

*Draft PC Minutes were reviewed  
and approved at the February 12,  
2025 PC Meeting.*



**Wilsonville Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
January 8, 2025**

Wilsonville City Hall & Remote Video Conferencing  
<https://www.ci.wilsonville.or.us/meetings/pc>

**CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL**

**Chair Karr** called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

Present: Andrew Karr, Ron Heberlein, Sam Scull, Nicole Hendrix, and Jennifer Willard

Excused: Yana Semenova and Matt Constantine

Staff Present: Daniel Pauly, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Miranda Bateschell, Kerry Rappold, and Mandi Simmons

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

**Amanda Guile-Hinman, City Attorney**, confirmed the Planning Commission preferred to hold officer elections at its February meeting.

**CITIZEN INPUT**

There was none.

**WORK SESSION**

2. Climate Action Plan (Rappold)

**Kerry Rappold, Natural Resources Manager**, along with **Consultants Hillary Bettie and Maurya Braun of Sustainability Solutions Group (SSG)**, presented the Climate Action Plan via PowerPoint, overviewing its key components, influencing State requirements and Wilsonville plans, project timeline, and public engagement strategy. (Slides 4-12)

- Wilsonville's Greenhouse Gas Inventory results were presented by sector (Slides 13-15), along with two, projected future energy use emission modeling scenarios:
  - Business As Usual (BAU), which only applied changes in population and economic growth, vehicle efficiency standards and climate warming; and
  - Business As Planned (BAP), which builds on the BAU by adding the impact of approved and funded climate policies. (Slides 16-21)
- The Low Carbon (LC) scenario model builds on the BAP by adding measures that would help the City achieve its climate goals; however, the LC was not complete as the project team sought feedback from the Commission on potential low carbon actions first.

- Potential low carbon actions, which could be adjusted based on public feedback, and sample implementation measures were also presented that would help the City further reduce its energy and emissions reductions. (Slides 22-27)

Discussion included feedback from Commissioners about ideas, climate actions, and implementation measures they wanted to see (Slides 26-27) with responses to Commissioner questions from the project team as noted:

- Transportation was the largest emissions sector and only two transportation-related actions were presented, so perhaps more should be explored.
- Mode shifting could be challenging given the big change in lifestyle required; incentives may need to be considered.
- The City needed the infrastructure in place to encourage people to change to different modalities.
- **Natural Resources Manager Rappold** clarified the Open House would be geared toward soliciting input on the proposed actions being discussed tonight by the Commission. The Community Survey gathered perceptions and included lists to see what people would be willing to do. The survey results would be shared with the Commission, as well as the specific questions posed to businesses and industries about what they would be willing to consider to reduce their impact.
- All City departments should be given the opportunity to be involved on the Climate action team.
- The regulations seemed to be coming from the State into the Wilsonville community, but how much of the State's activity was being driven from a Federal perspective, and how would the City navigate the changes anticipated over the next several years? Would the community stay the course in pursuing the identified goals, which would be very fluid.
  - **Consultant Braun** believed the tendency in many communities was to assume the State would achieve a certain amount or that there would be a certain amount of support, or regulatory strength coming from the State. The communities achieving success in climate action planning were taking a grassroots approach, and much could be done at a local level to incentivize the actions discussed. A recent study by the Department of Energy and State of Oregon concluded that the economic impact of the energy transition was positive.
  - The City should be ready to engage in local opportunities to support the changes, especially given the multiple benefits for the community, from better air quality to much lower energy costs for households.
- **Natural Resources Manager Rappold** clarified the goals and requirements would apply to new construction of commercial, residential, and industrial structures, as well as remodeling or additions. The incentives provided to existing owners and occupiers would depend on the extent to which an existing structure was being remodeled. He would consult with the Building Official to see how it might apply.
- Solar incentives were believed to have expired and could be reestablished along with other incentives, like for wind. New construction was a positive step forward, but a lot of opportunities exist in the community for applying ideas.

