
City of Sherwood, Oregon
Planning Commission
May 27, 2014

Planning Commission Members Present: **Staff Present:**

Chair Jean Simson

Commissioner John Clifford

Commissioner Beth Cooke (at 7:05 pm)

Commissioner Russell Griffin

Commissioner Sally Robinson

Commissioner Lisa Walker

Julia Hajduk, Community Development Director

Bob Galati, Civil Engineer

Brad Kilby, Planning Manager

Kirsten Allen, Planning Dept. Program Coordinator

Planning Commission Members Absent:

Vice Chair James Copfer

Council Members Present:

Councilor Robyn Folsom

Legal Counsel:

Chris Crean

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Chair Jean Simson called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

2. Agenda Review

The agenda consisted of the Consent Agenda and a public hearing for the PA 14-01 Transportation System Plan Update.

3. Consent Agenda:

- a. **January 28, 2014 Planning Commission Minutes**
- b. **February 11, 2014 Planning Commission Minutes**
- c. **March 11, 2014 Planning Commission Minutes**
- d. **April 8, 2014 Planning Commission Minutes**
- e. **May 13, 2014 Planning Commission Minutes**

Chair Simson indicated that she submitted Scrivener's errors that did not change the content of the minutes and recommended that on page 22 of the February 11, 2014 minutes the record show that Mr. Tiemann declined an opportunity for rebuttal or additional testimony with his remaining time.

Commissioner John Clifford indicated that he was present for the February 11th meeting, but in the final motion it indicated that he was absent. Commissioner Clifford's name was changed to Commissioner Walker who was absent at the meeting. At Commissioner Clifford's request the first line at the top of page 23 of the packet was changed to read "Brad responded to a question from Commissioner Clifford and commented that..."

Motion: From Commissioner Russell Griffin to approve the Consent Agenda as amended. Seconded by Commissioner Lisa Walker. All present Planning Commissioners voted in favor (Vice Chair James Copfer was absent).

4. Staff Announcements

Brad Kilby, Planning Manager, spoke of the first Local Trail Advisory Committee (LTAC) meeting for the Cedar Creek Trail that was held on May 15, 2014 at City Hall. He asked Commissioner Clifford, LTAC liaison, to tell about the meeting. Commissioner Clifford said there was a good turn out and the main speaker, from the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District (THPRD), was very informative.

Brad indicated that the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) also held a meeting on May 15th about the Ken Foster Farms site in southeast Sherwood. The DEQ has provided the City with a draft copy of the findings in the Remedial Investigation Report, dated May 15, 2014. The report has been placed in the Sherwood Library reference section.

Brad asked Commissioner Walker, who was in attendance, to convey what happened at the meeting. Commissioner Walker said the meeting was meant to be a general information meeting to let the public know that the process is ongoing and on hold. She said the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) may change some of the threshold levels allowed for Chromium levels in the soil (they did not indicate whether it was up or down) and it may be another year from any conclusions. Brad said he heard that the Chromium was concentrated in certain areas and that there were two types of in it the area. Commissioner Walker said it was a complicated site with a continuing process.

Julia added that even though nothing on the site may change, the standards change, so the rules and complications change too. She recounted that at the Oregon Brownfields Conference earlier that day the tannery and the Ken Foster Farms site was a topic of discussion where even the environmental professionals commented on how complicated the site was.

Note: a brownfield site is real property where the expansion, redevelopment, or reuse of which may be complicated by the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant (www.epa.gov/brownfields/overview/glossary.htm).

Brad informed the Commission that TriMet has announced that they will be investing in services again and will release their Draft Service Enhancement Plan this summer. He said they have discussed expanding service to the YMCA and an option for service between Tualatin and Sherwood. Brad said the City can provide comments to advocate for or against proposed enhancements.

Brad related that the Friends of the Tualatin River Wildlife Refuge had over a thousand people attend their annual Bird Festival and Sherwood is in the running for a \$100,000 grant towards a dog park. The City is looking at the west portion of Snyder Park for the first dog park and there is a link on the City website to vote for Sherwood.

Brad thanked the Commission for their commitment to reading all of the material for the Transportation System Plan update and pointed out that the consultants role was to:

- Create a network of connected streets which serve all transportation modes in Sherwood.
- Create an efficient system that is compliant with state and regional policies.
- Ensure that all people have access to safe, healthy, convenient and affordable transportation options regardless of age, income or other socioeconomic factors.

- Propose measures, by way of the project list, to the community to help realize a complete system of streets, sidewalks, trails, bike lands, and transit amenities.

Brad said the Planning Commission's role was as an advisory body to the policy makers, which is the City Council. He said the proposal was a mix of policy and regulation based on engineering data, long range forecasting and assumptions that he did not always understand and encouraged members to ask questions. Brad advised that the Planning Commission was to make a recommendation to the City Council based on the proposal and if the recommendation changed the direction of the policy or regulation, follow up with the reasoning for that change would be needed. He suggested that members ask themselves if they liked or disliked the concept, if the language afforded the community an opportunity to study the concept, if it was right for the community, and if the City was compliant with state and regional policies.

Brad reported that there was an article in the May 27, 2014 edition of the Daily Journal of Commerce (DJC) about the signal removal and the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) court case.

5. Council Liaison Announcements

Councilor Folsom said the Budget Committee passed the budget for the Fiscal Year 2014-15 with a vote of 13 to 1, which will go to City Council on June 17, 2014. She said there was an 11% extra reserve over the 20% requirement due to the economy and hard work of staff equivalent to over \$900,000. The budget committee opted to use approximately \$450,000 on one time assets like park equipment replacement, and \$300,000 would be placed in a reserve account for maintenance of assets built about ten years ago.

Councilor Folsom mentioned Murdock Park as one of those assets recently finished from funds allocated in the last budget cycle. At Chair Simson's request, Councilor Folsom explained that the Budget Committee is made up of seven citizen volunteers and the seven City Council members. She added that citizen comments were part of the budgeting process and a Budget Committee meeting was held on a Saturday to encourage citizen involvement, but it did not. After the budget is approved by the Budget Committee it is forwarded to the City Council for adoption (see the June 17, 2014 agenda) and public comment will be allowed at that hearing.

Councilor Folsom reported that all five of the Charter Amendments on the May ballot had passed by a great margin.

6. Community Comments

Keith Weir, Sherwood resident came forward and said he drives to Sherwood nearly every day using Railroad Street and Main Street. He spoke of the TriMet bus taking up both lanes [when turning] and of instances where either he or the bus had to back up. Mr. Weir recounted that he spoke with the Police Department and City staff who told him that TriMet "handles everything". He suggested that the City not let TriMet handle everything. Mr. Weir commented that Tualatin Sherwood Road needed more lanes and it could be done with the space used by the bike lanes and sidewalks. Mr. Weir commented that Old Town had the character to be like Bridgeport in the future and eliminate cars in Old Town except for during Cruise-in Sherwood.

Chair Simson explained that Washington County takes care of Tualatin Sherwood Road and it is in their plan to widen the road.

Julia Hajduk, Community Development Director, added that there is coordination with TriMet and the conversation about routes and the ease of their turning movements could be had. She responded to Chair Simson's question about which department that would be and said that it was multiple departments: Engineering, Public Works, and Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue (TVF&R).

Bob Galati, City Engineer, added that the City Council has directed staff to look into the cost of removing the monuments, replacing them with something less site restraining. It is on the Engineering Department's task list.

7. New Business

a. Public Hearing – PA 14-01 Transportation System Plan Update

Chair Simson read the public hearing statement and stated that the Planning Commission would be making a recommendation to City Council. She asked for any conflicts of interest. Receiving none, she asked for the staff report.

Brad Kilby, Planning Manager, gave a presentation (see record, Exhibit 1) and explained that the Transportation System Plan was last updated in 2005 except for the minor amendments done for individual projects such as Cedar Brook Way, the extension of Baler Way, and Langer Farms Parkway North. He indicated that the update was staff initiated was to amend:

- Goals and Policies within Chapter 6 of the City's Comprehensive Plan,
- City's Development Code Chapters:
 - 16.10 Definitions
 - 16.80 Plan Amendments
 - 16.90 Site Plan Review
 - 16.94 Off-Street Parking and Loading
 - 16.106 Transportation Facilities
- 2005 Transportation System Plan (superseded if adopted)
- Map Amendment to remove the trip cap imposed through Ord. 2008-003 regarding the Pfeiffer property on Hwy 99W next to Providence Medical.

