



PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 2023

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the April 12, 2023 PC Meeting Minutes



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

April 12, 2023 at 6:00 PM

City Hall Council Chambers & Remote Video Conferencing

Draft PC Minutes are to be reviewed and approved at the May 10, 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, April 12, 2023. Chair Heberlein called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m., followed by roll call. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ron Heberlein, Jennifer Willard, Andrew Karr, Kathryn Neil, Olive Gallagher, and Nicole Hendrix. Kamran Mesbah arrived at 6:07 pm.

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Daniel Pauly, Kelsey Lewis, Dwight Brashear, 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 March 8, 2023 Planning Commission Minutes

The March 8, 2023 Planning Commission Minutes were accepted as presented.

WORK SESSION

2. Transit Master Plan (Lewis)

Kelsey Lewis, Grants and Programs Manager, SMART, noted this would be the third time the Draft Transit Master Plan was presented before the Planning Commission and introduced the project team.

Commissioner Mesbah arrived at this time.

Ms. Lewis, Brenda Martin, Project Manager at enviroissues, and Michelle Poyourow, Project Manager at Jarret Walker & Associates, presented the Draft Transit Master Plan update, reviewing the project's progress on the timeline, the top priorities received from public engagement, Key highlights of the Master Plan, and next steps.

Comments and questions from the Planning Commission were as follows with specific feedback as noted:

- The project team confirmed Argyle Square already had service currently, which the proposed Bus Routes B and G would provide every half hour and also during rush hour on weekdays.
- Ms. Lewis clarified WES was run by TriMet and not SMART, but both collaborated together. SMART and TriMet had an agreement that WES would go through 2026 but the future of that was unclear. She agreed the frequency decreased from every 30 minutes to 45 minutes, adding there were no current plans for that to be more frequent.
 - Ms. Poyourow believed it was important to know the operating costs per hour and that WES was rather high compared to MAX trains as WES required two Staff personnel for each train and TriMet required one. The higher cost might affect TriMet's decisions.
- Ms. Poyourow agreed proposed Route B to Tualatin would take pressure off WES, noting the goal was to provide an all day, all week service comparable to WES. TriMet has never been able to get WES up to the level of service to generate a lot of ridership, which included decent frequencies, but also service all day as people needed service beyond rush hour. Route B could run as a supplement to WES, making the same stops and allowing people to make trips through out the day. The route would also provide a lot of local mobility within Wilsonville, especially on Canyon Creek Road, which was not currently served.
 - She would have to research the costs of WES versus a full-service bus route, but recalled that over the last 10 years, the per hour operating cost of WES was much higher than that of a bus, and especially a SMART bus. One should be able to put more buses on the road and provide a better frequency. The advantage of WES over a bus is speed; it gets passed the congestion. Buses could have better speed with an exclusive right-of-way, but that was not as available. Without the much needed frequency and all-day, all-week schedule, WES has not created the ridership people hoped it would.
- Ms. Lewis confirmed that small segments of the 2X route to Tualatin ran on the shoulder currently and had been very effective in helping SMART have better on-time performance. The proposed Route B service would use the same shoulder to Tualatin, but no similar right-of-way access was currently available on the shoulder between Tualatin and Tigard. SMART has been partnering with ODOT to look for other places where the shoulder can be used. The team is looking to replicate the success of the I-5 shoulder for the route going to Clackamas Town Center on I-205.
- Train enthusiasts want to perpetuate the option of riding trains, but if better service could be provided for same amount of money, public entities should search for such solutions.
- Often people needing more access to public transit did not have driver's licenses and were attracted to jobs in big warehouses with premium wages for night shifts or work outside Wilsonville. Had this need come up in SMART's outreach?
 - Ms. Lewis confirmed they definitely heard from people wanting to commute during times not served by SMART, so longer or later service hours were discussed. Outside of the Master Plan, SMART had recently been promoting vanpools, which was a great option for shift workers due to its flexibility. The Amazon warehouse in Woodburn was a particular focus as SMART considered a Woodburn service, but vanpools were a great alternative.
 - Vanpools were typically initiated by employers for their specific businesses, but SMART's vanpool program was currently open to anyone. One vanpool was going already, and SMART was looking to expand that and was working with specific employers, as well as people coming from the same places.

