



PLANNING COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2022

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the July 13, 2022 & August 10, 2022 PC Meeting Minutes



PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

July 13, 2022 at 6:00 PM

City Hall Council Chambers & Remote Video Conferencing

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, July 13, 2022. Chair Heberlein called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m., followed by roll call. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ron Heberlein, Jennifer Willard, Aaron Woods, Andrew Karr, and Kamran Mesbah. Olive Gallagher arrived after roll call. Breanne Tusinski was absent.

City Staff: Daniel Pauly, Ryan Adams, Mike Nacrelli, and Mandi Simmons.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

CITIZEN'S 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 June 8, 2022 Planning Commission Minutes

The June 8, 2022 Planning Commission Minutes were accepted as presented.

WORK SESSION

2. Wastewater Treatment Plant Master Plan (Nacrelli)

Mike Nacrelli, Senior Civil Engineer, noted the Wastewater Treatment Plant Master Plan was the first since the last major upgrade to the Master Plan in 2012 and would look at the plant capacity, condition of the equipment, the regulatory landscape, and any issues that needed to be incorporated into a capital plan.

Dave Price, Project Manager & Vice President, Carollo Engineers, briefly highlighted his professional background. He presented the Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Master Plan via PowerPoint, noting Carollo based its planning around the City's Comprehensive Plan and the growth expected in the community through 2045 to ensure the treatment plant had capacity to treat in compliance with the NPDS permit to discharge to the Willamette River. Also reviewed were potential regulatory drivers, the WWTP condition and process capacity assessments, alternatives evaluation for addressing capacity deficiencies, as well as the recommended plan for new projects and infrastructure to provide additional capacity, the proposed phasing schedule, projected yearly cashflow, and next steps, which included the Master Plan's adoption anticipated in mid-October.

Discussion and feedback from the Planning Commission was as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- Had the upcoming projects in 2023 and 2024 been estimated in the City's budget to provide the needed funding? (Slides 15 and 16)
 - Mr. Nacrelli replied the larger dollar amount projects, the UV System Improvement and Secondary Clarifier Mechanisms, were both in the Five-Year Plan of the recently adopted budget. The Seismic Improvements project could be accommodated in the City's Wastewater Capital Budget, and Staff would look into adding it to the Five-Year Plan in the next budget cycle. The Fiber Optic Cable Addition, at less than \$60,000, was a relatively small project. The Dewatering Performance Optimization project did yet have a dollar amount and Staff would work with Jacobs Engineering Group Inc., the City's contract operator, to get that figure. The City might provide some funding through that operations contract, but the project would not have a major impact on the City's cash flow.
 - He confirmed a good amount of the near term proposed projects were in the Five-Year Plan, though a few things still needed to be addressed.
- What was the financing plan for 2031? Would funds come from CIP and is there adequate annual Capital Improvement Project (CIP) funding for the 2031 projects? (Slide 16)
 - Mr. Nacrelli noted the 2031 Solids Dryer Improvements project was the next big project. As mentioned in the Staff report, the current fiscal year budget identified a wastewater rate study and SDC analysis would be done in. The final Master Plan document would be used to see what the numbers and schedule meant for the monthly rates and the system development charges (SDCs) and how they might need to be adjusted. After the public hearings, over the next year, figuring out the finance plan would be the next step in implementation.
- Mr. Price clarified that grouting any soil voids around the existing piping was not part of the Seismic Improvements project but recommended in the geotechnical report and Northwest Geotech's study. When Northwest Geotech did its site work, no active erosion or piping was occurring; however, the City would need to pay attention to those requirements when doing the new improvements for the aeration basin, or if something was identified that appeared could be an issue, such as a hole showing up suddenly after some rain events. He did not know of anything to be worried about regarding the soils currently.
- Were there many complaints over odor and should the City do any projects to address odor?
 - Mr. Nacrelli responded he had not heard much about odor complaints from the operators at the site or from Delora Kerber, Public Works Director, who manages the contract.
 - Mr. Price added odor-control facilities were tied to the dryer and the solids building. He was not a solids processing expert, but there were risks when the process was interrupted and solids were not making it through the dewatering process to the dryer on a continual basis, which would occur because something broke or something else interrupted the normal flow. Under normal operations, the assumption was that the existing units were functioning as they were intended to control odor.
 - Mr. Nacrelli added he had not noticed any odor during his many times visiting the site.
- Mr. Nacrelli clarified the process for solids did not include a digester with gas harvesting, noting the digesters were eliminated with the last upgrade.
 - Mr. Price added there was no digestion, dewatered raw solids went from the centrifuge units right into the dryer unit, and that process was intended to function on a continual basis.
- Regarding plans for generating gas in the future, which was typical when dealing with solids, Mr. Nacrelli noted producing heat and electricity from harvested methane had been a big part of his previous job at

the City of Gresham, but it would be prohibitive for the City of Wilsonville to ~~try and~~ go back to using anaerobic digestion after eliminating the digesters.

- Mr. Price clarified that the percentage increases on Slide 4 were 2045 projections for an increase in the potential need for capacity based upon Staff's analysis using Metro numbers.
 - On how the percentage projections compared to the population increase percentage, Mr. Price replied the projected population of 30,000 in 2045 (Slide 3) was less than those represented in the table. (Slide 4) Often, conservative numbers were used when evaluating specific elements, like the loads or flows, for future growth and what would be produced. To ensure, Carollo was being conservative for planning purposes, the best-case scenario was not used. Every home built would not necessarily have the number of residents assumed by the Comprehensive Plan.
- The project assumed the same per capita load and flow generation seen today for 2045. The population increase would be around 18 percent, but the analysis showed increases of more than twice that in all categories. What infiltration inflow analysis information was available?
 - Mr. Price replied evaluations for treatment facilities looked at the actual flows received at the plant. Depending on the circumstance, the client's desires, and the needs of the community, the analysis might look at the collection system model to see the maximum amount of flow it could deliver. Typically, the flow numbers were generated based upon an evaluation using rolling averages, often a maximum month flow based upon a rolling 30-day average was used; not what the average was in one month compared to some time period, often it was the previous five years. The analysis did not necessarily utilize the same kinds of assumptions used in a collection system plan in part because with a treatment plant, no matter how tight the site was, the assumption was that more capacity could be built, expanded, or intensified. However, once pipe was put in the ground, it was difficult to make it any larger so often the collection system plan made very conservative assumptions, especially for peak flows it needed to convey to the plant to prevent wastewater protrusion from manholes.
- Did the City have a handle on clear water intrusion in the system?
 - Mr. Nacrelli replied the Wastewater Collection System Master Plan would have definitely looked at water intrusion and the Master Plan had a CIP to replace a lot of older pipes. He had been involved in several projects in Charbonneau, an older area where the age of the infrastructure had been a particular issue. The City was definitely addressing intrusion and the best way to do it was to either line or replace old pipes.
 - Commissioner Mesbah responded he had hoped to hear the City had a handle on any potential large inflow areas; not old pipes, but broken lines, especially in low areas with shallow ground water and he assumed some gravity lines were located where such water intrusion could occur, letting in water that was not efficient to treat. Was a conservation plan to reduce the loads in the future part of the WWTP Master Plan, assuming people would be as wasteful as they were today?
 - Mr. Nacrelli noted the increases in BOD and TSS were a bit higher than the flows, which probably reflected that the influent was often trending stronger because less clean water, or rainwater, was coming into the system. The City was treating the same amount of solids, but the hydraulic impact was not as severe as it would have been in past years. (Slide 4) He agreed more efficient pipe materials, fixtures, and plumbing contributed to less water being treated.
 - A program to encourage more conservation would be more to do with the water distribution and plumbing side of things and was not part of this project's scope. However, the City was interested in conservation and pursuing it.
 - Mr. Price added one thing that came up with many of the planning studies he had done over the last 18 to 20 years was the idea that flows were very important, and they are however, as Mr.

