, 2023. Chair Heberlein called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., followed by roll call. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ron Heberlein, Andrew Karr, Kamran Mesbah, Kathryn Neil, Olive Gallagher, and Nicole Hendrix. Jennifer Willard was absent.

City Staff: Daniel Pauly, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Dwight Brashear, Kelsey Lewis, and Mandi Simmons.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

CITIZEN INPUT

This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Planning Commission on items not on the agenda. There was none.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the April 12, 2023 Planning Commission Minutes

The April 12, 2023 Planning Commission Minutes were accepted as presented.

PUBLIC HEARING

2. Transit Master Plan (Lewis)

Chair Heberlein read the legislative hearing procedure into the record and opened the public hearing at 6:08 pm.

Kelsey Lewis, Grants and Program Manager, SMART, noted changes had been made to the draft Transit Master Plan since last month's Planning Commission meeting. Those changes, the recent survey results, and the public comments received would be presented this evening.

Michelle Poyourow, Jarrett Walker + Associates, said the team did more work on the Plan in response to the feedback from the Commission as well as the public. She introduced Brenda Martin, EnviroIssues, who managed public engagement for the project, and then presented the SMART Transit Master Plan Update via PowerPoint. Her comments were as follows:

- Community engagement was now closed and changes were made to the Master Plan, so SMART was now in the pre-adoption process. (Slide 2)
- Public input received on the Master Plan, included 39 online submissions from people the survey as well as via free form comments. Most commenters said they used SMART at least once a week, and their top three priorities, as in the previous survey, were higher frequencies, better regional connections, and improved weekend service, all consistent with the emphasis of the Draft Plan.
 - When asked if the Draft Plan was headed in the right direction, 22 people agreed, 11 were neutral, and two people disagreed.
- While many tiny, unnotable changes were made, the bigger changes made in response to feedback from the Commission and the public included:
 - On Pages 94 and 95, some important financial information was added to the executive summary.
 - Total operating costs were estimated for 2028 by applying the current 2022 unit operating costs, meaning the cost of putting a bus out on the road per hour, to the quantity of service being recommended for 2028. The total cost was added to the Master Plan.
 - The Existing Conditions Report published last summer was combined with the Draft Plan which provided information about past ridership and costs per ride on both for demand-response and fixed routes.
 - An additional table and chart would be added to the Master Plan based on the graphs showing cost per passenger trip on demand-response service, or Dial-a-Ride, from 2011 through 2020, and the newly created graph showing cost per passenger trip for all fixed route services combined 2011 through 2020. National Transit Database data was used. (Slide 5)

Chair Heberlein called for questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Hendrix appreciated the time the project team took to follow up and implement some of the suggestions from the last meeting. She requested clarification on the Chariot's letter that was submitted today.

- Ms. Lewis briefly explained that SMART shared the current 1X Route with Chariot from Wilsonville to Salem, and the letter reiterated Chariot's excitement about its partnership with SMART on the IX Route to Salem as well as SMART's interest in partnering with Cherriots on the Woodburn route. Cherriots also requested clarification about its responsibilities regarding service costs, and SMART was working on a response to clarify the matter and send it back later this week.

Commissioner Karr

- Asked the reason for the spike in cost per rider in 2020. (Slide 5)
 - Ms. Lewis explained the pandemic caused a huge drop in ridership, resulting in the per unit cost of everything increasing and the extra things SMART did not previously do, such as extensive cleaning, also added increased costs.
- Understood the cost of the new programs seemed to be around \$8 million through 2026/2027 (Pages 85-88). Would the operating costs double with the Master Plan in place?

- Ms. Lewis clarified those figures came from the City budget forecast included in the Master Plan.
- Ms. Poyourow stated on Page 89, All Recommended Service Increases totaled \$8 million, which she calculated by taking the increase in revenue hours included in the service increase, which was just hours of vehicles and drivers on the road in service, and multiply it by the 2022 fully loaded, operating costs per revenue hour.
 - Forecasting how much the operating costs would change between per hour of bus and driver time between 2022 and 2028 was a financial planning exercise beyond the scope of this project. Instead, she calculated how much it would cost to provide the quantity of service represented in the 2028 network and Dial-a-Ride if the cost of doing business stayed the same.
- Explained he was trying to figure out if the additional cost of the additional services was really \$8 million.
 - Ms. Poyourow confirmed he wanted to figure out the degree of change and directed him to the table on Page 45, which described service and summed the quantity of service per route. The bottom line was comparing the 2028 and 2021 quantity of service to get ratios. In terms of hours on the road, the revenue hours would be 189% more, and 226% more for miles on the road; however, the calculation did not include the additional vehicles needed.
 - She realized "ratio" was the wrong word and agreed percent increase was better; that the revenue hours had increased 189% from what they were in 2021, so almost triple. She would change the word ratio in the document.
 - Confirmed that an offset or an equal increase in revenue hours and cost per hour was expected.

