



PLANNING COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2021

I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Consideration of January 13, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 13, 2021
6:00 P.M. – (VIRTUAL)**

**WILSONVILLE CITY HALL
29799 SW TOWN CENTER LOOP EAST
WILSONVILLE, OREGON**

*DRAFT PC Minutes to be
reviewed and approved at the
Feb. 10, 2021 PC Meeting*

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Kamran Mesbah called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. Those present:

Planning Commission: Kamran Mesbah, Ron Heberlein, Jerry Greenfield, Breanne Tusinski, Jennifer Willard, Aaron Woods, and Olive Gallagher

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Ryan Adams, Daniel Pauly, and Tami Bergeron

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

CITIZEN'S INPUT - This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Planning Commission on items not on the agenda. There was none.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Chair Mesbah welcomed new Planning Commissioner Olive Gallagher and invited all the Commissioners to briefly introduce themselves.

Commissioner Gallagher and the current Commissioners shared how long they had lived in Wilsonville, their professional backgrounds, and any experiences they had in serving in the community and on City commissions.

A. Planning Commissioner Chair and Vice Chair Nominations

Ryan Adams, Assistant City Attorney, reviewed the rules for nominating and electing the Planning Commission Chair and Vice Chair for 2021.

Jerry Greenfield nominated Kamran Mesbah for 2021 Planning Commission Chair.

Kamran Mesbah nominated Aaron Woods for 2021 Planning Commission Chair.

Chair Mesbah confirmed there were no more nominations and declared the nominations for Chair closed.

Following a roll call vote, Kamran Mesbah was elected as 2021 Planning Commission Chair by a 6 to 1 vote with Kamran Mesbah opposed.

Aaron Woods nominated Jennifer Willard for 2021 Planning Commission Vice Chair.

Jennifer Willard nominated Ron Heberlein for 2021 Planning Commission Vice Chair.

Chair Mesbah confirmed there were no more nominations and declared the nominations for Vice Chair closed.

Following a roll call vote, Jennifer Willard was elected as 2021 Planning Commission Vice Chair by a 6 to 1 vote with Jennifer Willard opposed.

The Commission and Staff briefly discussed when elections were to occur for the Committee for Citizens Involvement (CCI) Chair and Vice Chair.

Jerry Greenfield moved to table the elections for the CCI Chair and Vice Chair to allow Staff to review the City Charter with regard to the matter. The motion was seconded by Aaron Woods and passed unanimously.

B. Consideration of the November 12, 2020 Planning Commission minutes

Chair Mesbah corrected the fourth bullet on Page 5 of 7, under the Key Issue: Cottage Cluster Units on a Single Lot vs. Individual Lots (Page 9, Staff report) as follows, "Chair Mesbah believed that flexibility ~~would~~ **could** allow the City to buy lots and develop affordable housing." He noted politics will dictated whether or not the City bought certain land to develop affordable housing, which might be beyond the scope of the wish of the City Council.

Ron Heberlein moved to approve the November 12, 2020 Planning Commission minutes as amended.

- The following correction was made on Page 5 of 7, under the Cottage Cluster Units Issue, fourth bullet, "Chair Mesbah believed that flexibility ~~would~~ **could** allow the City to buy lots and develop affordable housing."

Olive Gallagher seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

II. WORK SESSION

A. HB 2001 Compliance Middle Housing (Pauly)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted the work session was focused on Wilsonville's Middle Housing project, which would help the City achieve compliance with State House Bill 2001 Middle Housing provision. The project also implemented actions from the City's Equitable Housing Strategic Plan, adopted in 2019. The project team prepared additional information on the work presented in November, including how the Comprehensive Plan and the City's Development Code related to the new policies in HB 2001. Updates were provided in the packet based on the Commission's input and feedback from a high policy level. The team also prepared a Master Plan memo to see how some of the city's master planning areas intersected with the changes in HB 2001. Frog Pond was one such anticipated significant growth area where changes might be necessary or relevant.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, introduced project team members Joe Dills and Kate Rogers from Angelo Planning Group. Mr. Pauly, Mr. Dills, and Ms. Rogers presented the Middle Housing Code Update via PowerPoint, which included reviewing key components of and issues specific to the Frog Pond West Master Plan and presenting three options for modifying the Master Plan to bring it into compliance with HB 2001. (Slides 1-15)

Discussion and feedback from the Planning Commission on the three options regarding the Frog Pond West Master Plan was as follows with responses by Staff to Commissioner questions as noted:

- Mr. Pauly explained that public feedback on the Master Plan revision process depended on the option chosen. The Code changes were required by the State, as would be explained to the community, so the focus was on both compliance and the best interests of Wilsonville. For example, density changes would occur, so the question was how to implement design standards to ensure potential density worked the best it could in existing and future neighborhoods. Modifications of the Master Plan Map would involve more public outreach with neighbors and property owners.