- Ms. Martin added the survey in the fall focused on how a fixed route could better benefit Wilsonville and fixed route buses were not best for the warehouse and other jobs, so offering vanpools was the best way to address those niche needs outside normal transit service times. From the survey, SMART was focused on the priorities concerning fixed routes: connectivity, coverage, frequency, etc.
- Ms. Lewis confirmed vanpools were an option on SMART's website and added that subsidies were being offered for the vans through a state grant to help pay down the cost of getting the vanpools started.
- Table 5 in the Master Plan was straight out of the City's budget, but what would the 2028 budget look like with the proposed changes, such as the substantial cost increase for providing the extended service and hours?
 - Ms. Lewis replied currently, the Master Plan included rough costs of the projected increases to hire more staff and buy more buses. It was important to know the proposed changes would be part of a gradual process. The project team would work on a snapshot of what a 2028 budget might look like.
- How would the limitations of hiring bus operators, mechanics, etc. impact the goals of the Master Plan for 2028, or was it a prioritization exercise of what SMART wanted to do with what was available?
 - Ms. Lewis agreed the barriers of not enough buses or drivers impacted SMART not having full service today. The Master Plan was put together so new routes could be phased in with the focus point on outreach feedback, namely more frequency and the route to Clackamas Town Center. SMART would continue to check in with the community and City Council to identify the highest priorities. The live survey also asked which of SMART's proposals was the highest priority, which would also be helpful.
 - The project team was realistic in making this a 2028, not 2024, Master Plan and steps were in place to achieve it, such as a yard expansion and that design process started a week ago. If there was a struggle with priorities, such as whether to expanding the frequency of the new F route as opposed to the B route, SMART would look at input from the public about what was most important.
- Ms. Lewis explained Ms. Poyourow, as the consultant, had also asked early in the process about the balance between coverage versus regional connections. Coverage typically meant service coverage of the city, was there bus service close to every place in town? Typically, it was coverage versus ridership. Was it better to have more frequency or for everyone to have a bus close to them? It was usually sort of 50/50 and SMART tried to balance that.
- The trade-off between ridership and coverage should be clarified as a local issue in the Master Plan.
- Route B looked like it was competing with WES, but complementing WES was a good way to start and then having consistency with the bus or train as options would be interesting to see how that developed over time.
 - The route SMART was working on with the Cherriots partnership was a great idea.
- With the bus coverage moving from 18 to 23 buses at the peak, how many more drivers would be needed in 2028 compared to now.
 - Ms. Lewis replied it was a complex question because schedules could change easily. More all-day service could mean more full-time schedules and fewer split shifts. Ultimately, more drivers would be needed.

- Ms. Poyourow agreed it was complicated. Writing bus schedules and driver shifts, or rostering, was a not just math but a craft. One could not just calculate the number of buses needed to determine the number of drivers needed per week. The 2028 network would increase the number of vehicle revenue hours, when a bus and driver are out on the road providing service, by 171% which was more than double. The peak vehicle requirement would only go from 18 to 23 because much of the increase would be outside of those peaks. Likewise, the increase in the staff needed would not go up by that much, but as stated, having a more all-day schedule would make it a bit more efficient to staff the service. In general, the number of drivers would not increase with increased service but would increase more than the increased number of the peak fleet.
- Ms. Lewis confirmed SMART had a great history of gaining lots of grants and managing them well. There were a lot of funds in transit due to the renewed interest and understanding in the importance of transit since the pandemic, so funding was not the main concern. Drivers, buses, and bus parts were the constraints at this point.
 - Even though the Master Plan required more funding, she was confident SMART would get the grant funds because the expansion of services would help the community get where they needed to go, which was a good story when grant writing.
- Moving forward and making informed decisions was difficult without seeing the numbers and what the extra service would cost. That expenditure should be added to the Master Plan, whether in 2028 or over a three-year phase, from 2028 to 2031.
 - Actual ridership numbers should also be included in the Master Plan, so the cost per passenger could be calculated for the current and new service. Estimated ridership increases as a result of the new ride times and frequencies, etc. all help inform whether it made sense for the City and its residents to spend extra money on the service. These key pieces of information was needed to make an informed decision.
- Were two transit center notes still the right solution if WES discontinued service in 2026?
 - Ms. Lewis replied that as inefficient as it seemed to have two transit centers, there are two sides of town, and pedestrians do not feel safe crossing under a freeway. The key point is to make connections more efficient for riders, so they did not feel like they were spending a lot of time waiting or going around in a circle to get where they wanted to go.
 - Ms. Poyourow agreed, noting the proposed transit center on the east side did not have to be as big as the one on the west side. As a terminal facility, it would be a place to park a bus, for the driver to use a restroom and sit to eat lunch along with a nice bus stop and shelter for those catching the next bus. It was also a place where service naturally converges, which was ideal for transfers. Ms. Poyourow explained two issues:
 - In addition to the pedestrian issues related to the city being divided by the freeway, it was hard for buses to cross the freeway because there were so few crossing points, and that was where congestion was concentrated. As the network grew, one or two routes might have to terminate without crossing the freeway, not having every route go to both sides of the freeway on every trip, which implied having a place to end a bus route on the east side.
 - The second transit center was a result of the freeway, not WES.
- The pedestrian bridge over I-5 should accommodate transit and pedestrians, like the Tilikum Bridge.
 - Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted the I-5 bike pedestrian bridge was in the Transportation Systems Plan (TSP) and Bike and Pedestrian Plan for some time. In discussions