Brad explained that a traffic analysis was not performed for the Pfeiffer property when Ord. 2008-003 was adopted and Council decided that the additional CAP would be put on the property. As a result of the TSP update there has been traffic modeling as retail commercial for the property and that the analysis is no longer needed, because measures to mitigate the impacts have been identified.

Brad explained that the public involvement included two Planning Commission work sessions, a dedicated website that was updated at least monthly, two public open houses, a Citizens Advisory Committee that met three times, and a Technical Advisory Committee consisting of engineers, planners and policy makers from Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Washington County, Tualatin, Beaverton, and Tigard. He said the Draft TSP has been available to the public for comment since late March, and there were several articles about the TSP Update in the Archer or Gazette.

Brad stated that the proposed amendments meet the necessary approval criteria to justify a Planning Commission recommendation for approval of the policy document and Staff recommends that the Commission forward a recommendation of approval of the proposed amendments to the Sherwood City Council based on the work and input that has been put into this process to date.

Brad turned the time over to the Bob Galati, City Engineer. Bob introduced the project consultants Chris Maciejewski and Garth Appanaitis from DKS Associates and Darci Rudzinski with Angelo Planning Group. Mr. Maciejewski gave a presentation (see record, Exhibit 2) and recapped the process to date. He said the process was at the final step of adoption for a process that started about a year ago. Mr. Maciejewski reported that the planning work done in the city and the region over the past five plus years was compiled and the City's transportation infrastructure inventoried regarding how it was working and how people use it in order to identify transportation needs. Then transportation needs were forecasted 20 years into the future using Metro's regional forecasting tool to the year 2035. Mr. Maciejewski stated that money available was considered to develop alternatives to meet those transportation needs through multi-modal transportation projects. With that we came out with a preferred list of projects and accompanying implementing ordinances.

Mr. Maciejewski gave an overview of what the document contained and said that it sets the vision for the community on how the transportation system will help manage growth with strategies to guide in those decisions. He said there is list of future improvement projects that would improve safety, operation, mobility, connectivity and other types of transportation needs around the community. He said one of the most important section was the standards which include standards for:

- Cross-sections – the components of a street, width, sidewalk, etc.
- Access spacing – how far apart should driveways and roadways be
- Traffic calming – how to protect the livability for residential neighborhoods as traffic volumes increase
- Connectivity – local street connection
- Mobility targets – how to manage congestion and how much congestion is acceptable

Mr. Maciejewski explained that the update was being done, because the 2005 Transportation System Plan looked to the year 2020 and a twenty year plan needs to be in place. He said the update contains an updated project list that compiles all the work that has been done over the last five plus years, regional projects like the Tualatin Sherwood Road widening project, and concept plans areas. The project list is a little different from the last update and is focused on lower cost strategies used to manage congestion as opposed to major capital improvements to widen roadways to build out of congestion. Mr. Maciejewski related that mobility targets are highlighted more in the document and the Capacity Allocation Program (CAP) Ordinance is removed.

Mr. Maciejewski explained that to build the project list the City started by establishing transportation goals from goals already in place as policy elements and worked with advisory groups to develop evaluation criteria that aligned with those goals. He said the process used revenue constraints and compared the evaluation criteria to choose which alternatives made the most sense. Mr. Maciejewski showed that there were two types of projects; *conservatively fundable* projects which looked at the revenue from the last five

years that can be used on transportation and projected out the next twenty years; *projected fundable* projects take into account the potential growth areas around the city and the revenue that could come in with that.

Mr. Maciejewski concluded that there was a focus on lower cost items, safety and multi-modal projects and roughly a third of the approximated costs are spent on each of the major types of transportation: 37% is projected to be used for pedestrian enhancements, 33% for Motor Vehicle, 23% for Bicycle, and 7% on Transit. A more significant component in the 2005 plan was motor vehicle focused. Mr. Maciejewski said the documents list each project by mode and color coded with near term, medium term or long term priority.

Mr. Maciejewski explained that there was updated language in the draft TSP about the Brookman Road area as the city coordinated with Washington County in designating that as an arterial roadway, but the language acknowledges that there are compatibility issues with the Brookman Road Concept Plan that may need further work or revisited.

Mr. Maciejewski indicated that the City and ODOT staff have been coordinating on the Hwy 99W cross sections and are close to having an agreement. He said TriMet has continued its Local transit service enhancements planning and a proposal from them will be coming this summer that will need to be incorporated into the TSP in the future. Mr. Maciejewski advised that the need for parking management plan was identified as part of the Sherwood Town Center planning process. He recounted that a statement that was added relating support from the community regarding relieving traffic congestion from through traffic and support for regional efforts with Washington County or other jurisdictions to get through traffic onto Tualatin Sherwood Road or Hwy 99W, giving an option to go around the city.

Note: Part of the TSP Update includes amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Sherwood Zoning and Community Development Code so that all documents complement each other. DKS Associates was contracted to work on the transportation aspect of the TSP update. Angelo Planning was contracted to work on Comprehensive Plan and Sherwood Zoning and Community Development Code language.

Darci Rudzinski from Angelo Planning Group explained that she was one of the planners that worked on the policies in the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code language. She explained that the language has evolved as a result of feedback from the Planning Commission, the City Council, the Technical and Citizen Advisory Committees and City staff. She related that one of the objectives was to get the proposed language in closer compliance with the Regional Transportation Functional Plan, which implements that Regional Transportation Plan, as well as the state Transportation Planning Rule. Ms. Rudzinski reported that some of the more substantial areas of change being proposed in the code was the traffic impact analysis; the code articulates existing city practice that the city uses the impact analysis to assess what the impacts of proposed development might be on the transportation system and, if necessary, gives the city the power to ask for mitigation to make sure the system is in line with the growth that happens. She added that bicycle parking requirements were clarified, and the CAP program was removed.

Ms. Rudzinski stated that the changes in the Code and the Comprehensive Plan are intended to reflect what is happening in the Transportation System Plan so there is underlying policy that supports what the city requires of developments and city improvements when building a new facility for the community. She noted that there were some housekeeping items; if strategies or implementation measures have already happened it was suggested they be deleted. Ms. Rudzinski revealed that some Comprehensive Plan

policies included planning coordination with regional partners like Metro, Washington County and ODOT, and added performance targets and measures with a policy that articulates Sherwood's intention to try to adopt measures that reflect Metro targets. She concluded by saying that the through traffic had come up as an issue so there is policy language that encourages regional trips do not occur on local street systems.

Chair Simson proposed that the Commission hear public testimony before the consultants answer questions. The Commission was in agreement.

Brad said there was written testimony submitted by Sherwood resident, Wade Anderson. Chair Simson indicated that the Commission would read the letter after hearing public testimony.

Ty Wyman, attorney representing Merlone Geier Partners, which owns the Albertsons based shopping center on Tualatin Sherwood Road, cited his appreciation for the time and attention given to Merlone Geier. He commented that the article distributed by Brad Kilby did a good job talking about the LUBA case regarding the removal of the signal on Tualatin Sherwood Road. Mr. Wyman mentioned that the TSP Update is far beyond the traffic signal, but the signal was important to them. He said that Merlone Geier was not going to ask for any revisions or additions to the proposed update, because the signal is already in the existing plan. Mr. Wyman stated that Merlone Geier is invested in the Sherwood community and intends to stay with or without the signal. He expressed appreciation for time spent by Bob Galati and Brad Kilby with himself and his client about property issues and acknowledged that it was not an easy one.