- Was it possible to model the climate action improvements that would be available without incentivizing the efficiency targets and also with incentivizing efficiency targets to help motivate potentially recruiting funding for those incentives?
  - **Consultant Braun** responded modeling the impacts of incentives themselves was not straightforward as it varied a lot from community to community and based on current energy prices and economic income levels. The team could provide a sense of the cost impacts and savings, as well as some guidance on the levels of incentives in general that motivate people and other factors as the Commission began implementing the Plan.
- The traffic back up on I-5 at the Boone Bridge was a huge contributor to carbon emissions. Modeling showing what emissions improvement, if any, could be expected as a part of an eventual Boone Bridge expansion was suggested. While the improvements could increase trips, if the outcomes reveal that the bridge improvement is Climate Action Plan friendly, it could be used to motivate the State to do the project.
- Having a way to incentivize climate action improvements on existing buildings should be considered as a draft action.
- **Consultant Braun** explained the mode shift percentages (Slide 26) were taken from Tigard and the Clackamas County Climate Action Plan as averages that could potentially be used in the Wilsonville community. The numbers modeled for Tigard and the County were presented as a potential scenario to work toward. The actions were pathways the City could take to get to net zero carbon emissions. The current numbers were a starting point and could be adjusted.
- **Consultant Braun** explained the trips modeled included traffic trips into, out of, and entirely within Wilsonville. The emissions are attributed to the origin of the trip. If the trip started outside Wilsonville, it would not be included in the inventory, and carpool trips were modeled the same way.
- The percentage of trips being carpooled seemed quite large. Were any other communities getting close to 30% currently? Moving from 3% to 7% transit seemed more realistic. Going from a 5% to 30% shift in carpooling would require significant changes in behavior across a wide swath of the community. The draft actions should be achievable even if a bit on the aspirational side.
- The project team did not know what percentage of new building construction currently had solar power; 2050 was the longest possible timeline. While the State's clean energy initiatives should help the City as far as cleaning the grid, putting solar on new buildings would increase the city's ability to withstand power outages, making buildings more resilient. (Slide 27)
- Having a stepping stone, such as 50% solar by 2035, was suggested to help ensure the City was on track. Code changes, like requiring solar PV on all Coffee Creek buildings starting in 2030, could also move the City toward larger percentages. Waiting until 2050 to meet the goals would not be realistic.
  - Requiring solar PV would also impact housing affordability, which the Commission did not want in the immediate future.
- **Natural Resources Manager Rappold** stated the 100% Renewable Natural Gas (RNG) goal might be a challenge, noting the City just finished Wastewater Treatment Master Plan

which was already at \$200 million. Staff's input on the project's feasibility would be required; perhaps the timeline would be extended.

- **Consultant Braun** added a feasibility study would address potentially cheaper technology and the wastewater treatment facility's location. RNG had a lot of value in terms of being able to supply very high heat, particularly to industries that need it. RNG could potentially be sold without the need for natural gas lines at a very good price. RNG was also a way to virtually eliminate wastewater emissions, address issues like fats, oils, and greases burning up motors, provides revenue, and helps the City transition to cleaner future. These changes could be considered at the recently upgraded system's end of the life.
  - The City of Gresham's wastewater treatment plant is emissions positive, taking out more emissions out that it contributes while saving that City about \$400,000 in savings.
- **Consultant Braun** clarified the action to divert 50% of organic waste from landfills by 2030 could be achieved by a reduction in the generation of organic waste or by diverting 50% of the same organic waste stream; it was an implementation question and could be managed either way
- Changing the wording to "50% of organic waste *reduced*/diverted from landfill by 2030" was suggested to show that option was available. (Slide 27)
- The project team clarified the gray boxes on Slide 27 were State initiatives included as placeholders to represent what would assist the City in meeting its low carbon goals. While part of the calculations factoring into the low carbon scenario, the City would not be putting implementation measures in place to achieve them.
- Overall, the Climate Action Plan looked good.
  - Understanding the magnitude of costs to implement each action plan would be helpful so the City could focus on the most cost-effective actions.
  - Knowing how difficult the action plans might be to implement due to technology would also help the City narrow its approach.
  - **Natural Resources Manager Rappold** noted SSG had agreed to work with the City on the magnitude of costs.
- **Consultant Braun** confirmed a multi-pronged attack with concerted efforts across all the actions would be required for Wilsonville to hit 45% reduction by 2035 and 80% by 2050, and many ways the City operates and how citizens get around town would be affected. However, achieving even 95% of the goals would make a huge difference. Pushing hard on the action items would be very beneficial as once the action items start advancing, they would become self-perpetuating.
- The project team confirmed that many surrounding communities were going through a similar exercise, noting Climate Action Plans in Tigard, Clackamas County, and the City of Tualatin. Many communities nationwide were involved in developing Climate Action Plans due to funding that came through from the IRA and more funding was available. The EPA allocated the funding in such a way that the federal administration would have difficulty withdrawing it, which SSG could assist with. Funding was available for things like fee transitions, installing and supporting solar installations, etc.