about the pedestrian bridge design, transit was considered, but accommodating a full-size transit bus added significant cost and would be prohibitive for the facility. However, keeping in step with frequent changes, the bike and pedestrian facility over I-5 was designed to be compatible with and able to carry small autonomous transit vehicles that could act as shuttles between the transit center and Town Center. Once the connectivity needed in the Town Center is developed, the Park Place connection identified in the Town Center Plan would likely be turned into a promenade bike/pedestrian facility that might offer amenities for adjacent storefronts and have the potential to serve transit via buses or autonomous transit vehicles given the large right-of-way but closed to private vehicular circulation. Staff had been working to integrate compatibility with transit across the pedestrian bridge.

- Having a transit hub in Town Center, which was the hub of the community, would increase the attraction to Town Center and was good to have in the Master Plan.
- If WES went away, should the City have two transit hubs or only focus on the transit center in Town Center alone.
 - If the hub and transit center were within walking distance, this issue comes up. If not, east side/west side centers might be needed.
 - Ms. Lewis said it was very possible the two transit centers would be discussed in the next iteration of the Master Plan. Once the pedestrian bridge is built, the pedestrian connection would be there. SMART has tried to get funds for autonomous shuttles, but the FTA was not ready for that yet. She agreed that if things changed with WES and that transit center became less prominent, more attention would be likely be focused on the Town Center transit center.
- Discussions about the transit-oriented development (TOD) proposal next to the WES transit center considered that entire stretch as a potential for a TOD corridor, and if that happened, there would be the critical mass to maintain a transit hub there. The bigger universal picture needed to be considered.

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

Dan Pauly, Planning Manager, reminded Staff had been working on implementation, including the Development Code amendments, of which there were a fair amount. He presented the Draft Development Code Amendments via PowerPoint, reviewing the follow-up code amendments regarding the Discretionary Alternative Path and Green Focal Points/Open Space Requirements, as well as new Code amendments regarding the Frog Pond Grange and the Kahle Road Treed Area.

Discussion and feedback from the Planning Commission on the Code amendment topics was as follows with responses by Staff to Commissioner questions as noted:

Discretionary Alternative Path

- Mr. Pauly confirmed the future changes in the waiver process would be citywide, potentially driven by State statute.

Green Focal Points/Open Space Requirements

- Was the direct access provision in the Code necessary? What would result from removing it?
 - Mr. Pauly replied the worst-case scenario would be the Green Focal Point being tucked somewhere that was inaccessible. Staff still needed to see how to simplify the language in the Code and test scenarios to see if it was even going to be an issue and for potentially unintended

consequences. Direct access was included in the Frog Pond Master Plan, which was primarily why it was included. However, if the intent of the Master Plan could be met without having to write it in the Code, that would work, too. Staff would follow up to confirm it was needed and work to simplify the language.

Frog Pond Grange

- The possibility of moving the Grange building had been mentioned in the past. Would the new code amendments still apply as long as the Grange stayed on the same plot of land?
 - Mr. Pauly clarified the Code did not say the building could not be moved, only that it needed to be preserved. Moving the building was a greater possibility in the past when a roundabout was assumed at Frog Pond Lane due to right-of-way needs. but that was not the case now.
 - He clarified the building could be accommodated with the road cross sections so widening the road would not impact the Grange building.

Kahle Road Treed Area

- Mr. Pauly clarified the Code would not cover the riparian area along the streams, only the upland area between the two streams.
 - He confirmed the area would be supplied by a local street which still provided options for multi-family, cottages, or buildings with minimized infrastructure. The Code amendments provided some flexibility regarding the buildable area.
- If a builder wanted to make the Treed Area a green focal point and it required bridges with pedestrian paths to access it, would that meet the rules in the prior section about accessibility by a road.
 - Mr. Pauly replied it probably would meet the rules if the developer made the area the active open space for the two nodes, because the access to Kahle would be the first road, and then Kahle Rd would be the second road access. The area could be used as a required usable open space, if it was not passive open space. (Slide 12)

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

Mimi Doukas, AKS, West Hills Development, said Staff had continued to keep West Hills in the loop ahead of time to be able to review the draft materials. West Hills gave the same feedback to Staff as she would provide the Commission tonight. West Hills appreciated the improved draft from the original with the big table and large sizes. Generally, she believed the Master Plan was headed in the right direction. West Hills' property, north of Advanced Road in Frog Pond East, was a large piece of property spanning three subdistricts and so required special considerations.