Anthony Bevel, Sherwood resident said he has lived in Sherwood for sixteen years and told the Commission that SW Lynnly to SW Houston serves as cut through streets from Roy Rogers Road to Edy Road. He commented that drivers go very fast through the neighborhood and said he would like to see traffic calming devices placed on the street. Mr. Bevel said that he has picked up dead animals and described the difficulty in retrieving his mail at 5:30 pm, because of the danger. He asked the City to put traffic calming devices on his street to correct the bad behavior. Mr. Bevel added that he had been told the reason for not having traffic calming devices was, because of the damage caused to emergency vehicles and he did not find it acceptable.

Mr. Bevel asked how a pedestrian was expected to get to the south side of Sherwood and commented that twenty years from now he did not see it happening. He commented about living near the Ross Island bridge that had a pedestrian bridge across Powell Blvd.

Eugene Stewart, Sherwood property owner said as a member of the Citizen's Advisory Committee he felt that there was not sufficient time to discuss a number of topics and he felt as though the process was rushed to satisfy Metro instead of looking at the needs of the citizens. He asked that the Planning Commission continue the hearing and leave it open for public comment. Mr. Stewart commented regarding a bypass around Sherwood and advised that when the Dundee Newberg bypass is built, Sherwood will see more truck traffic. He said trucks currently cut over to Salem and when the bypass is done it will create a better situation to drive up here instead of going through Salem.

Mr. Stewart told of a property owner on Roy Rogers Road who may develop that was told by Washington County planners that the road will be five lanes by 2018 from Scholls Ferry Road to Hwy 99W. He asked what would happen to the neighborhoods then and stressed the importance for Sherwood to look at a

bypass around our core area so traffic that does not want to stop in Sherwood can get through without causing traffic jams. He said that evening traffic can back up to the junkyard, which was unacceptable, and suggested that 90% of evening traffic through Old Town does not stop. Mr. Stewart urged that Sherwood look more seriously at where is traffic coming from, where is it going, and how it can be handled. He commented that Metro was pushing against single occupant vehicles and traffic counts done in the evening when commercial trucks were no longer on the road or are from 2010. Mr. Stewart asked how the recession has affected truck traffic and suggested that bicycle and pedestrian counts at major intersections be completed. He commented that some counts showed only one bicycle to four pedestrians and asked why plans to accommodate bicyclists were being moved forward when there is no demand. Mr. Stewart commented that the plans show where the bicyclist could go, but not where they were coming from. He asked where skate boarders would go and said there were a number of things he would like discussed, but four minutes was not enough time.

With no other public testimony, Chair Simson called for a recess at 8:03 pm and reconvened at 8:12 pm. The letter from Wade Anderson (read by Commissioners during the break) was labeled Exhibit G in the PA 14-01 file.

Chair Simson advocated discussing the questions raised by public comment first and asked about the process for getting traffic calming implemented.

Bob Galati responded that the City receives complaints through either the Engineering or Police Department. The Police Department determines, through an investigation of the complaint, what the traffic conditions are like. He said they may run a traffic count scenario that collects data such as speed, number of cars, and determine if the average speed is it hitting the 85% or are they exceeding it. If it is a speed issue they will do enforcement, because it is a safety issue. Bob said that traffic volume was more a quality of life issue and the City will try to change the system to make the drivers go a route other than through the subdivision. He related that with Mr. Bevel's subdivision stop signs were added at every intersection, but the City has not revisited to see if there has been a change. Bob explained that the process is to go back and check if the change had a positive effect and if not, decide on the next implementation; what least option works the best and then ratcheting it up.

Chair Simson summarized that the citizen has an opportunity aside from the TSP process to raise the level of awareness through staff, Police and the City Council. Bob confirmed that there was an internal process to address the issue. Julia Hajduk, Community Development Director, added that the City is developing a more formal traffic calming program. She set forth that the City plans to address concerns as they arise and consider the impacts on the local roadways when money is allocated for traffic improvements on major roadways through the capital improvement program.

Chair Simson commented that in the TSP there is a collector street from Roy Rogers Road to Sherwood Blvd, D29, identified as a long term project. Chris Maciejewski confirmed and said that the project came from collector grid spacing and Metro's requirement for having a complete grid. Chair Simson commented that there could be potential relief for Lynnly/ Houston in the long term.

Chair Simson asked regarding additional pedestrian crossings in the update. Mr. Maciejewski answered that crossings have been identified at the signalized locations; for example crossings on both sides of Edy Road crossing Hwy 99W. He added that the Cedar Creek Trail has a grade separated crossing in the long

term. Chair Simson asked about a crossing on Langer Farms Parkway between Century Drive and Oregon Street for safety purposes. Mr. Maciejewski responded that crossings were at the intersections and in order to have a safe crossing at another location it may need more than striping. He suggested that an enhanced crossing might be added as a TSP project. The Commission was in favor of adding it.

Chair Simson addressed Mr. Stewart's request to continue the hearing and said in a quasi-judicial hearing the body is obligated to keep the record open if a continuance is requested. She asked if this was true for a legislative hearing. Chair Simson commented that the public could testify at the City Council level. Chris Crean, City attorney, answered that it was not a legal requirement, because it was not in the statute. He said it was required in a quasi-judicial, but not in a legislative context.

Chair Simson began the Commission's comments by turning to Volume 2 of the TSP documents, Section A, page 4. She noted the Tualatin Sherwood Industrial Area and expressed a concern that the Tonquin Employment Area (TEA) was not called out and asked how the TEA was incorporated into the plan. Mr. Maciejewski responded that Volume 2 was documentation of the context setting exercise for the project where all of the currently adopted plans were reviewed and said this particular language came from Metro's TSP plan. He said the land use and the transportation system from the concept planning for the TEA were incorporated into the analysis. He suggested that a footnote could be added to clarify the reference, but it would not change the analysis. The Commission was in favor of adding it.

Chair Simson referred to the footnote 11 on page 5 and asked that it show the Sherwood Town Center as adopted instead of being considered for adoption.

Chair Simson turned to page 9 of the same section and asked how Metro's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) regarding non-single occupancy vehicles targets applied to Sherwood. She remarked that Sherwood is outside of the Portland area and not covered well by transit. Mr. Maciejewski answered that Metro establishes the targets for the region and their targets vary by area; outer neighborhoods have different targets than inner neighborhoods, town centers, or employment areas. He expressed that the designations in Metro's 2040 Concept Plan for Sherwood are equivalent to what would be seen for other suburban areas around the region and not unique. He added that the City has to incorporate the targets into the TSP and Sherwood is compliant with those targets or moving towards those targets in the twenty year plan. The analysis in the plan shows that all areas of town, except the very northeastern portion off of Cipole Road, are in compliance with the targets and no specific strategies are needed to address shortcomings.

Chair Simson asked for confirmation that Sherwood was already in compliance or moving towards compliance with Metro's targets. Mr. Maciejewski confirmed and clarified that the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) had a series of development alternatives the City needed to go through starting with operational enhancements, pedestrian and bicycle projects and building up to major capacity projects. He said that the process itself is one of the ways Metro dictates that communities move towards those targets in the process of updating the plan.

Chair Simson expressed her concerns with applying Metro's standards to our unique community and said we should try to preserve the small town community feeling when reviewing the document. She said she has spoken with others in the community with the same concerns regarding Metro.

Mr. Maciejewski discerned that if Sherwood was not meeting the targets and Metro was forcing action the City did not want, then it would be a greater issue. He said the findings of the analysis were not used to modify the project lists or the policies and advocated that the Commission address concerns with Metro in the long term, if it becomes an issue. Chair Simson asked if that applied to the draft goals, strategies and policies should the Commission change items in the draft TSP, because they did not meet the community vision and if the Commission was in jeopardy of violating Metro standards that would cause funding to be cut.

Darci Rudzinski responded that the changes in the document reflect the multi-modal goals and non-single occupant vehicle (SOV) targets which are now in the document, because they were not strongly emphasized in the policy language or needed clarification that Sherwood was part of regional planning process. She said the recommended language could be modified to better reflect the community and it was the appropriate time to do that. Ms. Rudzinski said the targets in the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP), and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) are high level and all-encompassing of the region. She remarked that Sherwood has representation at Metro and is represented on the technical advisory and policy advisory committees, and has a Metro councilor. Sherwood's plan should reflect the community's goals and recognize that Sherwood is part of a region with regional aspirations.