Nacrelli had indicated, wastewater management tried to control the flow as well as ensure a process that could handle and treat the organic loads coming in, all of which included contaminants. In his experience, water conservation efforts did not always benefit wastewater treatment plants. For example, efforts in northern California, where constituents were regulated to a much lower level than DEQ, had resulted in the unintended consequence of water coming into the plants with a much higher concentration of pollutants. Water conservation was important, but it needed to be looked at carefully and watched at the wastewater plant, which was why the loads were looked at closely in the analysis which was often more important in some ways.

- Mr. Nacrelli noted the flows and loads increase was greater than the population increase and asked if that was because non-residential sources were also included.
 - Mr. Price confirmed the numbers did reflect non-residential sources, which included the prison and other industrial/commercial users within the service area, which were not reflected in the population numbers. Following Commissioner Mesbah's comments, he did want to take a hard look at the flows and loads analysis along with evolving land uses to make sure everything was in line.
- Industrial uses, like a brewery with higher loads to the treatment plant might exist in the city that the Commission was unaware of. Was the growth projection lowballed or would the City experience higher growth?
 - Mr. Nacrelli replied Metro's numbers were definitely on the low end, which was why they looked more closely at the medium projections indicated by the green line. (Slide 3, Green line)
- Historically, Metro numbers had been low, but the other aspect was that the City did have some say in how fast it grew. Some of the costs shown in the Draft Cash Flow chart were the costs of growth. (Slide 16) Perhaps those things should be thought about in addition to the expansion of load systems, etc. There were costs associated with choosing to grow which the City needed to be strategic about. The plan was conservative and seemed to have room to cover more than Metro's projections. Layering conservatism in the planning process should be avoided. Conservatism in facilities planning sometimes resulted in over-building unnecessarily that went unused long term.
 - Mr. Price replied that was a concern of his as well. Process engineers were conservative because no one wanted to under plan. The community should pay close attention to who was responsible for paying for which element of the need. Unfortunately, some elements might not be driven by capacity, but performance. There was an element of capacity embedded even in that large dryer unit that somebody would benefit from other than the existing users.
 - Mr. Nacrelli added because the City did not appear to have a capacity issue in the near-term, it could track what growth actually looks like over the next five years and then adjust accordingly, as the Master Plan would be adaptive. The City had not updated the Plan in 10 years, but he expected the City would not go longer than five years before assessing growth and making adjustments to the Master Plan as necessary.
- It would be helpful for the report to include a full built-out analysis. As the City built out areas it was adding, would it have adequate capacity, or would capacity go unused by the time the equipment needed to be replaced because it was not useful anymore; without having really used it? That would be a waste of taxpayer or ratepayer money. A full build-out analysis with timelines would provide some idea of whether the growth of the facility was being tracked in lockstep with the expected built-out of the areas added to the urban area.
 - Mr. Price noted the flows and loads had been projected out to the projection curves. Early in the analysis of the plant, Carollo Engineering, in conjunction with City Staff, decided not to necessarily

plan around the built-out numbers for the reasons pointed out. Including the build-out numbers would result in a more intense treatment plant site at the facility to account for the population nearly doubling, as shown by the projection on the higher rate curve. (Slide 3)

- Mr. Nacrelli clarified build-out was unrelated to the rate of growth. The current city boundaries and reserve areas would max out and fill up at some point according to how the areas were zoned. There was a number associated with build-out, though ~~not~~ it was not necessarily tied to a time frame but to land use.
- Build-out could be tied to a time frame because the Planning Department had some idea of how fast the neighborhoods would develop. For example, 1680 units were planned for Town Center, 1750 units were planned in Frog Pond East and South. At 2.5 people per unit, 8500 residents would be living in developments the City knew were likely to be built between 2022 and 2035. Coffee Creek and Basalt Creek would likely be built out within a 20-year time period. While those were industrial uses, the City knew it would happen during the subject growth period.
- The expected growth chart should reflect the planning the City knew was already in progress. The city's population would increase from 27,000 to 37,000 just with the known development in Frog Pond East and South and Town Center, and that did not include Frog Pond West. The standard curve should include known development and another curve should address potential additional growth.
 - Additionally, the City should be explicit in its conservatism. Right now, the plan showed a 12 percent population growth from 2021 to 2045, but a 30 percent increase in load. The discrepancy between those two numbers should be explicit, especially as it the Master Plan progressed toward Council. The plan needed to be explicit in why the load increase was twice as much as the population growth, which was a big deal.
 - Mr. Nacrelli clarified Jacobs Engineering had taken over CH2MHill, the company that had the design/build/operate contract for the treatment plant, so Jacobs was now the City's contract operator for the treatment plant.
- As different population projections were done, Staff and the consultants were asked to use the same time frame for gathering historical data and for the future projection. For example, show 30 years' worth of previous data and then project 30 years into the future. A projection using 5 years of data to project 25 years in the future was not statistically defensible. The prior five years of growth could have been a growth spurt that was being extended 30 years into the future, which was not accurate. Growth, especially in a small city like Wilsonville, was choppy, so it should be averaged out to determine the long-term trends.

3. Frog Pond East and South Master Plan (Pauly)

Dan Pauly, Planning Manager, noted this was the Commission's sixth work session on the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan. He presented the Master Plan, including updates in response to the Commission's feedback via PowerPoint, reviewing the housing related design concepts and describing the similarities and differences between the three housing design types, displaying examples of each type using photographs from Villebois and Frog Pond West. He noted three housing design types were not set in stone, but the presentation addressed questions from Council and would be helpful for the Commission. Understanding the three housing types would be important in developing policy.