- **Consultant Braun** explained the result of the City not hitting 45% by 2035 and 80% by 2050 would be significantly increased costs to municipalities, other levels of government, insurance companies, and residences, which SSG called the cost of doing nothing or the social costs of carbon. Approximately seven major insurers had pulled out of California and were unwilling to insure properties there. The sooner things shift, there would be less of an impact.
- **Natural Resources Manager Rappold** explained the 45% by 2035 and 80% by 2050 percentages were from the State Executive Order, which was also reflected in the next work session item.
  - **Planning Manager Pauly** noted the limited amount of staffing resources on the state level, so decisions would be made at the State level about whether to prioritize enforcing housing related code versus climate related code.
- **Consultant Braun** agreed many of the actions would have increased incremental costs upfront; however, that fact was fading fast. For example, renewable energy is now much less expensive generally than fossil fuel energy which has resulted in renewable energy working on its own. States like Texas have shifted toward renewables precisely for that reason. The more that happens, the less capital costs become an issue. The payback for things like building improvements was in the long-term affordability of home or building ownership. While completely eliminating energy costs from a house increases the initial cost of the home by about 4%, the long-term energy savings is tremendous in terms of encouraging affordability. The houses built are not only more affordable, but healthier as well.
- Retrofitting a home for solar can take 15 years to payback; a substantial delta many existing homeowners would not be able to afford. Climate Action Plan goals conflict with the City's affordability housing goals.
- **Natural Resources Manager Rappold** agreed the City's goals would need to be balanced moving forward and the required percentages and wording would need agreed upon as far as requirements for new and existing construction.
- How much consideration for the advancement in technologies and the efficiency improvement in technology is factored into the reduction curve?
  - **Consultant Braun** explained that when doing a financial analysis after completing the low carbon modeling, technological improvements are incorporated into the cost element, noting a reduction in capital costs to reflect the upscaling of operationalizing large-scale manufacturing. However, the efficiencies of new technologies were not factored in; the assumptions included the current efficiencies and lifespans of the technologies being used.
    - The financial analysis was not part of SSG's scope with the City at this time.
    - Having a draft action for implementing new or novel technologies that may be coming was suggested, so the City would have that opportunity going forward.

**Natural Resources Manager Rappold** concluded by highlighting next steps, including opportunities for public engagement, which involved outreach to primary, middle and high

schools and the Open House being held from 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm on January 16<sup>th</sup> in the Willamette River Room at City Hall. Adoption of the Climate Action Plan was expected in June or July. (Slides 29-30)

### 3. CFEC Parking (Pauly)

**Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager**, and **Consultant Brian Davis of Studio Davis** presented the Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities (CFEC) Parking Compliance and Standards Reform via PowerPoint, reviewing the background, goals, and scope of the project, the Parking B compliance options along with Staff's recommendation of Option 1, and the subsequent Development Code amendments anticipated.

Feedback from the Commission was as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- **Planning Manager Pauly** agreed to calculate the overall percentages of land involved with the Parking A and B compliance phases, as well as vacant land or land available for development.
- **Consultant Davis** stated the vast majority of cities were going with Option 1 due to the proximity of public transit and administrative difficulties involved with the other options. However, the decision was very context sensitive and politically influenced. Oregon City had a smaller percentage of exempt land area and already had a number of programs required under Option 3 and therefore chose that option. (Slide 9)
- **Planning Director Bateschell** explained Parking A is always based on the frequency of transit routes. As the city expands into Frog Pond East and South and SMART modifies and expands its route to serve those neighborhoods, the extension of that frequent line would modify the ½-mile buffer zone and expand that boundary as the line moves. Similarly, if one of the SMART transit lines running through the industrial area modified its frequency, then there would be a ½-mile buffer around that transit line as well.
  - **Planning Manager Pauly** noted no transit line expansions were planned in the northwest industrial area. The Villebois line could increase in frequency and further lines could be added. The SMART Canby route went by Charbonneau, but it was not as frequent as the cross-town shuttle.
- **Planning Director Bateschell** explained that TriMet's 96 line would not be considered frequent and would not count for Wilsonville. The requirement regarded the frequency of the community and the frequency being served. Wilsonville's SMART service is much more frequent than TriMet's 96 line. The frequency of transit service was the metric established with the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD).
  - At this point in time, the northwest industrial area is served less frequently, but as the city grows and develops into Basalt Creek, the bus lines currently serving Coffee Creek would extend into Basalt Creek, and the map would need to be modified to reflect the changes in the frequency of transit lines and which areas the City could enforce minimum parking standards.