On that point, Chair Simson turned to page 12 of Section A under the heading Metro RTP Near-term goals, which is within the next one to four years, where it says that alternatives analysis for high capacity transit (HCT) corridor should be completed. She enquired how that would be integrated into our community. Mr. Maciejewski responded that it was in reference to the ongoing Southwest Corridor planning process underway that Metro was leading and not a new effort that Sherwood would undertake. Julia Hajduk concurred, suggesting that it could be clarified specifically as the Southwest Corridor project. A process that has decided not to bring high capacity transit (HCT) to Sherwood, but that Sherwood is part of the planning effort with local transit service connecting into the HCT in Portland, Tigard, and Tualatin.

Chair Simson sought confirmation that the document was what Metro was requesting of us and by being included in the Southwest Corridor study area, even though Sherwood is not part of the HCT solution, it is connected locally through enhanced transit service through Tualatin. Mr. Maciejewski confirmed that the goal is reached by participating in the planning process which looks at the overall corridor strategies. Discussion followed with a reference to the Southwest Corridor process being added to the draft document.

Ms. Rudzinski commented that the Plan and Policy Summary was, a background policy document, done at the beginning of the process to illustrate all of the planning documents that informed the transportation planning process. It does not obligate the City to do anything, but identified anything that could be relevant to developing the TSP update.

Chair Simson remarked that the only process she knew to review the Draft TSP was to start at the beginning and go through page by page. She turned to Volume 1 of the TSP documents, page v, Traffic Calming. She asked regarding traffic calming and if the process needed to be called out in more detail; how does a citizen requests traffic calming per the TSP? Julia responded that it was not appropriate to have that level of detail in the TSP and it was more of process of policy and the Community Development

Department was working on a more comprehensive traffic calming program. Even once that has been completed it would be part of the Municipal Code not the TSP. Chair Simson asked if it should be part of the goals, policies, or strategies in the Comprehensive Plan. Julia concurred that it could be in the Comprehensive Plan as a goal to have a traffic calming program, but it would not identify the process.

Mr. Maciejewski added that there are standards in Volume 2 around which types of traffic calming treatments are appropriate on which types of facilities which came from Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue (TVF&R). He explained that TVF&R went to all of their cities and counties in their service area and coordinated on what was acceptable for their primary response routes based on safety and impacts on travel time.

Ms. Rudzinski added that Goal 3, Policy 10 is an existing policy that discusses traffic calming: *the city will establish and maintain a set of guidelines and standards for traffic calming measures to retrofit existing streets and as part of land use review.* Chair Simson suggested a corresponding strategy to implement a traffic calming plan.

Bob Galati, City Engineer, provided that there was language in the Traffic Calming section should change from the Sherwood “Public Works” department to the “Community Development” department.

Chair Simson pointed to the Street Cross-Sections standard on page v and asked about the last sentence which reads: *In constrained situations, a design exception may be allowed through a variance procedure.* She said in the development code a “variance” was a term used in land use application and in this context the street cross section would go through a “design exception”. Bob agreed and explained that in the Engineering Design Manual described how to apply for a design variation, the internal review process, and the appeal process to City Council. Chair Simson requested to change the language from a *variation procedure*, which is already defined in the code, to a *design exception process*.

Chair Simson turned to Volume 1, page 37, project D24, Sherwood Blvd Intersection Modifications: *remove the Sherwood Blvd/Langer Drive traffic signal (allow right-in, right-out, and left-in movement only), and install a traffic signal at the Sherwood Blvd/Century Drive intersection (add eastbound and westbound left turn lanes).* She commented that this was a topic of the [written] testimony and expressed her concern. Chair Simson acknowledged that technically it was the correct project, but asked, as citizens of Sherwood, if it was politically and emotionally correct to remove the light. She argued that the consultants and staff provided technically correct answers from Metro, ODOT, and computer models, but just as Villa Road was removed from the last TSP, did the Commission believe the signal should be removed in the short term.

Commissioner Cooke indicated that she had concerns about removing the light and said she would like to see the impact of the new road going in off of Tualatin Sherwood Road first. She acknowledged that the removal of the light may be an eventuality, but she was concerned of the impact on the retail areas nearby that already had vacant issues. Discussion followed. Bob Galati clarified that the removal of the light would make access right-in/right-out only and the project tries to correct an existing deficiency in how traffic backs up at the highway light through the intersection at peak times during the day. He added that Dutch Bros was required to make improvements to prevent turning movement and traffic stacking onto Century Drive. Bob explained that the identified project solution is to move signals around, but there is no indication of whether it will get worse. He commented that it was more appropriate to determine whether it was a short term project, medium term, or long term project. Commissioner Cooke commented on how long the Kohl’s location was empty and wanted to give them a chance to survive.

With the Commission's agreement, Chair Simson requested that project D24 be moved. She noted that the project list can change at the desire of City Council.

Julia Hajduk added that when the City Engineer prepares the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), a five year plan, the City looks at funds available, project costs, priorities, impacts, and need. She said the preparation process for the CIP may become more publically inclusive. Julia stated that if a project is listed as short term, but there was no public support or dire need it would not be included in the CIP. If a project is listed as long term and citizens are eager about getting the project done it might be moved up in priority. Chair Simson said that it was a \$900,000 project and if it moved to an aspirational list it would free up funds for more appealing projects.

Commissioner Griffin indicated that he would like to wait and see how the overall traffic pattern is affected by other signaling changes and suggested the project be placed on the medium term list. He said he did not want to leave it on the short term list. Mr. Maciejewski reminded the Commission that there was a major retail development on the east end of the corridor which showed the Century Drive/ 12th Street as a key corridor.

Commissioner Cooke commented that she was not comfortable killing off an existing retail in favor of another and she would like to see how it played out. Discussion followed.

Chair Simson stated that she could see the benefit of the light on Century Drive, but did not see it as a short term project that needs to be done right now without roads in place and suggested medium term. The Commission was in agreement.

Chair Simson turned to Volume 1, page 39, Project P44, Oregon Street Sidewalk Infill Segment 1, and asked if the project was supposed to be a short term project. Mr. Maciejewski confirmed that it was, but was missed when the draft document was edited.

Chair Simson turned to Volume 1, page 44, Figure 14 and asked if the map was presented to the Technical Advisory Committee or Citizen's Advisory Committee. Mr. Maciejewski responded that he did not think the map had been presented, but that it was a graphic representation of the strategies discussed with the committees with options for enhancing local transit service and providing connections to Tualatin. He said they were routes where local service would be an option and if a local study was done regarding local transit routes, these were the prioritized locations. Commissioner Griffin questioned if it would be TriMet, or a local city service. Mr. Maciejewski said it could be either, but the map showed the larger, arterial collector roadways that might be appropriate for a transit service route.

Chair Simson asked how this impacted the developer when an application came in if a wider road would be required. Brad commented that he would point it out to TriMet when notifying them of the project and see what kind of comment they provide. He said if TriMet was not going to provide transit service, there would be no issues and until transit is within a quarter of a mile of a site, the city does not generally require anything of a developer and ask TriMet what they have planned for the area 99% of the time they don't respond. Chair Simson clarified that the existing blue colored line impacted current development and provides an opportunity if TriMet decides to connect Sherwood to Tualatin. Brad responded that there is talk in the Service Enhancement Plan of looking down Tualatin Sherwood road or to the YMCA. There may be opportunities on the blue line, but TriMet already stops where they want and the map was

more of an indicator to the city staff. Maciejewski added regarding traffic calming that if there was a proposal to do any modification to any roads to narrow or put in “vertical deflection devices” speed humps the transit routes should be cross referenced when making those decisions.