Joe Dills, MIG|APG continued the PowerPoint presentation, summarizing the feedback and preferences discussed by the Planning Commission last month, noting the aspiration to create and connect special destinations within the neighborhoods was still part of the physical planning. (Slide 29) He described the

updates made to create the Draft Plan Preferred Alternative (Slide 30), including changes to traffic circulation, street classifications, and the placement of housing types which helped enhance connectivity throughout the Master Plan area. Additional comments from Saumya Kini from Walker Macy addressed the equitable distribution of housing and multiple types of affordable products throughout the neighborhood and Andrew Paris from MIG|APG overviewed the housing capacity estimates and mix assumptions used to determine the impacts to transportation and infrastructure planning.

Mr. Dills noted the Planning Commission's policy discussion would determine how to achieve the best variety within the housing types. Unlike Villebois, which had a master developer, replicating the best of Villebois would need to be done through public standards and zoning ordinance techniques.

Comments from the Commission and responses to Commissioner questions was as follows:

- Initially there did not seem to be enough Type I in South, but since three-unit town houses could fit into both Type I and Type II. The mix within the type allowed some flexibility with the minimums and maximums. The map was fine.
- Ms. Kini clarified the arrows pointing toward the BPA easement indicated there would be some kind of public connection, whether it was an alley or a pocket park.
 - Mr. Pauly added Staff was still exploring a potential connection across the easement on the north end near the Grange. Otherwise, Staff did not expect any vehicular access across the easement.
- Mr. Dills clarified the arrow down the middle of BPA easement was a proposed trail and as it connected to and crossed Stafford Rd, the trail would be in the proximity of the northern extension of the Boeckman Creek Trail, which Metro was ultimately showing as a trail that would go up into the Stafford Basin. The proposed trail would connect the area to the larger, regional trail network. (Slide 30)
 - Having openings into that open space between houses on the long block paralleling the BPA easement was suggested.
- Ms. Kini noted previous discussions suggested a portion of school property south of the Future Community Park could provide an opportunity for Type 1 housing; however, since the previous meeting, it had been determined that property should be considered part of the school district and was shown as such on the map. The team also had good communication with the City's traffic engineers and the School District about the trail connections and felt confident about showing a trail connection going south toward Boeckman Creek Primary School.
 - Did the land use change result in fewer dwelling units in Alternative C? At the last meeting, Alternative C had a total of 1,803 dwelling units and now it showed approximately 1,600 units. The focus of the new alternative was to do a little mixing and matching within Alternative C. Was the reduction in the overall buildable area driving the reduction in the number of units?
 - Mr. Dills confirmed the school parcel was part of the reduction, but the larger cumulative effect was from going from fuzzy lines to hard lines with block thinking. The amount of Type I decreased as it was fit into areas with the actual conceptual block formation.

Mr. Pauly continued the PowerPoint presentation with a review of housing variety policy options, key points to consider, and a summary of four draft policy options to facilitate housing variety. Staff recommended combining Policy Options 2 and 3 to adopt a minimum of target housing types and a maximum of individual housing types.

- He clarified that including Frog Pond West, the entire area was similar to Villebois, which was developed mainly by four developers. While some small developers would come into play, Frog Pond would ultimately have a maximum of four or five developers. Frog Pond East would not have as many as North

where the large tracts of land would likely be controlled by one or two developers. There was potential for some smaller scale projects in the southern portion.

Planning Commissioner comments and responses to Staff's questions (Slide 37) continued as follows with Staff addressing further questions as noted.

Commissioner Willard expressed support for Policy Option 4.

Commissioner Karr:

- Liked Policy Option 4 but asked if specifying a minimum and maximum would require a minimum and maximum for each housing category within the type or could a maximum just be attached to detached single-family, for example.
 - Mr. Pauly replied the number would be adjustable; each bucket did not have to be in each block. The minimums and maximums could vary based on the size of the subdistrict or the context.
- Noted detached single-family would push things out of the affordable range, so developers would get the idea if a maximum was placed on at least detached single-family. He believed minimum and maximum requirements were needed on housing types in order to meet the City's affordable and equitable housing initiatives. If not required, developers would build detached single-family houses as they were the most profitable.

Commissioner Woods also liked Staff's recommendation, which provided a good balance between the City complying with HB 2001 and providing a limit range on housing types. However, in addition to single-family detached homes, there should be options for tiny homes, perhaps even a tiny home requirement, if builders were available, to offer more affordability for first-time homebuyers. He clarified tiny homes were typically 499 sq ft to a maximum of 899 sq ft and had all the amenities of a larger home but were just smaller in size and cost.

Commissioner Gallagher believed the City needed to be very clear about the minimum standards regarding what the City wanted to achieve. If the City just made suggestions, profit would overrule standards. She confirmed this was captured in Policy Option 4.

Commissioner Mesbah:

- Also liked Policy Option 4. In looking at the different housing types presented, it was clear that articulation of the façade made a big difference in how the space looked and felt. He was not sure the project team was talking about that level of design at this point or if they ever would.
 - Mr. Pauly replied the City could build off some of the articulation standards adopted for Middle Housing as well as the articulation standards in Frog Pond.
- Commented he had to remind himself that details, like bump outs and coves, which make an attractive façade add to the cost of construction, but he would hate to see blank walls for the affordable housing. There was an approach to affordable housing that said real affordable housing needed to be really well designed because otherwise there were additional costs in maintenance and other things. He hoped it would all fall into place to be a harmonious and coherent look for the neighborhood.

Commissioner Karr asked that Staff include a breakdown of the housing types in Villebois at a future work session. Villebois was a good representation of what the Planning Commission would like to see; though the streets were narrow, it was a nice housing development. He noted discussion had begun about urban renewal and using tax incremental funding to help with some of the HB 2001 affordability requirements in Frog Pond.

Commissioner Heberlein:

- Agreed requiring a certain mix of housing was the only way to go realistically and liked the idea of focusing on a maximum number of single-family homes, which should be investigated further. However, would placing a maximum number on any product type penalize later developers as those in earlier could take up certain housing units? Was there some mechanism to help ensure that would not happen?
 - Mr. Pauly replied the geography the standards were based on would assume each geography was done by one single developer.
- Supported Policy Option 4 as a blend was good.
- Requested that Staff bring examples of housing variety policies that had been successful elsewhere to future work sessions to be used as a template.
 - Mr. Dills replied research had shown that Wilsonville was a trailblazer regarding such policy.

INFORMATIONAL

4. Outreach Framework (Pauly)

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, noted Consultants Bill de la Cruz and Pat Noyes had concluded their contract work resulting in draft Outreach Framework. He presented the Wilsonville Framework for Inclusive Engagement via PowerPoint, noting the updates made since the Commission's May work session and.... providing an overview of the framework, how the process was designed, examples of barriers and potential actions, as well as a menu of outreach activity, and next steps.