Chair Heberlein:

- Confirmed that selection for the size of vehicles for the Master Plan was based on peak forecasted ridership and not necessarily the average ridership. He asked what total life cycle and environmental analysis would be done to understand the impact of upsizing a bus to support two hours of peak demand, and then having buses of the size operating 85% empty the rest of the time.
- Ms. Poyourow explained that trying to right-size the bus to the number of people expected on the bus at different times of the day would end up costing more in deadhead miles, deadhead hours, and staff time. The efficient and sometimes the more environmental responsible thing to do most of the time was to assign the vehicle needed for the really crowded trip to run through the day, creating a simpler schedule, reducing complexity of staff schedule, and avoid doubling up miles and hours going back and forth from the depot.
 - There would be lot of different aspects of vehicles to manage in SMART's fleet, including the type of fuel used, for example, if electric was being used, where and when would they be charged and how long would that route be, as well as the environmental impacts, vehicle size; vehicle age; the number of wheelchair boardings expected, etc. SMART Staff would be trying to optimize for many factors, and crowding was just one, so it was important to respect the math to make it efficient to run a large enough vehicle for the busiest trips of the day for a longer part of the day. These were just some of the considerations that go into planning what vehicles are used on which trip.
- Wanted to make sure that appropriate combined analysis was occurring when making such fleet decisions. It came down to identifying the key goals and considering the impacts. If environmental impact was the number one goal, then a different decision might be made from a fleet and staffing

perspective than if the goal was reducing staff cost. It was not clear from the Master Plan that such an analysis was part of the process.

- Ms. Lewis agreed, noting that while there were a lot of decision processes, realistically, Staff did such analyses every day. Staff and the analyst were constantly on the watch for trends in ridership, for example, which led to further analysis of other related factors. Currently, coming out of the pandemic, low ridership was on the radar, and crowding was being analyzed, too.
- One realistic factor not yet mentioned was that SMART needed vehicles and some vehicles were easier to get right now so those were the vehicles SMART would purchase, which might not follow the plan of getting larger buses, right away. She noted environmental impact was a higher priority than vehicle size. The goal was to get to all alternative fuel vehicles by 2028, and that was part of SMART's process. If a 40-ft diesel bus was available, SMART would wait because environmental impact was a higher priority. A lot of factors impacted SMART's vehicle purchase decisions, including crowding and lift services.

Commissioner Mesbah noted the environmental impacts discussed were all pre-isolated for the transit system. The whole purpose was to make the transit system more welcoming and easier to use, so people use transit instead of driving. Environmental impact needed to be considered in the larger context so vehicle sizing, scheduling, and other factors should be optimized to encourage more transit usage. The environmental impacts of more people using their cars were tremendously larger than a 20% larger bus. The whole purpose was to make using the transit system so easy that people stop driving and use transit no matter the conditions. The complexity of the entire picture needed to be appreciated when discussing well-optimized environment impacts. There were a lot of moving pieces and people have to make a choice.

Commissioner Karr asked how ridership data was captured.

- Ms. Lewis replied counters were used on the buses, and drivers did paper tally as a backup system to the counters. The analyst then crunched the numbers and put them into a system called the National Transit Database (NTD), a federal system where ridership and data on other factors were also collected.
- She confirmed the analyst analyzed the counters and papers as well as information extracted from the NTD to run big data analyses.

Chair Heberlein called for public testimony regarding the Transit Master Plan and confirmed with Staff that no one was present at City Hall to testify and no one on Zoom indicated they wanted to testify. He closed the public hearing at 6:36 pm.

Commissioner Karr believed the Transit Master Plan was a very good and workable plan overall.