Chair Simson turned to Volume 1, page 57, Truck Routes, where ODOT and Washington County identify Hwy 99W and Tualatin Sherwood /Roy Rogers Road as truck routes and that the city cannot limit the volume to capacity (V/C) ratio. She explained that on page 55 it indicates that within the Sherwood Town Center, which includes Hwy 99W and Tualatin Sherwood /Roy Rogers Road, the traffic will be allowed to be over capacity. She asked regarding this discrepancy. Mr. Maciejewski explained that the 1.1 v/c is part of metro’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and should also match the Oregon Plan for that area and is an overlay that would supersede the freight route mobility standard for ODOT. He said that Washington County, who manages Tualatin Sherwood Road, does not necessarily comply with what Metro has in the RTP and when doing something on Tualatin Sherwood Road, Washington County standards trump. When doing something on the highway system, ODOT standards apply, but they are consistent with Metro in the Town Center overlay. He said the freight routes outside of the Town Center have a certain standard and roads inside the Town Center apply a new Town Center standards.

Chair Simson asked if the City was setting up for failure. She went on to say that the standard for Washington County and ODOT was .99 and .90 and the City says it will allow 1.1 capacity on our Town Center which is over 100%. Mr. Maciejewski responded that it was being done on facilities that were not Sherwood’s and those agencies have said they want to plan for that, because otherwise they would have to spend a lot more money that they do not have to avoid congestion issues. It is how the County chooses to manage their system and planning for more than 1.1 v/c capacity, which means is that they are anticipating that demand will spread into multiple hours, people will change driving behavior; there will be more congestion in those areas, and traffic queues will get longer.

Commissioner Cooke asked if those agencies were planning for more congestion in order to save money that it would cost to relieve in our small town. Mr. Maciejewski confirmed that it was not just for Sherwood, but part of the statewide and regional policy. Ms. Rudzinski added that planning and building for that type of congestion may give facilities that are larger and may destroy downtown as well. You can try to build your way out of congestion, but the roadways you end up with are very wide.

Chair Simson said she was reading a concern into it. Mr. Maciejewski expressed that it was a tough balance. Commissioner Griffin added the plan mentions the effect of a change to the footprint of an intersection several times. He said the intersections were rated with possible solutions. He said some of the solutions were ranked lower than others, but were more palatable, because it was less infrastructure coming into the city. He said having 1.1 v/c was better than having eight lanes.

Chair Simson turned to Volume 1, page 67-68, Transit Service Enhancements and said it was her two greatest concerns about projects going forward and making sure the language allows citizen input. It talks about high capacity transit. In the last paragraph it says: *While it have been determine that high capacity transit (HCT) will not be provided from Portland to Sherwood through the current Southwest Corridor planning process, it is possible that HCT to Sherwood may be reconsidered in the long term.* Chair Simson suggested language indicating that HCT, in the long term, would go through another public process. Julia responded that HCT is not coming to Sherwood and that was valid to acknowledge that if it is considered it would be through another

regional planning process not because there is a sentence about it in the TSP. Mr. Maciejewski concurred and said the language was consistent with the Sherwood Town Center process. Discussion followed and staff was directed add the language, suggested by Chair Simson, to the plan.

Chair Simson turned to Volume 1, page 67 and said the Brookman Road Concept Plan was mentioned in the plan several times that Washington County wants to designate Brookman Road and arterial road. She explained that Brookman Road in the Concept Plan, as approved by City Council, as a collector route with several streets connecting to it. Chair Simson said she could not support the TSP that calls Brookman Road an arterial and inconsistent with the Brookman Road Concept Plan. She said the Concept Plan should be revisited. The spacing for the collector was set at 100-400 spaced roads, if it is made an arterial it would have 600-1000 foot spacing and a lot of people would be driving through small neighborhoods to get to a very big road and the plan did not intend this. Commissioner Griffin commented that the property was inside our Urban Growth Boundary, but not inside the City limits and the County's road. He said he felt the County was mandating the road to be five lanes and he was not in favor of it. Chair Simson asked if the City could designate the road to be a collector and force the County to come before the Planning Commission to change it to an arterial. Mr. Maciejewski answered that the County has jurisdiction over the roadway so their road designation trumps the City's designation. He said if a land use action for the property was submitted, the County would make the decision. Chair Simson stated that scenario is okay so long as the area was in Washington County, because the project will be completed to County Standards, but if the area is annexed into our city the Comprehensive Plan and the Brookman Area Concept plan will be in play and there would be a conflict.

Chris Crean commented that, absent an agreement between the County and the City, both comprehensive plans can't apply at the same time; it is one or the other. So long as the road is outside of the city, the County's comp plan applies. He reminded that Brookman Road is a County road and some roads automatically transfer jurisdictions with an annexation while others are subject to a transfer process. Mr. Crean said that if the county transfers the road to the City then Sherwood's Comp Plan applies.

Julia specified that the zoning is not for a collector road, but the street spacing that was illustrated in the concept plan shows spacing much closer together and it was envisioned that it was going to be a collector road. She said that if it comes in as an arterial road and the county standards apply the zoning does not change, but there would be wider spacing. That does not mean that we would not want to review if the planned zoning on an arterial road was still appropriate.

Chair Simson explained that she was part of the Brookman Road Concept planning and she was looking at the zoning map that lays out all of the zoning and language in the Comprehensive Plan with the roads. In there it says *a significant challenge to development of the Brookman Road area is providing connections to the surrounding street network without degrading livability on residential streets*. When created the plan anticipated light industrial, neighborhood commercial with a lot of density next to 99w anticipating that people would be able to access it. She said that if they cannot access Hwy 99W then they will use Middleton Road to get to Sunset or down the road 1000 feet to go through a residential neighborhood and she had great concerns that we will be sending commercial traffic through neighborhoods to get to get to Hwy 99.

Bob interjected that in his discussions with the County they said it would not happen, County arterial spacing standards cannot be maintained with that development and an already concept planned area with

the spacing requirements. He explained that normally there could be a parallel collector status road that would connect to the arterial at the appropriate spacing levels, but that is not going to work there, because the spacing is too narrow, with topographic constraints, the vegetative corridor and presence of the railroad that chops it up. Bob said there is no way to meet the County's spacing standards for an arterial and be able to develop the area. He commented that the other aspect is that the identified southern connector is not set up, they want to go further south, but cannot, because of political lines. It is a roadway that has been overlaid for political expediency and even if the County indicated it would be twenty years before constructing the southern connector there was a question of what happens with all the road connections. The area will develop and the properties will have to have local road connectors. Bob said it will have to be a compromise, that is why it is a redefinition area and the Concept Plan will have to be looked at again.

Mr. Maciejewski added that it was important to understand the context. This is the I-5 /99 connector southern arterial that the County is talking about and they believe it is important. He said the City supports a strategy for roads to bypass the city and the County cannot show the line south of Brookman Road, because that would be outside the Urban Growth Boundary. The County needs to adopt their plan with the connector shown on Brookman Road and they want to move ahead with the arterial shown there. He said the County has suggested policy language acknowledging that there is a functional need for both types of roads in the area; one to move regional traffic and one to provide access to Brookman Road and the County will have to look case by case as development comes in and cannot legally land lock properties and say there is no access unless they buy the property. Mr. Maciejewski acknowledged that there will have to be compromises until additional planning work is done and The County may have to apply for a goal exception to move the arterial alignment south of Brookman Road.

Commissioner Griffin asked why the County was designating only a portion of the road if they do not have a plan for the southern extension of I-5. Mr. Maciejewski responded that from 124th Ave east they do, from Ladd Hill to 99W is Brookman Road, and the part in between goes through Clackamas County and they do not have control over that area. He said The RTP has the entire corridor in the plan and when the I-5/ 99 Connector Study was completed it showed a fairly straight east to west alignment across the area that would require major grading work to get through the hills.

Bob said the language in the TSP update was approximately three months of negotiation with County Planning and it was the best compromise to provide assurances for the developer's expectations, and still give the city the flexibility to change the plan to meet needs as they occur. He said it is a difficult situation to get both the city and county TSPs to align.

Commissioner Griffin asked if the city could show support a bypass route that would take traffic out of populated areas. Chair Simson expressed her concern for the language that said the *long term intent is to re-evaluate the Brookman Addition Concept Plan*. She asked if long term meant after the area is annexed in and then change the plan for the property owners. She commented that it would be a staff level and a funding issue to revisit the concept plan to match the arterial.