- The primary concern was the Code was silent on how phasing happens with focal points to make sure West Hills could develop those green focal points consistent with the phasing plan to avoid starting development clear on the east side and trying to build a focal point clear on the west side. West Hills wanted the focal points to be built as the surrounding development is built.
 - Mapping in the Master Plan did not actually show a green focal point in Subdistrict E-5, which is the middle subdistrict. She believed it was because in the Master Plan, the park was on the north side and the community park on the south side, which was the same proximity Staff referenced on the southern properties that were adjacent to the park. How did that relate to the green focal point requirements?

- West Hills' current design, which is not the final design, had the park shifted so it was at the end of Brisbane Street. It had a good relationship to the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) corridor and the Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ), but it changed where that park is relative to the subdistricts. How does that relate to the green focal points?
- The green focal points are not entirely defined. There is a need to do a plaza in the Main Street area on Brisbane, and that was straightforward, but the rest of the focal points needed to be green happy things. It could be a playground. It could be a splashpad. She was having trouble distinguishing between just open space, improved open space, and a green focal point. She believed there needed to be a little more refinement of the difference between a green focal point and a park. But regardless, West Hills' subdistricts were a little blurry in terms of how that community park or neighborhood park would sit within those subdistricts. If there were enough goodies in the neighborhood park, could that satisfy the green focal points for E-5 and D-6? It seemed like it would, but the Code was not clear enough to assure West Hills was good shape or not. A little more clarity was needed on that.
- West Hills agreed that the proximity standards were trying to solve a problem that did not exist with the subdistricts. If a green focal option is being provided in each subdistrict, that addressed proximity; the directional thing was satisfied. She believed it was more about openness and adjacency to a public way. The SROZ area at the north end on Kahle Rd was on the very edge of that subdistrict, which Staff said they were trying to avoid. It was not actually a bad thing to put it there. West Hills would prefer to strike that proximity language as it was just one more layer of regulation that was not necessary.
- She believed it was a foregone conclusion, but 25% of gross area for open space across the whole PRD was a big standard. She knew it applied across the whole city, but compared to other jurisdictions, 25% was pretty high; 20% of net was more common, so people were not being penalized for public infrastructure, for roadways, storm facilities, etc. Basing the percentage on gross did not acknowledge some of the public dedications that are required. However, that was more philosophical than practical for this conversation probably.

Mr. Pauly clarified some of the references in the version Ms. Doukas saw had more information. For example, the green focal points referenced back to usable open space standards, in 4.113, which had a long list of precisely what is considered, so that was pretty defined in that sense.

- The idea of openness and being adjacent to a public way for the green focal points was something Staff could continue to work on and was a good direction for refinements.
- He clarified the area calculation was not truly gross because typically, there was so much area that is SROZ, so it was not truly 25% of net area, which was partly why Staff designed it as they did. It was gross development area, so the SROZ was already being taken out, and then SROZ could be counted as part of the open space. Oftentimes, more open space would be required if 20% of net was used, rather than being able to count that SROZ area towards the open space requirement. The Azar site had the BPA easement which could be used for usable open space, so from an open space standpoint, those standards worked well for West Hills compared to a typical development, because they had so much essential land that otherwise was not part of their net area that they could count towards their open space requirement.

Ms. Doukas noted it was not a problem for West Hills' site, but more of a philosophical matter.

INFORMATIONAL

4. City Council Action Minutes (March 6 & 20, 2023) (No staff presentation)
5. 2023 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, noted Wastewater Treatment Plant Master Plan continues to be reviewed and would not be a public hearing next month.

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, explained that Work Program schedule was often in flux, so Staff was unlikely cancel any meetings at this point as agenda items could possibly be added in months where no items are currently listed. The Housing Needs and Capacity Analysis project was just getting started and would set the framework for work on a housing production strategy for next year. If agenda items do not materialize, Staff would be happy to cancel meetings, particularly during the holiday season, to give the Commission a night off. Typically, Staff knew a month in advance if nothing was anticipated on the agenda and would give the Commissioners a heads-up.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Willard moved to adjourn the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 7:50 p.m. Commissioner Hendrix seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

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