Commissioner Karr believed the City had done a good job of engaging with the community in the past, but the framework elevated its game, adding a focus on underrepresented stakeholders would help to better serve the entire community, not just the few who attended all the meetings. He applauded the City's efforts, noting in the long run, the framework would make the City/Wilsonville that much better.

Commissioner Woods said he had participated in the framework from the very beginning and found the outcome to be very comprehensive, detailed, and specific. Some key items would be very difficult to overcome, the first being the general interest from the community itself and looking at what the community wants and needs. Hopefully, there were community ambassadors to help to pool groups together and find out exactly what the City was missing. 'Build it and they will come' would not work in this scenario. There were multiple attack points the City would have to approach and it would take some time. Engaging unrepresented stakeholders would be extremely important. The framework was an excellent document, but the City had to do a deep dive and look at how to tie together some of the needs while trying to understand what the community and underserved communities need as well as finding ways to bring them out. Some people would not be able to travel to meetings or access Zoom meetings. It was a good document, but there were key points to concentrate on to make the City's objectives work.

Commissioner Mesbah seconded Commissioner Woods' statements. He was pleased with the framework document, adding the City was dealing with a general citizenry that is disinterested until something is proposed that catches their attention. Throughout the country, communities were finding out that they needed to build that kind of engagement and community spirit into a functioning democracy at a small scale. Part of the impetus for having the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Committee was to have a committee focused on building that kind of rapport with the community and that kind of outreach, especially with underrepresented communities. Perhaps, if the City built engagement with the underrepresented, the rest of the community would also get interested because the effort necessary to do that kind of work would have spillover effects throughout the community. The Planning Commission needed to think about building that level of engagement as part of its job description. The Planning Commission was the outreach committee. As the document noted, just holding public hearings was not outreach. The Commission needed to come up with

ideas to engage portions of neighborhoods and the community on different issues; perhaps even going out to the community instead of expecting the community to come to the Planning Commission. He wanted to underscore Commissioner Woods' statement that this work was heavy lifting, and the City needed to start brainstorming about how to do it.

Commissioner Gallagher agreed it was a heavy lift and added that, as an ethicist, she wanted to point out that the City could have the best of intentions, but it was trying to overcome something that was based on a sense of trust and respect, which was not something that could be overcome by forming a committee with good intentions; it had to be built over time through action, and it was a very challenging process, especially in the country right now. She did not want all the good intentions of trying to bring people together to overlook the reason why those populations felt not included to begin with, which would just put a Band-aid on a problem that was not going to heal.

Commissioner Heberlein believed the Outreach Framework was a great step towards helping to ensure the City was consistent in how it reached out and solicited input. A key would be to focus on Steps 1 and 2, making sure the citizenry was involved in defining the problem and identifying the desired outcome and making sure the City was focused on listening to the entirety of the citizenry in those early steps. The City tended to jump to brainstorming solutions, but it needed to make sure it had a general consensus on defining the problem. There was a significant amount of disagreement over whether a bridge was needed on the Boeckman Dip and the City's money being better spent elsewhere. This was an example of where the City may have been able to do a better job of defining the problem, the desired outcome, and getting the citizens' involvement up front to mitigate some of that, even though it may have resulted in the same solution. He was hopeful the document could help the City make more informed decisions moving forward.

Commissioner Gallagher noted earlier comments about setting a minimum standard for developers in terms of the types of housing the City wanted and added that in a way, the Commission was really asking the citizens of Wilsonville, 'What kind of town are we? What kind of a place do we want to be? What kind of values and what kind of behavior do we want to reflect that will make people feel welcome here and included?' How could this be quantified [put your arms around it] unless certain behavioral standards were set in order to achieve the vision for the type of community the citizens wanted and tried to live it every day.

Commissioner Willard asked to see the long-term data over the engagement through the six steps outlined in the Framework. Was there a particular step in which the community was more engaged? Those numbers could be used as a baseline to measure progress from. In terms of diversity, equity, and inclusion, it would be helpful to understand what parity was. What did the City know about the mix in the community and the engagement it got now, and when would that be at parity? Those two data figures would be meaningful to understand if the City was making progress.

5. City Council Action Minutes (June 6 & 20, 2022) (No staff presentation)

There were no comments.

6. 2022 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

There were no comments.

ADJOURNMENT

The regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission adjourned at 8:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

August 10, 2022 at 6:00 PM

City Hall Council Chambers & Remote Video Conferencing

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, August 10, 2022. Chair Heberlein called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., followed by roll call. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ron Heberlein, Aaron Woods, Andrew Karr, Kamran Mesbah, Olive Gallagher, and Breanne Tusinski. Jennifer Willard was absent.

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Ryan Adams, Daniel Pauly, Dwight Brashear, Eric Loomis, Kelsey Lewis, Mandi Simmons.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

CITIZEN'S 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 July 13, 2022, Planning Commission Minutes

Consideration of the July 13, 2022, Planning Commission Minutes was postponed to the Commission's September meeting.

WORK SESSION

2. Transit Master Plan (Lewis)

Kelsey Lewis, SMART Grants and Programs Manager, introduced the Transit Master Plan (TMP) update noting SMART Transit Director Dwight Brashear and Transit Operations Manager Eric Loomis were present via Zoom for questions.

Michelle Poyourow noted she was involved in the TMP in 2016 and was honored to come before the Planning Commission again. She presented the progress on the TMP update via PowerPoint, introducing the project team members from Jarrett Walker + Associates, enviroissues, who were leading the public engagement, and from Parametrix, who would assist with transit operations advice,

capital planning, and fleet planning once a transit network and service plan was drafted. She briefly described the purpose of the TMP update, the changes since the last update in 2017, and the general project timeline, noting the progress made so far and anticipated milestones of the update with completion expected in Spring/Summer 2023.

Brenda Martin, Public Involvement Specialist, enviroissues, continued the PowerPoint presentation, highlighting events and tools during the first phase of public engagement occurring through October and describing the public survey and stakeholder workshops planned in August and September. Her key additional comments were as follows:

- The public survey scheduled to begin this Friday, August 12th would be administered online via the 'Let's Talk Wilsonville' SMART page for the TMP as well as on board buses to solicit bus riders' participation. (Slide 7) SMART Staff had been attending farmers markets and community events throughout the city this summer to let the public know about the TMP update and would continue to do so until the end of the survey on September 12, 2022. (Slide 7)
 - While much of the information being sought from the survey was available from data over the last couple of years, much of it had changed due to the pandemic.
- An intensive, half-day workshop would be held in early September for stakeholders with a vested interest in the TMP, such as those representing agencies or key organization/community groups that tended to be more transit-dependent or had trouble connecting to transit currently. The workshop would focus on gaining a better understanding about the tradeoffs between local versus regional service, and the priorities regarding where SMART could better serve the residents and visitors of Wilsonville. Enviroissues had created a list of stakeholders to invite to the September workshop and sought the Planning Commission's input about any additional stakeholders to invite to September's workshop. (Slide 9)