Julia added that the reevaluation could happen at any time; if funding can be obtained, concurrent with annexation discussions, after annexation. She explained that re-planning and re-zoning happen often, it is not unheard of to do after annexation and a conversation to have with property owners.

Commissioner Sally Robinson said she would be more comfortable with language at the bottom of page 67 where it says *In the interim to provide for future flexibility, Brookman Road has been designated as an arterial with a 5-lanes of right away needed* if it indicated that the County was identifying the road as an arterial.

Chair Simson asked regarding the County giving the road to the City and reverting access spacing that complies with the concept plan. Mr. Maciejewski advised that if the County was preserving the roadway corridor for the southern arterial they were unlikely to hand the road over. Bob added that if the County could build the corridor further south they may be amenable to if the City wanted it. The Commission requested to add "by Washington County" to the document. Julia reminded the Commission that the city was required to have our TSP to be consistent with the County's TSP and Metro RTP. Julia indicated that the City did discuss this with the county, regarding the arterial, but in the end the two documents have to be consistent and we cannot adopt something that is blatantly not. Chair Simson asked if the County was willing to incorporate the Brookman Concept Plan into their document. Bob answered that the County had worked the flexibility into the language that allows the concept plan to be looked at and the need to be flexible in applying county standards for development in the area. Mr. Maciejewski acknowledged that it was not the ideal and the desired function is to have no access except at a few arterial street connections based on the TSP language for the eastern portion of the corridor from 124th to I-5. With the language proposed for Brookman Road the county shows that they realize they cannot have that type of access control. The language in the County's TSP is "cut and pasted" into the City's. Bob added that the language was what staff worked together with the County that was acceptable. Commissioner Griffin commented that it was a triumph considering that the City does not even own the road. Staff was requested to add "designated by Washington County" to the document.

Commissioner Robinson asked regarding Langer Farms Parkway near Home Depot. She referred to project D12 on the project list which extends it to the other side of 99W and asked if it was considered to have Langer Farms Parkway wider to accommodate the growth from the Walmart coming in to town and the other traffic that will be created by that. Mr. Maciejewski replied that the volume demand for the road was projected for the next twenty years and when the concept plan for the area was designed the city took into account all of the potential development in the area and forecast out twenty years to see if there was enough demand to warrant a four or five lane corridor. At the time there was not enough demand to use it as a short cut route, but primarily to provide access and the decision was to design it as a two to three lane roadway. Chair Simson asked if none of the modeling for the road from Oregon Street to Home Depot projected more than one lane each way. Mr. Maciejewski affirmed.

Commissioner Robinson expressed her surprise and expressed that she thought it should be part of a long term plan to expand the roadway if development warrants it. Chair Simson commented that designating it as a larger road would require a larger right of way than is currently required. Mr. Maciejewski confirmed and said that by adopting the road as a larger corridor a right of way dedication would be required from future developments. He commented that there would be no technical basis for justifying a larger corridor and questioned if that would cause issues. Bob related that staff could provide the technical basis for the road designations and said to speculate on the future size of the road or the business development without the technical support leaves the City open to being challenged at all levels the first of which would be an appeal that the City would lose. Mr. Maciejewski related that the study did not indicate a huge demand

using the link from Tualatin Sherwood to 99W north towards Tigard; coming south from Tigard to Tualatin was not a huge demand. The major regional demand is crossing the highway to Roy Rogers or south to Newberg and of all those origins of destinations. It is the least dominant traffic stream. After a comment from Commissioners Walker and Simson that they plan using the road, Mr. Maciejewski stated that the road will be utilized by local traffic, but local traffic generally are not enough to trigger a multi-lane roadway. Commissioner Walker said she expected traffic from Tigard turning left at the Home Depot to cut through to Tualatin Sherwood Road to avoid the traffic stacking at the light at Tualatin Sherwood Road and Hwy 99W. Mr. Maciejewski reminded the Commission to remember that SW 124th Ave going south of Tualatin Sherwood down to Tonquin Road, into the north Wilsonville area, so all the Tigard/northern Tualatin demand will use the 124th corridor to go north/south through the area, which may explain the projections.

Commissioner Robinson asked regarding upgrades to Tonquin Road. Mr. Maciejewski indicated that the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Washington County's TSP have upgrades to Tonquin Road, not to a five lane road, but a standard two lane road with upgrades to an urban standard east into Tualatin's planning area with three lanes, sidewalks and bike lanes.

Bob read on page V of the Preface, Transportation Standards, Street Cross-Sections where it states *that new streets shall meet the design requirement in Sherwood's Engineering Design and Standard Details Manual per the functional class in the TSP* was referring to the street cross sections. He said the cross section requirements need to be part of the TSP and the design manual concurs with the TSP and may even show the same details. Bob explained that, as the City Engineer, he was following the TSP as far as the standard for road sections; designation and physical standard. He stated that details (Figure 8-2 to Figure 8-6) needed to be in the TSP documents. The language *Engineering Design and Standard Details Manual per the functional class in the TSP* was changed to *Transportation System Plan per Figures attached*.

Chair Simson moved to page 53 of the Planning Commission packet to the Proposed Transportation Goals and Policies and asked for comments. Receiving none, she turned to page 57 and expressed that she thought Strategy 4: *Plan for an array of transportation assets and services to meet the needs of the transportation – disadvantaged*, was a duplicate of Goal 5: *Provide reliable convenient transit service to Sherwood residents and businesses as well as special transit options for the City's elderly and disable residents*. Darci Rudzinski responded that she did not think the strategy was as narrow as just planning for transit.

Chair Simson read Strategy 5: *Evaluate, identify, and map existing and further neighborhoods for potential small scale commercial businesses to primarily serve local residents*. She said this was an existing strategy and that the commentary suggested that the strategy be reevaluated to ensure that it continues to be relevant and match the city's priorities. She asked if there was ever a need to rezone from residential to commercial and if it was a strategy that was needed in the TSP. Ms. Rudzinski responded that the strategy was related to Policy 4: *The City shall encourage the use of more energy efficient and environmentally sound alternatives to the automobile by: (last bullet) encouraging the development of self-contained neighborhoods, providing a wide range of land use activities within a single area*. She said it was likely the City was looking at mixed use neighborhoods with a small commercial serving the neighborhood through a convenience store or hair salon that would not attract a lot of traffic but serve the needs of the immediate neighborhood. The strategy was there to ensure those uses were allowed in the right places and not just everywhere. Commissioner Griffin commented that it said potential and that action was not required. He said it could apply to the edge between Brookman Road

residential the commercial properties and the strategy was not irrelevant yet. Chair Simson suggested that it was more for the existing neighborhoods like the southeast Sherwood area. The strategy remained.

Chair Simson turned to page 60, Goal 2, Strategy 7: *Adopt performance measures that are consistent with regional modal targets for non-single occupancy vehicles and track the City's progress with meeting adopted goals and policies each successive TSP update.* Chair Simson suggested to add "based on local community goals" and said she did not like having to adopt Metro's standards without applying community values. Ms. Rudzinski suggested "consistent with community values", which was accepted by the Commission.

Chair Simson turned to page 66, Goal 3, Strategy 12 it has deleted language and with the new language that says *Support public or private development of the bicycle and pedestrian improvements shown on Map 2 of the Town Center Plan.* She said that through the Town Center Plan the City was trying to incorporate both sides of 99W and ensure that opportunities were available throughout the Six Corners area. She commented that the deleted language included Six Corners which had been identified in the Comprehensive Plan as a regional area developing on both sides of the highway to complement each other and not be completely different.

Note: The deleted language was "consider a mixed use overlay zone in a the development code that will apply to the Six Corners area. Include design standards that will encourage a vibrant, pedestrian friendly environment through the implementation of boulevards, medians, mixed-use development and site design".

Commissioner Griffin commented that the strategy changes seem unrelated and changed from the Six Corners area to bicycle and pedestrian improvements.