- **Planning Manager Pauly** noted the map would not change much if TriMet’s 96 line was added due to the route essentially already being in the buffer.
- **Consultant Davis** added Options 2 or 3 would result in even more complex City Code for developers to try to understand. Option 1 took any TriMet or SMART variables off the table.
- Option 1 was the easiest, least administrative, and least confusing for future development. The city’s future development would occur in the northwest area as other areas of the city were pretty much built out and minimum parking was not a relevant topic.
- **Planning Manager Pauly** noted that historically, parking had not been a big issue for detached homes or rowhouses, whereas multifamily parking was usually limited regardless of the ½ mile per unit.

The Commission consented to move forward with recommending Option 1 to City Council.

Discussion on the potential Development Code amendments was as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted (Slide 13):

- **Consultant Davis** confirmed the ¾ mile radius only applied to transit rail stations and would not impact Town Center, which as a climate friendly area would not be impacted.
  - He confirmed the State requirements on Slide 13 would require modifications to existing Code.
- Encouraging versus prescribing was the general preference, using “should” versus “must”.
- Requiring solar for parking larger than a half-acre was good, but having the fee-in-lieu was uncertain.
- Having maximum parking minimums citywide provided consistency.
- **Consultant Davis** clarified the key element of the flexibility regarding EV/Bike Parking was the words “at least”. The City was required to have conduit for any new parking so at least 40% of the parking spaces could be EV spaces. If the Commission planned to have 100% EVs by a certain year, including that EV requirement in the Code would make sense. The flexibility regarding EVs and bike parking was to allow the City to meet or exceed the 40% requirement.
- Given the certainty around technological advancement, leaving EV/Bike Parking at 40% seemed wise. Getting the city to 100% EV did not seem possible.
- The solar option would encourage more solar, but paying a fee-in-lieu was not ideal.
  - **Consultant Davis** explained the purpose of the fee-in-lieu option was to incentivize not developing parking. If the City set that fee relatively high, the City would have funding to use toward a large parking lot in Town Center, allowing people to park once and frequent multiple businesses. The idea was whether the City wanted to encourage not building parking or building parking that was energy generative, or at least relatively attractive with stormwater facilities and tree canopies to provide shade. He shared Hood River’s experiences with the fee-in-lieu option.
    - Ideally, as little land as possible would be devoted to parking, such as parking structures with solar panels on the roof. Minimum parking requirements had resulted in so many empty parking lots.

- Grace Chapel and Oregon Institute of Technology had a terrific, shared parking agreement.
  - **Planning Manager Pauly** noted City Code allowed shared parking for certain uses within a certain distance, particularly for non-residential uses. Staff had to make findings in the land use approval stating that minimum parking requirements had been met by the shared parking agreement and a condition that the agreement be signed was added so it was a legal binding agreement. He provided background on what lead to the agreement.
- With CFEC, the City would no longer have minimum parking requirements.
- The fee-in-lieu was an interesting option as it supported consolidated parking, which was a great idea.

**Planning Manager Pauly** stated the project team would return in a couple months to get feedback on any updated Code work, adding an event was being organized to get public input.

#### **INFORMATIONAL**

4. City Council Action Minutes (December 2, 2024) (No staff presentation)  
No comments.
5. 2025 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

**Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director**, explained the Commission’s calendar for January was uncertain; however, some things were in flux, such as the housing needs and production strategy work, as well as work on the Climate Action Plan and CFEC projects. Staff was also scoping a revamp of the City’s Comprehensive Plan, which had not yet been funded or adopted as part of the work program and budget. At this point, she hoped the Planning Commission would be able to take a break for a month or two next year.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.