Amanda Guile-Hinman, City Attorney, advised the Commission on language required for the motion.

Commissioner Hendrix moved to adopt Resolution LP23-0001 with the amendments to adding the Fixed Service Ridership Cost Chart and changing "ratio" to "percent change" on Page 45 as discussed and recommending City Council approve the Transit Master Plan. Commissioner Mesbah seconded the motion.

Commissioner Hendrix believed the team did a great job and was excited to see how the Transit Master Plan was implemented over time.

A roll call vote was taken. Motion passed unanimously.

WORK SESSION

3. Frog Pond East and South Implementation-Development Code (Pauly)

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, stated Staff continued to bring in the proposed Development Code amendments bit by bit. Staff was doing testing and working through some important pieces of the larger amendments which would come before the Commission in the coming months. He presented the Frog Pond East and South Development Code Amendments via PowerPoint, updating on three specific components: Defining Urban Form, Design Standards for Housing, and Design addresses.

Comments and feedback from the Planning Commission on the key components was as follows with responses by Staff to Commissioner questions as noted:

Define "Urban Form":

- Mr. Pauly confirmed Urban Form was an accurate term used in the field and not something Staff came up with. The only pushback was that Staff was talking about suburban, not urban.
- Urban form is a term of art. Suburban is an urban form.

Design Standards for Housing:

- Section 4.13.14, A1 stated, "The variety standards in Section C.1 do not apply in the Village Zone or the Frog Pond West neighborhood in the Residential Neighborhood Zone." Including Code references for what would apply, the applicable standards, was suggested when discussing where the standards did not apply, including in Section 3 as well.
- Mr. Pauly clarified a standard parking spot was 9 ft by 18 ft. In areas where the maximum driveway width was 18 ft, such as in the Street Dreams in Frog Pond West, it reduced the pedestrian-vehicle conflict zone, and the driveways essentially slants out to a third parking spot at the site.

Design Address

- How would people access the entrance of their residence if the building frontage ~~of~~ was on Stafford Rd and parking was in the back. One of the plans had multifamily along Stafford.
 - Mr. Pauly replied that in the demonstration plans he had seen, especially south of Brisbane, the parking lot for multifamily would be between the wetland and stormwater feature, and the buildings along Stafford would probably be accessed by a private drive.
 - He clarified that the front entrance did not necessarily have to face Stafford, requiring people to walk around to access their residence. For multifamily, there were design options for a breezeway that went all the way through allowing people to enter from either side; otherwise, an entrance might be required on both sides of the building.
- Would the backyard treatment on Boeckman Rd in Frog Pond West change to a front yard treatment on Advance Rd?
 - Mr. Pauly noted a transition was written into the Development Code, assuming the Stafford-Advance intersection developed the same; the treatment of Stafford Rd would wrap around to

the wetland which was about 250 ft to the east of Stafford, and then pass that wetland, it would transition to more of front facing homes with courtyards.

- Mr. Pauly confirmed that multifamily would need access points from Stafford into the residences, by not necessarily front doors facing the street. A patio door would be acceptable as a pedestrian access in the current draft. A multifamily project would likely have a breezeway to enter from either side. A detached home or town house configuration would probably have an alley loaded home with the entrance on Stafford, so there would be no parking on Stafford.
 - A homeowner could park in the garage and a visitor would park elsewhere and walk around to the front. There were tradeoffs between a front parking lot and a pedestrian orientation.
- There would be no front parking lots off Stafford Rd because that would be too many access points. From prior conversations, the idea was to ensure the houses did not turn their back on Stafford. The issue was how the back of the house is designed to look, essentially, and not the location of the front door. The back patio could be made to look like a front porch.

Chair Heberlein called for public comment after Commission consented to hearing testimony.