Ms. Rudzinski responded that the Town Center Plan identified the City's concentration zone where mixed use would be the most appropriate and the Planning Commission's recommendation was not to ignore north of 99W, but that there should be some integration with similar policies. She said she was not aware that there was strong support for mixed use and she could see that what was recommended was not a one for one replacement, but taking advantage of the space provided by a deleted policy. She indicated that if the existing policy was still valid, and the Town Center Plan did not fulfill the desire then it could remain. She said that she thought it was a placeholder for when Six Corners was considered the town center.

Chair Simson concurred that the mixed use overlay was not as relevant as when the area was the town center, but as was testified, the citizens on both sides of the highway need to have the same opportunity for bicycle and pedestrian avenues that connect to each other. She said the Commission fought during the town center planning efforts to create cohesion; that Six Corners

, both north and south of Tualatin Sherwood Road and east and west of Hwy 99 be treated to get the connectivity. Ms. Rudzinski replied that she did not think Map 2 would satisfy that for north of the Six Corners language to the proposed language so that the support for public and private development of bicycle and pedestrians without being confined the map that shows the town center. The Commission was in favor of adding "and within the Six Corners area north and south of the highway".

Chair Simson turned to page 73, Goal 5, Policy 9: *The city supports transit service that serves the needs of the residents and businesses in and adjacent to the Town Center, including maintaining a robust local transit service network and planning for future local and high capacity transit service to neighboring cities.* She asked if there was any concern about the language. Commissioner Griffin commented that it did not tie the city down to anything.

Chair Simson turned to page 75, Goal 5, Strategy 4: *Work with Metro, as well as the cities of Tualatin and Tigard, to explore feasible modes and location to provide high-capacity transit service to the Towne Center and adjacent areas.* She said that she was okay with this strategy and expressed concern for Strategy 6: *Continue to explore opportunities to achieved long term transit supportive densities in the Town Center in order to increase the viability of high-capacity transit.* Chair Simson said to her it meant an increase in density and expressed concern over that policy decision. Commissioner Griffin commented that this concern not wanting to increase density was expressed during the town center meetings. Chair Simson disclosed that the commission felt pressured during the Town Center planning process to comply with metro requirements. She asked if the city was required through this process or any other process to increase our densities.

Ms. Rudzinski responded that it was not required through this process, but as part of having a community that can support transit is having enough people and businesses to do that. High Capacity Transit is very destination oriented and there needs to be enough of those to support that type of investment. Ms. Rudzinski reminded that there were also positive comments regarding having transit as an option, but ridership drives demand and demand is provided by people and businesses and without one you cannot cost effectively have the other. She said the focus has shifted since the development of the Town Center planning away from high capacity transit because it has been deemed not feasible to come all the way to Sherwood. She said Strategy 4 keeps the door open for future planning and Strategy 6 is a question for the Planning Commission to answer.

Commissioner Griffin declared that it was too far in the wrong direction to continue to explore to increase the viability of high capacity transit; he did now think the city was in a position to be looking for that right now and that the statement was not relevant at the moment. He said Sherwood wanted connectivity with TriMet and surrounding cities, but the public has not shown interest in light rail or increasing density. Chair Simson commented that the buildings shown, in the town center planning process, over three stories were received poorly. Commissioner Robinson suggested deleting Strategy 6 and keeping Strategy 4. The Commission voiced their approval of the suggestion.

Chair Simson said she was done with her suggestions for Goals and Policies. Commissioner Griffin pointed to page 67, Goal 3, Strategy 19: *The City will reexamine local street standards and will explore appropriate locations within the City an circumstances under which a narrower street standards may be permitted as part of new development.* He said he understood having less impervious surface and commented with words like reexamine, consider, explore, and if appropriate the strategy may be vague enough to be acceptable. Commissioner Clifford commented on SW Dewey Drive, a curved road with houses on either side, with parking on one side and parking was horrible on Fridays because of garbage cans on the street for collection and the buses and car traffic. He asked how a situation like that could be avoided. Commissioner Cooke concurred that the situation was unsafe. Mr. Maciejewski responded that the issues were a lack of connectivity that forces all the traffic onto one roadway and the design of the road itself. He said the cross-sections in the Plan have a narrower local street (28') and a wider option; there are volume thresholds for when each street would be appropriate. In the update, a road like Dewey, that is a higher local volume, would not be a 28 foot wide street and he thought it has already been addressed with the cross-sections and the strategy may not be relevant by the work that has been done in the TSP.

Commissioner Walker commented that when the road is built you may not know how much traffic it will have. Mr. Maciejewski answered that when development occurs a traffic study is done for the roadways and should consider connectivity in the area and what the TSP forecast has indicated. Chair Simson commented it was probably not envisioned that SW Lynnly and Houston would be accessed the way they are either and it is hard to think of using streets more narrow than we already have. The commission wanted to remove Strategy 19.

Chair Simson noted errors beginning with page 85, the first reference to the TSP should be written out as Transportation System Plan and page 88, second paragraph, the *and/or* should be *and*.

Chair Simson turned to page 92, and expressed concern for the existing code for carpool and vanpool parking spaces that requires preferential spaces for development with twenty or more employees. Commissioner Griffin added that the carpool/vanpool spaces would be required to be located closer to the main entrance than all other spaces except for ADA spaces and asked where that came from. Ms. Rudzinski replied that the language was modified language from the model code for small cities and commented that it was not a lot of spaces, but a space or two next to the employee entrance and was intended to incentivize carpooling to increase the non-single occupant vehicle percentage. Commissioner Simson asked how the twenty employees was determined. Ms. Rudzinski responded that it did not make sense to provide carpool spaces for small businesses, the number is somewhat arbitrary and the intent was to incentivize the behavior in the larger businesses. Commissioner Walker asked if the employees were full time or part time. Ms. Rudzinski answered that the determination would be at development review and would not be monitored over time in a community this small. It would be a one-time deal; for a business park, larger employer, or industrial area. Commissioner Walker suggested increasing the number of employees. Discussion followed regarding the correct number. Suggestions ranged from a hundred employees when TDM requirements are required, forty five for when healthcare is required. Commissioner Walker suggested forty full time employees, which was accepted by the Commission. Commissioner Clifford asked about local shopping centers that have fifteen minute parking stalls and asked if the businesses were offering that or if it was an incentive by the developer. Ms. Rudzinski indicated that she had not seen any code that required them. Brad Kilby suggested it was a leasing incentive and the City only required that a minimum number of parking spaces be provided and how the parking is managed is up to the property owner. Ms. Rudzinski added that a parking management plan should be part of development in the Town Center Plan.

Chair Simson turned to pages 100-101 and asked why the maps were being deleted. Ms. Rudzinski explained it was so that information was not duplicated so that the development code does not have to be updated when the TSP updates. She added that it was unusual to have the maps in the code.

Chair Simson complimented staff for the article in the May edition of the Sherwood Archer explaining that the Capacity Allocation Program (CAP) would be removed. She indicated that if there were issues from the development community, they would be at the hearing, but none were present. Chair Simson explained that Bob Galati had explained why the CAP was no longer relevant in a work session and she thought it was a great idea. She said the citizens had enough notice and opportunity to raise a concern if

they wanted the CAP to remain and it gave her a comfort level that the Commission was doing something outside of what citizens would be concerned about.

Chair Simson turned to pages 96-99, Bicycle Parking and Facilities. She said the section seemed cost prohibitive and needed a defined number of hours for short term and long term parking. Commissioner Griffin stated that the language says long term is defined as at least several hours which needed to be clearer. If it is long term racks, storage rooms, or lockers have to be provided located within one hundred feet of the entrance and covered. He said that could be expensive.

Chair Simson agreed and turned to the table on page 99. She said it was an existing table with use categories that she thought was in the code, because it was required by Metro in 2005. She said the use categories listed in the table did not match the use categories in Sherwood's code and what was driving the number of bicycle spaces required did not align with existing uses. Chair Simson asked what the City was required to put in the code per Metro or any other governing agencies. Ms. Rudzinski answered that the City needs to distinguish between long term and short term and the definition is by design. The City may identify people who will not only use a bike rack for a certain duration, but to look at it as a design issue in providing space for people to feel comfortable leaving the bicycle for a longer period of time. Commissioner Griffin said the commission needed to come up with a more concrete way of measuring long term parking.