Comments and suggestions from the Commission were as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- Additional stakeholders suggested by the Commission included homeowner associations (HOAs), minority groups, and more focus on youth representation.
 - Enviroissues could contact the City's Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Commission for specific suggestions on how to reach different ethnic groups in the city.
 - **Ms. Martin** assured the team would work to ensure all stakeholder groups included a diverse representation at the workshop.
 - With two or three physical therapy clinics in the area, as well as Providence Medical Center, those who are injured for a period of time and unable to transport themselves could be an underserved population who did not realize the transit options available when unable to drive themselves.
 - Many people in younger generations, such as older high school students and college students, were looking to test the limits of their freedom and reduce their carbon footprint.
 - The youth were the future of transit and the future of the city, and it was important that the City was really listening to those who would be using the system for the longest period of time.
- 'Stakeholder' typically meant those who use the transit system, but those who did not use the system may emerge from the survey. Having follow-up conversations with non-riders was suggested to understand why they did not use the system, whether any were potential users, and what the impediments were to ridership.

- **Ms. Martin** noted a few survey questions asked how often the respondent had taken SMART over the last year, and if they had not ridden or had never used SMART, they were asked for their reasons and allowed to choose as many as applied. Those results would be interesting and could help the consultants do some follow-up. Those non-users were not the stakeholders usually thought of, but they were the people SMART was trying to convince to use transit.
- **Ms. Martin** clarified the survey had been translated into Spanish, and she believed the page could be translated via Google, which the team would research.
- Understanding the goal would better inform what stakeholders to suggest. If the goal was to achieve an X increase in ridership that would involve a different set of stakeholders. If the goal was to maintain the existing ridership base, then that was a different set of stakeholders. Knowing what was trying to be achieved would make it easier to develop a list of stakeholders.
 - **Ms. Martin** believed the existing summary included a list of goals for the TMP.
 - **Ms. Poyourow** noted the stakeholder workshop would address questions of priority and policy for the future TMP. Stakeholders were not just people who might themselves want to ride the bus, but also people whose opinions should be considered about how Wilsonville grows, how transit changes in Wilsonville, and what would be most important as the City developed its transit system over the next five years. The stakeholders were people with lots of different perspectives on the city, the life and growth of the city, as well as people interested in transit. The existing stakeholder list included a very specific portion of the community, so homeowners would be a good addition to the stakeholder group.

3. Frog Pond East and South Master Plan (Pauly)

Dan Pauly, Planning Manager, presented the updates to the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan via PowerPoint, providing information requested from the Commission, which included a brief overview of Villebois' housing mix, highlighting the design concepts discussed in February, and presenting the residential policies for housing variety. Staff sought input on several elements related to the criteria for Components 1 and 2, which involved target housing types and a cap on single housing types, respectively.

- Component 1. (Slides 7-8) Staff had some initial ideas about target housing types and the criteria to use. (Slide 8) He noted defining the mix of uses would not define any specific price point, but would look at the mix that would give the best opportunity to serve different market segments.
 - Targeting housing types identified in the Affordable Housing Analysis would serve the market rate segment of 80 to 120 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI).
 - Other ideas included accessory dwelling units (ADU) and cottages. ADUs could help with affordability as well as meet certain demographic segments of the market not otherwise served by larger homes.
 - Accessible living options were another idea, particularly smaller, accessible, single-floor options; however, these options would further analysis by the project team.
- As discussed during July's work session, some housing varieties would not likely be built by the market through incentive so a requirement would make more sense. However, the City may be able to incentivize some housing types, such as ADUs.
- Staff sought feedback on identifying the target housing types, how much of each housing type should be required and what to require versus incentivize.

The Commissioner comments and feedback regarding Component 1 Criteria was as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- Different housing products could be placed within all three housing types, so with the 80% to 120% AMI goal and knowing Frog Pond West was built out with larger houses, East and South would need a mix of townhouses, condos, and smaller, detached single family homes.
 - Commissioner Karr suggested Type 1 could be a mixture of 4-unit townhouses, multi-story condos, and detached single-family with 20 percent minimums and 30 percent maximums of each type. Type 2 could be a mix of three-unit townhouses and detached single-family homes, both with 30 percent minimums and 50 percent maximums, for a kind of 50/50 split. Type 3 could be four- and two-unit townhouses mixed at 50 percent and detached single-family homes at 50 percent. He agreed to email Mr. Pauly those numbers, which could be passed on to the other Commissioners.
- **Mr. Pauly** confirmed that a zoning scheme could be developed that offered a minimum requirement of a housing type and incentives for exceeding the minimum percentage.
- The City should do everything possible to have a standard minimum and then incentivize, which would work with other design preferences. Although how to provide a target mix for a balanced approach was unclear at this time, providing housing types with no numbers was a problem. It was important that the City not paint itself into a corner and make it impossible to meet not only incentives but the market situation. Thus far, the Commission had worked on the premise of keeping flexibility while also including minimum targets to avoid missing the opportunities for achieving the upward mobility and housing mix desired. The markets analysis was very helpful but coming up with a design and policy that allowed flexibility for Staff and those rendering approval to find the best and most doable mix at the time was difficult. Having draft policy language to frame the issue would enable Commissioners to give provide better feedback.
 - **Mr. Pauly** noted Staff could explore ways to update the regulated mix in a couple years after the City completed the Housing Needs Analysis and had a new production strategy.
- Hopefully, that was not needed. The hope was to have aspirational language that tells decision makers, whenever decisions were made, what the target vision is and allow them to hone that to the conditions and opportunities at the time. Maybe that was not doable, and something would need to be set up now, and then revisited in two to three years.
- The City was looking at market affordability of 80 to 120 percent. Was there a reason 60 to 80 percent was not considered?
 - **Mr. Pauly** replied 60 to 80 percent would not be delivered by market rate housing and would need to be some sort of subsidized-type project which, in terms of types, would still be allowed but would be separate from the Master Plan. Language would likely exempt subsidized, affordable housing from any variety requirements. If funding came into place, partnerships were made, and an affordable developer built something, that would be outside this Master Plan. The City could not require a certain amount of 60 to 80 percent, and it was likely no products could be developed at that price point without being subsidized somehow.
 - Information was available in the Affordable Housing Analysis, but tiny homes would likely be in the 80 to 120 percent category. While tiny homes would meet a different kind of market need demographic than other products, they would still be fairly expensive due to the fixed cost of building the infrastructure and installing kitchen and bathroom fixtures.