Mimi Doukas, AKS, West Hills Development, stated West Hills continued to follow the Development Code efforts. Her comments were as follows:

- On Page 556, Sections b and f seemed to be in conflict with each other. The general intent was understood, but the Code language needed to be clarified. Additionally, the language at the top of the page, the headings were confusing.
- Referencing Section c, West Hills believed the 18-ft maximum driveway width was very narrow and suggested it be widened to 20 ft to enable people to step on pavement, which was a more stable surface when exiting their cars. It was better for accessibility, visitability, and function.
- On Page 564, West Hills wanted to clarify that the image was the one intended, and it was not indeed to be all wrought iron. West Hills believed the combination of masonry plus wrought iron along Advanced Rd or Boeckman Rd provided a good balance of transparency plus permanency. All wrought iron felt a bit too accessible. The gate image on Page 563 was a bit confusing.
- Regarding Commissioner questions on the multifamily dwellings along Stafford Rd, West Hills had a plan to have garden apartments along that stretch of their property with sets of units and stairwells intertwined to create a breezeway effect, allowing for entries to come through and the parking to be on the east side of the building in addition to the urban frontage along Stafford Rd.

Commissioner Mesbah understood Mr. Pauly to mean that the driveway was 18-ft wide near the street and it could be widened as it got closer to garage.

Mr. Pauly noted AKS had worked a lot on driveway width in Frog Pond West and might have some feedback.

Commissioner Karr said the garage could be wider than 18 feet.

Chair Heberlein noted that the Code did not have that language. It did not state, “The maximum driveway width is 18 ft at the sidewalk” so if that was the intent, it should be updated to be clear.

Commissioner Mesbah asked if there was an intent of the width being a certain number of feet away from the sidewalk. He assumed Staff did not intend 18 ft at sidewalk and 6 inches passed the sidewalk,

it expanded to 24 ft, which would defeat the purpose of ensuring people use the sidewalk. It also depended on what defined the sidewalk width as a masonry wall was different than grass.

Mr. Pauly believed the distance at the sidewalk was the most critical point. He agreed whatever defined the width should not be a drivable surface.

Commissioner Karr asked if the width was measured at the curb or inside the sidewalk.

Mr. Pauly stated he would clarify the driveway width with the engineering team, who had a lot of experience in the matter, and would work with them to get the language crisp.

Commissioner Mesbah said the point was taken that when parking the car close to the garage, people want to be able to get out on pavement instead of grass or mud.

INFORMATIONAL

4. City Council Action Minutes (April 3 & 17, 2023) (No staff presentation)
5. 2023 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Commissioner Karr noted Columbine St was renamed as Ponderasa. He asked if the City was doing anything to publicize the camping code. There had been a lot of discussion in his neighborhood that they were going to start seeing tents in the nearby park.

Amanda Guile-Hinman, City Attorney, replied for the record, those were excluded; no camping is allowed in parks. *Let's Talk, Wilsonville!* had a project page dedicated to prohibited camping that has all the information. She confirmed the camping information had been in *The Spokesman* as well as the Boones Ferry Messenger. The City would be preparing informational materials that would be available at all City buildings.

Commissioner Karr noted the questions started coming from information published in *The Spokesman*, which often needed clarification and proper English applied. He has had the same conversation with many different neighbors, and told them all the same thing, that their local park would not have tents in it because parks were excluded. Now, he would point them to *Let's Talk, Wilsonville!*

Commissioner Mesbah noted the problem was the misinformation was already out there, adding the City had gone out of its way to inform the people through all the media.

Ms. Guile-Hinman noted as the project manager, she was happy to provide clarification to anyone with questions, so they could be referred to her.

Commissioner Mesbah understood the question was whether the Commission was going to have a public open house on the camping code, but it was already a law for the City.

Ms. Guile-Hinman confirmed Council already voted unanimously in favor on first reading on May 1, and it would go for second reading on May 15. The law would go into effect July 1, 2023.

Commissioner Karr understood the City's camping code was more specific than the State's code.

Ms. Guile-Hinman clarified the State required the City to have regulations, but as far as the time, place and manner regulations, which was the subject of the discussion, the State only required that they be objectively reasonable, which was very informative.

- She confirmed the City's camping code was not the same as what the State would have had if the City had not adopted its own.
- She believed Council was really intentional in wanting the code to be where the City could get its arms around any potential issues because the ultimate goal was to get the people help and services they need. Unlike other jurisdictions, Council was intentional about stating where people experiencing homelessness could go, rather than defining where they could not go, which created enforcement and education issues. Defining where they could go would help ensure they were connected to services.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Hendrix moved to adjourn the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 7:26 p.m. Commissioner Karr seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

By Paula Pinyerd of ABC Transcription Services, LLC. for
Mandi Simmons, Planning Administrative Assistant