Ms. Rudzinski answered that the city requires the design to have a certain amount to be long term bicycle parking and must have at least one long term space and of the amount required a certain percentage of those will be long term. Commissioner Griffin asked what the racks, storage rooms, or lockers were like and if they were inside or outside. Ms. Rudzinski responded that there should be flexibility in the code in this respect and examples can be found to guide developers; a plastic locker like the ones found at transit centers, a closet area inside, anything as long as somebody feels like they can leave their bike there for longer than it takes to go into a convenience store. She explained that the long term parking is for the commuter, student, or employee who will work a shift and does not want to leave their bike vulnerable to the elements or to being taken. She recognized that it was a shift in thinking and was more difficult to conceive how it would look in Sherwood, but everyone was struggling with this and figuring out what makes sense for their communities. Regarding the table, Ms. Rudzinski said it was not unusual to roll up uses, unlike parking requirements that are use oriented. She said the bicycle parking could be tacked on to the parking requirements table, but the existing table would be the easiest way to go, because only the design will change not the requirements. She suggested that looking at the appropriateness of specific bicycle parking requirements for specific uses was a longer process.

Chair Simson pointed out that the last items on the list (colleges, schools, community service, parks and open spaces, park and ride facilities) were zoned Institutional Public and should be categorized as such. She advocated changing Basic utilities to Industrial and asked what drive up vehicle servicing was. She was informed it was like a Jiffy Lube. She asked about Drive-thru restaurants and determined that they would require bicycle parking with one long term space. This provided four categories: Residential, Commercial, Industrial, and Institutional Public.

Chair Simson and Commissioner Griffin declared that they were still not happy with the long term parking. Chair Simson repeated her sentiment that it was cost prohibitive. Brad commented that in 1.d of

the section it requires that *at least 50% of the require bicycle parking spaces be long-term*. He noted a project he worked on in the private sector for a private school that required 40 parking spaces and commented that the 50% requirement would have been an issue. He said there were different ways to cover the bicycle parking and talked about the cantilevered roof on the bathrooms at Stella Olsen Park to provide covered bicycle parking. If cost is a concern the Commission could lower the percentage of required long term spaces.

Chair Simson asked regarding long term parking in a park, where the parking has to be within one hundred feet of the entrance and secured or with a security guard. Councilor Robyn Folsom revealed that she was the council liaison to the parks board when the bathrooms were being built and this code requirement was a concern. She said it almost stopped the bathrooms from being built.

Commissioner Cook added that she had a child who bikes around town and she was teaching him to lock up his bicycle. She said she did not see very many bike commuters and did not see an increase in the next twenty years. She said 50% seemed aspirational and a high threshold to reach. Brad added that he rode his bike to work at a previous job and often the employer will make concessions for bicycle commuters.

Chair Simson and Commissioner Cooke said that their experience was that bicycle commuters would bring their bicycles inside the building for long term parking. Commissioner Cooke intimated that she would be comfortable with 25%.

Ms. Rudzinski reminded that the long term parking requirement was flexible and could be as little as a bicycle hook on the wall in the utility closet inside that building. She said it may be difficult at site design approval without the building plans, but for the smaller employer it would be easier to accommodate inside. Ms. Rudzinski said there was a lot of flexibility for how to satisfy what secure means and the language is not suggesting that Sherwood has to make sure every development has a security guard for one bike commuter.

Chair Simson commented that it may be difficult for an applicant that has to meet all of the code requirements with a code requiring racks in an area that is secure or monitored, within a hundred feet of the entrance. Commissioner Griffin asked if the requirement was putting a burden on certain businesses and said that he understood the concept of encouraging people to bicycle.

Commissioner Walker suggested that if the requirement is more than four or five long term spaces then the code applies, and if the applicant meets a minimum threshold then the 25% of the parking must be long term parking. Discussion followed with the following language being proposed. "If required to provide eight or more bicycle parking spaces, 25% of those spaces must be long term". The commission discussed how this would work with Target as an example. They decided that if Target was a new development they would be required to provide five long term bicycle parking spaces and that it was a reasonable number.

Commissioner Walker said she was more concerned for the burden placed on the small businesses. Brad commented that he liked long term bike parking for his bike and he did not want to leave it out. Chair Simson asked him that if long term bicycle parking was at City Hall and it met the code if he would park his bike there or in his workspace. Brad responded that he would use the long term parking, because he

did not have room in his work space. He revealed that when he does ride his bike there is closet under the stairs that is available.

Chris Crean added that when he was a bicycle commuter he used a fenced off area in the parking structure that was secured and he would not leave his bicycle outside all day. Bob Galati commented on bicycle lockers that could be rented at a location in Portland. Mr. Crean commented that they were expensive and a secure, covered and fenced area was good.

Commissioner Robinson asked if the current schools in Sherwood were meeting the criteria being discussed and was informed that they probably were not. She said she did not think much of the population in Sherwood commuted and asked if anyone had researched how much of the population was being served. Mr. Maciejewski said those numbers were not available. Ms. Rudzinski argued that it was a “Catch 22” and facilities need to be provided before people will commute by bicycle. It is a safety and security issue and if you do not build it, people won’t commute by bicycle. Brad related that Sherwood is on the scenic route for Washington County and the Commission has discussed ways to do agro-tourism to wineries and the city could attract that dynamic. The commission members confirmed the suggested language.

Commissioner Clifford asked regarding the language requiring the long term spaces to be located within one hundred feet of the entrance and asked if it could be changed to be more specific which entrance was appropriate. Commissioner Griffin said it specified that the language indicates that it is the entrance accessed by the intended users. He commented that it did not matter to him where it was located if it was inside the building, because it would be out of the rain. Chair Simson suggested that the space could be any place inside the building or within 100 feet of the entrance, if outside. Discussion followed with the language changed to “Locate outside spaces within a hundred feet of the entrance that will be accessed by the intended users”.

Chair Simson stated that she had no other concerns or comments and asked the commission for any.

Commissioner Griffin commented that *at the discretion of the City Engineer* was used several times in the code and asked if that was how it was meant to be. Bob responded that the TSP goes hand and hand with design variations and if an applicant comes up with something outside of the standards they will have to justify it, but it will not be granted for monetary motives. He said he needed some leeway to take into account certain design requirements that are unique; a property that does not fit and development cannot work without flexibility. Bob said it was a balancing act and he did not grant everything that comes in. Commissioner Griffin asked if it would stand up at LUBA.

Chris Crean said he was less concerned about LUBA and more concerned with statutes that allow challenges to conditions that seem arbitrary. A decision that is exclusively at the discretion of a person without standards and safeguards could be abused and become arbitrary and capricious decision making. He said in this case the way the code and the manual work out, the design exception process allows for variations from design standards that are administered by the City Engineer with its own internal standards and safeguards to protect against arbitrary decision making by the City Engineering. Bob added that the design standards manual is written in a manner that requires the City Engineer to document decisions, with background information and written justification why the exceptions are accepted with limitations being placed on them. He said he liked having the option of trying to make something work, but was very

rigid when it came to the applicability of making a change to a standard and if there is a very good reason for it that can be supported.

With no other comments, the following motion was received.

Motion: From Commissioner Lisa Walker to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for PA 14-01 Transportation System Plan Update based on the applicant testimony, public testimony received, and the analysis, findings and conditions in the staff report with the modifications as discussed. Seconded by Commissioner John Clifford.

Julia Hajduk asked if the recommendation could be to a "date certain" so the public hearing with the City Council did not have to be noticed. Discussion followed regarding when the Council would be available, noticing procedures, deadlines for the grant contract and who pays for the consultants. The Commission decided to re-notice and the vote was taken.

All present Planning Commissioners voted in favor (Vice Chair James Copfer was absent).

8. Adjourn

Chair Simson adjourned the meeting at 10:35 pm.

Submitted by:

Kirsten Allen

Kirsten Allen

Planning Department Program Coordinator

Approval Date: _____

June 24, 2014