- He confirmed cottages referred to cottage clusters (Slide 8) and confirmed Staff would double check to see if the cost of cottages or tiny homes could meet the below 80 percent market segment, and if so, the City may want to include them in the target housing types.
- Staff was encouraged to look into the affordability of tiny homes and cottages more closely, and Commissioner Woods offered to send more information if needed. For affordability purposes and considering first-time homeowners, the City should seriously consider tiny homes while ensuring the tiny homes fit with the models in the particular subareas.
- The City should consider a certain percentage of accessible, one-level homes that could meet the needs of seniors or those looking to move from a two-story to a one-story home.
- As far as requiring versus incentivizing, incentivizing was preferred. Certainly, the City did need to require a certain percentage, but determining those percentages was a struggle given all the other variables being discussed. Perhaps **Commissioner Karr's** information would help.
- It was important for the City to pay attention to the extreme changes happening in the country, the climate, and in the world, and serving the needs of the future population rather than the known quantity in the present. Concern was expressed about the City making decisions about percentages of housing types based on what was known right now, when the question was what kind of community would Wilsonville be 20 years from now? What kind of population was the City trying to attract? What kind of businesses? Would the City be able to provide housing to the population working in those businesses?
 - That was why flexibility was needed.
- Regarding comments about the affordability of cottages and tiny houses, the City's focus in Frog Pond was as it should be. The Commission had already discussed that a greenfield development could not effectively produce affordability. The graphs on Page 20 of Attachment 1 indicated where the housing shortfall was in the city, which was drastic, as well as the closing housing target the City could meet for the Frog Pond neighborhood, which was on the edge of the city. The Planning Commission had discussed how having public funding available for housing would make things different, at least in other parts of the city, so the City could have housing availability for lower percentages of median income. Had City Council discussed that topic or was the Council still where it was three years ago prior to the housing strategy? Was the City getting any closer to at least looking down the road at the potential of having housing services?
 - **Mr. Pauly** confirmed that was in process, but there was certainly more work to do. Council was looking at the TOD transit project to provide some immediate affordable housing. Matt Lorenzen recently worked on the vertical housing tax credit which could be used both in Town Center and Villebois, and potentially even in the Frog Pond commercial area, if the developer wanted to do vertical mixed use. In addition, the Urban Renewal Task force recently had a meeting about exploring how urban renewal could come into play and considered a system similar to the Wilsonville Investment Now (WIN) Program, where spot-specific additions were made to the Urban Renewal District in order to take advantage of help from tax increment financing to assist with affordable housing. All these options were being proactively looked at right now, and there was a lot more to do. City Council realized affordability was an ongoing conversation but was interested in the topic.
- Staff's comments were helpful. The timeline for any discussions to start creating options for affordable housing was probably about the same as the development of the Frog Pond neighborhood. Since those conversations were happening at the same time, Frog Pond did not have to be the last, best chance for the City to get everything it needed in affordability taken care

of, which would not be doable anyway as the analysis showed. The need to be flexible was critical, so the City did not lose out on opportunity because it was too rigid and not creative enough, or too lenient and avoided keeping the accountability to get as much affordability as possible.

- Regarding affordable housing, the City was in a conundrum with a green field in Frog Pond. The stats on Page 14 of the Affordable Housing Analysis showed the City's greatest need currently was very expensive housing and really inexpensive housing, which was not at all what the City was aiming for with Frog Pond. The only way the City would get to the lower end was through "infill-subsidized," taking existing market rate housing and subsidize based on a person, rather than subsidizing an entire building, like a HUD building. The City was missing the mark with its target of serving the 80 to 120 percent bracket in Frog Pond because the largest demand shown was in the 150 percent or more bracket. Basically, the city's largest housing need was at the top end and at the bottom end of the income scale. If Frog Pond was built out for the 80 to 120 percent target, people would buy the houses, however, how long the houses would stay in that target range was questionable; house values would inflate quickly.
 - **Mr. Pauly** clarified the tables on Page 14 were an extrapolation of existing population and reflected a gap for the 120 percent because that was not a strong part of the city's existing product mix and population.
- Wouldn't Exhibit 15 identify the City's housing need gap? The center portion of the chart showed the existing housing needs, and the only three needs were very high income, very low income, and extremely low income, which matched Exhibit 9 on Page 14.
 - If the needs were broken up differently, like middle income from 80 to 100 percent and then 100 to 120 percent, then that product mix might show up from 100 to 120 percent AMI.
 - **Mr. Pauly** replied he would follow up on that at the next work session.
 - It was a question of who the housing was being built for. Was housing being built for people in the 80 to 120 percent MFI who had not yet moved to the area or for people already in Wilsonville who wanted 120 percent MFI and above?
 - Exhibit 9 indicated there was a huge shortfall above 120 percent, which was probably above 150 percent AMI. If the city did not have housing for those people, they might buy a less affordable house or move out of Wilsonville to an area with houses that fit their lifestyle. Villebois was a well designed, built, and looking community. If that was what the City was shooting for and those housing types fit the 80 to 120 percent AMI, then that should be the City's goal. Right now, there was a huge shortfall in the less than 30 percent AMI, and the City had to figure out how to make housing available for that portion of the population, though perhaps not within Frog Pond.
 - Housing being built in Frog Pond West was all at 120 percent AMI and above.
- In Exhibit 15, did the city distribution include Frog Pond West, both what had been built and what was planned to be built?
 - **Mr. Pauly** replied ECONorthwest was not present as Staff had not anticipated such detailed questions about the data, but they could be invited to the next work session.
 - Including Frog Pond West in the city distribution shown in Exhibit 15 on Page 20 of the attachment or page 49 of the PDF was one thing, but if not, it seemed to indicate the City had built some of the 120 percent and above, which changed the existing housing need, as well as the potential requirements for what the City needed to build in Frog Pond East and South. The answer was important to ensure the City was using all the data available. Currently, the proposed target showed the need for lots of high and middle income, and very little of the

other things the City needed. While it was not possible to solve the existing need gap for extremely low income in Frog Pond East and South on its own that did not mean the Commission should not try to do something meaningful to make progress. Having nothing or very little meant the existing gap would get larger. Defining targets for housing types was difficult without being able to see that picture more clearly.

- Staff had indicated that certain target housing types did not include low, very low, or extremely low-income housing, because that would require subsidies and some other support from the City. But if the City cared about affordable housing, why not identify targets for those housing types as well, even if that meant land did not get built on? If the City really cared about solving those problems, then maybe it had to wait for the money policies to be in place to support that type of development. The City did not have to build in Frog Pond East and South right now but was choosing to do so.
 - **Mr. Pauly** said the types of housing below 80 percent AMI would be similar to the 80 to 120 percent but subsidized. The regulations being discussed were about products rather than actual price points. State law had fairly specific limitations regarding what the City could do with inclusionary zoning in terms of requiring a certain income need be met and that was not being addressed directly in the discussion. The question was what product mix would be most likely to meet identified needs at market rate.
 - Hopefully, some projects came in with funding from different sources to make the houses more affordable, however the City could not require and guarantee that through zoning tools. Other tools beyond zoning were needed to accomplish that.
- The idea was the City should have that right product mix to help facilitate the lower price points, even though the City could not force a price point on its own. The City should help provide the opportunity for smaller condos, smaller townhouses, and smaller detached houses.
 - **Mr. Pauly** agreed that made sense. He confirmed the Commission wanted Staff to further investigate whether ADUs, cottages, and other living options would be able to meet the needs at below 80 percent AMI at market rate and how those types could be facilitated.
- Updating Exhibits 2 through 4 to break out cottages and ADUs was also suggested. Currently, the smallest type shown was two-bedroom condos. Perhaps adding those two product types would give the Commission and the rest of the City, a better feel for what those price points could be and whether cottages and ADUs could be included as targets for specific housing types.
- Two or three statements had been made which were all true at the same time. The target housing type was going to be targeted towards a certain AMI, which was fine. Affordability was not all a zoning issue, which was correct as well. However, during the discussion, a willingness or encouragement from some of the Commissioners, and perhaps all of the Commission, was to encourage the City to move faster in providing incentive tools to make affordable units available in the Frog Pond neighborhood, even if not through zoning. The City could come up with a policy or scheme that allowed the City to buy certain units and make those units available as affordable housing. The City should also act to ensure the units remained affordable in the future, as opposed to gentrifying. Staff should keep in mind Commissioner comments about encouraging and making affordability available more quickly.
- The City needed to identify what it was trying to accomplish in Frog Pond and make sure it did not move away from that. Given the 80 to 120 percent AMI, the City should keep its objectives for the neighborhood in line with affordable housing.

- There was no discussion regarding creating a visionary partnership between the kind of people the City was trying to create housing for and the kind of community it hoped to create as Wilsonville grew. What kind of industry and business was the City trying to attract? There should be some sort of partnership on that side because the businesses brought into the city would require employees and management who wanted to live in Wilsonville. If there was a clear idea of the community the City was building for in the future, it would help the City anticipate the kind of people who wanted to come live and buy in Wilsonville, so they could work in their own community and not have to commute.

Mr. Pauly continued the PowerPoint presentation, describing the purpose of a cap on housing variety and requesting some guidance on the criteria for Component 2. Was the cap about limiting too many expensive or detached single-family homes or was it about making sure there was variety throughout the neighborhood, even if that meant fewer, less expensive units?

The Commissioner comments and feedback regarding Component 2 Criteria was as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- Further development of the minimum and maximum types would prevent a predominance of any one housing type. The struggle would be to make it affordable, and cottages seem to be the best answer for making housing affordable, which meant there would be fewer single-family dwellings. It was neither good or bad, but variety could be controlled through minimums and maximums by type.
 - **Mr. Pauly** noted Component 2 generally regarded a maximum of any one type of in a given area. Did the City want to focus that cap on single-unit dwellings or apply the cap generally, including to market-rate housing that may be more affordable?
- The City would want to include minimums and maximums across types because that would result in something similar to Villebois, which included townhouse buildings with one to five units, each with a different look and feel so there did not seem to be an overwhelming number of townhouses because the buildings were not similar in structure, color, and shape. The Village Center seemed to have a large number of multi housing units and townhouses with more and more single family on the edges.
- Having minimums and maximums were a good approach, but balance of housing varieties was needed to ensure the neighborhood did not look like townhouses predominantly in a particular area and but looked like a homogenous community across the board.
- Once the minimums were settled, the maximums would balance out more, but more information was needed.
- Some of the neighborhood design was based on the transect concept where the neighborhood center would have higher density. Similar to Villebois Village Center, more density would be in the village center. That density concentration was not an imbalance, but a concept that high density housing was placed near activity centers. The Commission had discussed balance overall in the neighborhood and that typically, affordable units were put in the most undesirable part of the neighborhood, out of the way and out of sight. The Commission decided early on that it did not want that and talked about Raj Chetty's research on how neighborhoods help lower income children develop a different outlook as a result of being cohorts of higher income children in the neighborhood. Mixing the affordability element with the type was the other aspect of balancing the neighborhood out and not having one type predominate in one area. The Commission had

discussions regarding those issues over the past several months and had agreements in those conversations.

- Requiring variety generally was important to ensure a cohesive neighborhood. Defining what the percentages should be throughout the neighborhood would help ensure the City would get what it was looking for in terms of the general look and feel. It could not be only X amount in a specific district, but the central area would be denser, and it would be spread out from there, but as long as the City had those percentages set up appropriately, it would be fine.

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, thanked the Planning Commissioners for a great conversation, noting she did not envy their position. A lot was discussed about Villebois tonight, and she wanted to point out why the City was in a more difficult position currently. With Villebois, the City could geographically determine what housing types were going to go where with precision and created a transect of density and could set aside specific parcels for townhomes, for example. During the development of Villebois, there were times when the development community came to the City and said this was too challenging and asked to build single-family homes. The City said no and eventually the townhomes it wanted were eventually built on the set aside parcels. The townhomes inevitably offered a different price point than the single-family detached. Currently, the City had to comply with House Bill 2001, which was good in some ways because the bill required additional variety. However, the legislation did not allow the City to provide the same type of precision or known development pattern in a specific area. Before the City could designate certain areas for cottage housing, townhomes, or other specific product, but that type of precision or flexibility was no longer available. The City was now in a position of allowing many more housing types to be built on any given parcel, which made it more difficult to know whether the developer would choose a single-family home, townhouse, cottage cluster or ADU. The State rules were the reason the City was discussing minimum and maximum percentages. Whether the City landed on something precise or something that provided more flexibility with more of a range was an important factor in the City determining how to confirm the same type of variety without the same tool. She acknowledged it was a difficult exercise, but Staff appreciated the dialogue and questions. Staff would also appreciate knowing about anything the Planning Commissioners thought would help them better answer the questions and direct the City towards an answer.

Chair Heberlein appreciated the Planning Director's helpful comments, noting the Commissioners pointed questions and comments were not reflective of any displeasure on anything. The Commissioners just wanted to be sure they got it right. The problem could be solved if the City was able to come up with a creative way to buy the land; then it could replicate what was done in Villebois.

Mr. Pauly echoed the Planning Director's appreciation for the Planning Commission's discussion, which had been very helpful and provided good feedback. A lot of hard mental work had occurred in the last hour.

Saumya Kini and Joe Dills of MIG|APG, continued the PowerPoint presentation, describing the Public Realm and the key guiding principles used in its design, as well as the draft Public Realm materials included in the packet that would be refined and expanded upon based on the Commission's feedback. (Slides 11-23)

- Two street and block demonstration options were presented to meet the intent of providing a safe and low-stress accessible network of transportation options. Each option showed differences in the connection between Frog Pond Lane and 60th Ave, the location of the neighborhood park, pedestrian crossings across Advance Rd, and how homes fronted on Stafford Rd. (Slide 18)
 - **Mr. Pauly** added the movement of the neighborhood park and Type 1 up to be adjacent to the BPA easement reflected in Option 2 grew out of City Council comments about better utilizing the BPA easement, perhaps as an extension of the neighborhood park. Staff had messages into BPA to explore what options could be used on the easement, including parking.

All Commissioners preferred Street and Block Demonstration Option 2. Key additional comments and feedback regarding Options 1 and 2 were as follows (Slide 18):

- While having the main street flow into the park in Option 1 was nice, moving the park to flow into the easement, as shown in Option 2, made more sense. Not having houses face the busy Stafford Rd was preferred because a child could run out the door into the street, as opposed to running out into the back yard. Homebuyers might look elsewhere if the homes faced Stafford Rd.
- Moving the neighborhood park adjacent to the easement would give the City a lot more bang for its buck and the park fit well in that location. Moving Type 1 to abut the BPA easement was preferred and there were no issues with the other areas in Option 2.
- Connecting the park to the easement provided a gateway for the easement into the neighborhood, instead of turning one's back onto the easement like Option 1. Option 2, especially with Type 1 housing looking over the easement for a good portion, would make the easement a more defensible, owned space as part of the neighborhood. With Option 1, it was uncertain how the neighborhood would 'own' the easement.
 - Having a more boulevard-like design for one of the streets was preferred to connect the neighborhood park and easement with the future community park instead of a trail, which was envisioned as lines on a paved street.
 - With another park being planned, there should be some kind of connection between the two, and an open boulevard was preferred.
 - A well-designed wide, green sidewalk on one side of the street connecting the neighborhood park to the future community park through the downtown area or higher density residential area would create an even better, organic connection of the natural areas at the core of the neighborhood.
 - In Option 2, having no Type 1 housing in and around open space in the middle neighborhood area was good.
- Having the park next to and encroaching upon the BPA easement was a good use of additional real estate from the easement.
- The Type 1 intersection and connectivity with the easement and neighborhood park was a top feature of Option 2.
 - Given the neighborhood park's location in relation to the BPA easement, maybe the park's size could be reduced because the BPA easement space could be utilized, especially if the City was trying to maximize buildable space to reduce overall development costs.
 - An alternative was to steal a bit of space from the neighborhood park to create a linear park from the Grange through the high-value trees down to the commercial main street to have a connection between those two areas. Reducing the size of the neighborhood park while still

maintaining the connection to the BPA easement would enable a connection from the Grange to the commercial main street and make the treed area a bit more functional.

Two options were presented for the bike and pedestrian circulation in the Master Plan. Each option included differences in shared street versus bike lane use, trail connections, and bike lane connections between Frog Pond Lane and 60th Ave. (Slides 19-20)

- A cross-section concept for Advance Rd as it passed by the community park was also presented as one option for consideration where a collector cross-section and right-of-way would include generous 12-ft sidewalks, a planted median, bike lanes and incorporate existing power poles into a planter strip on the north side. Houses would front onto the community park to create a sense of integration of the park and eyes on the park as the street redeveloped. (Slide 21)

Key comments and feedback regarding the street cross-section, Bike and Pedestrian Circulation Options, and Park and Open Space Framework were as follows (Slides 19-23):

- **Mr. Pauly** understood the green connection between the community park and neighborhood park along what would be an extension of 60th Ave north of Advance Rd was probably a good candidate for the cross-section concept, as well as Brisband St.
- Overall, the Commissioners liked the options presented.
- If 60th Ave worked best to have a wider sidewalk, as proposed on Advance Rd, and provide a connector between the community park and neighborhood park that was fine. Having a connection to the downtown was good, too.
 - Would the green area close to the commercial area that had been suggested as linear park fit in any kind of a green space trail? It was an opportunity that would otherwise be missed. A green focal point was shown on the Park and Open Space Framework (Slide 22) but not necessarily any connection between the green area and the commercial area.
- The wider street going into Brisbane St was a good option.
- The Advance Rd concept was great and opened up the whole feel for a neighborhood.
- The presented options provided a lot of trail connections and bike paths. The Advanced Rd cross-section would tie East and South together nicely, even though there was a main artery between them.
- The Advance Rd cross-section showed the area at the proposed community park, but what did it look like another 750 ft farther down in the rural area and not in the City of Wilsonville? Would the same cross-section be used clear to the end and then dead end into nothing?
 - **Mr. Pauly** replied the north side of Advance Rd would continue to have the wide treatment shown in the concept. Beyond 60th Ave were homes unlikely to redevelop so the southside of the road would likely not continue at that point but have a curb. There was likely an opportunity to bring the trail up to make a strong connection through the neighborhood into the BPA easement, so the trail would not dead end into the Boeckman Dip but curve up into the BPA trail.
- Having a more emphasized tie in as far as bicycle circulation in the BPA easement would be good. Bike riders could go from Advance Rd through the BPA easement and then down, bypassing the entire section of neighborhood unless that was their destination. Having intentional access to the BPA easement and connections to those major streets at Stafford and Advance Rd would be key feature, as well as the tie-ins from the BPA easement to the neighborhood park going into the commercial center.

- Frog Pond East had trail connections to most all of the green focal points in the Parks and Open Space Framework, but there were no trail connections in Frog Pond South. Should those connections be considered? The trail in the lower-left quadrant below Meridian School should connect with the trail to Boeckman Creek School. Were there other trail connections between South and the future community park? (Slide 22)
- The green focal point at the northeast section north of the BPA easement seemed out of balance in terms of the center of that general neighborhood area. In fact, both green focal points shown north of the BPA easement could be more centrally located rather than being so close to the BPA easement.

Mr. Pauly briefly summarized the engagement activities being used to obtain feedback on the Master Plan, noting the City's survey work currently focused on the public realm. The survey text was in the meeting packet and Commissioners were encouraged to take the survey or provide comments on the topics of the survey. The City was working with the School District on holding an open house on August 23rd regarding the design of Frog Pond School. City Staffs were also working internally across the Planning, Parks, and Engineering Departments on the Frog Pond West Park and Boeckman Corridor Project.

Mr. Dills confirmed the project team had a nice set of summertime outreaches going on.

Chair Heberlein thanked everyone for all the time and effort being put into the project.

INFORMATIONAL

4. City Council Action Minutes (July 18, 2022) (No staff presentation)
5. 2022 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, stated the Wastewater Treatment Plant Master Plan was moved out a month to address some concerns, including the demographic issues discussed in the last work session. Otherwise, the work program was looking as planned.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Heberlein adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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