- Ms. Bateschell suggested discussing the scope of outreach that was going to occur through the project depending on the options, including outreach to the East and South Frog Pond areas.
- Mr. Pauly responded that stakeholder outreach would occur to developers and neighbors, as well as broader community outreach using online tools, such as *Let's Talk*, due to COVID-19 restrictions. Targeted sessions regarding siting and design standards would present the history and address any questions in order to get community feedback. Staff was also working with Centro Cultural of Washington County with funding from Metro to support outreach to the Latinx community and other historically marginalized communities of color. Outreach was coordinated with the diversity, equity, and inclusion process that was ongoing in the City. The project was interesting in that outreach involved education on the technical requirements from the State and then focusing on what the community could have an impact on; making sure people were aware and targeting the areas the community could define as a local jurisdiction, which were primarily the siting and design standards.
- Mr. Pauly confirmed that HB 2001 did not require any actual production strategies, but rather looked at the zone capacity and allowed it in the Zoning Code. Additionally, HB 2003 required cities to regularly perform a Housing Needs Analysis followed with a housing production strategy, which could bring in different tools to produce middle housing. HB 2001 was more about zoning to allow middle housing. Under Option 1, nothing required developers to build duplexes if the market did not support them, so the existing Master Plan could be built out and it did require 10 percent duplexes in certain districts.
 - He further noted that both Option 1 and Option 3 could result in no middle housing, though Option 3 would allow more rowhouse or townhouse development, which might be more attractive to certain developers. Option 2 increased the density, but also included limitations, such as the land consuming requirements given the limited by the amount of land on which to put units. The added units in Option 2 could be additional single-family homes and not necessarily middle housing.
 - Ms. Bateschell added that while not necessarily relevant to Frog Pond West, HB 2001 had different requirements for areas that had prior master plan approval versus areas that would be master planned. Density expectations for development would be significantly higher for future master plan areas. The minimum planning requirements for development would be significantly higher, which combined with the interaction of different planning rules and minimum and maximum densities would push developers to higher minimums as well. Therefore, Frog Pond East and South would have more than eight dwelling units per acre.
- Mr. Dills confirmed that Option 1 was indeed what the State minimally required. Studies had been done during the State rule making process, which generally showed that attached townhomes were the most familiar and the most likely to be developed. However, no work had been done yet to test feasibility specific to Wilsonville and Frog Pond West. The outreach process beginning in February with developers that already built this kind of housing and were working in Frog Pond would provide more information. ECONorthwest was also on the team and could provide some quantitative analysis to estimate return on investment and other metrics. He confirmed that Option 1 would meet the State's goal of eight units per acre. The City would comply with the State's requirements with regard to the zoning code, but until building actually occurred, it was uncertain whether compliance would be met a little, a lot, or something in between.
 - Ms. Rogers clarified the State required the City to allow eight dwelling units per acre, not that those units actually be built. By allowing eight dwelling units per acre, the City would be compliant with the State rules.
 - Mr. Dills added that all three options met the State's minimum requirement for Wilsonville, but the Commission could choose to require more duplexes or more particular housing forms or to increase the minimum densities in Frog Pond West to move toward the guaranteed end of the spectrum. The options had been crafted to provide the potential for middle housing.
 - Commissioner Greenfield noted the Commission was bound by City Council to take account of the Equitable Housing Strategy in planning and should be promoting the development of at least duplexes in Frog Pond West.

- Mr. Pauly confirmed that Option 1 increased density the least amount and would not result in as many homes as the other options. He also noted that once a development was initially buildout, all middle housing types were allowed on redevelopment. New neighborhoods would likely not be redeveloped for quite some time. However, any redevelopment of existing development or related to existing master plans] could be from the entire menu of options. The State's requirements, and therefore the options presented, all applied to initial buildout, which meant when any vacant lot was built. A house built on an unbuilt subdivision lot would not likely be torn down next year to build a duplex.
 - Ms. Bateschell noted that five subdivision approvals in Frog Pond West were developing according to the original development plans. The next proposals received would be developed in accordance to what was adopted for the Master Plan provisions. Once all of those builds were completed, 10 or 20 years in the future, any one of those lots could be redeveloped in accordance with the HB 2001 provisions that applied everywhere in the city, regardless of the initial Master Plan buildout and code language. Even in an area like Frog Pond West, where perhaps only single-family detached was allowed in specific subdistricts, those lots could redevelop in the future into other middle housing types according to HB 2001.
 - She confirmed that the chosen option would apply now as the Frog Pond West Master Plan area was built out. However, if a property redeveloped in the future, any of the other middle housing types allowed by HB 2001 could be constructed if the site design standards were met. HB 2001 standards applied to all areas in all cities not at the edge of an urban growth boundary going through a master plan, and after initial buildout.
 - She confirmed that existing approved developments could not change development plans without going through the Development Review Board process. And, the proposal for what could be different would be based on the option chosen and when it became effective in the Code. Once a development was built, then another set of rules would apply.

Homeowners who had already moved into a brand-new development would have no control over density changes once the option was decided. Homeowners could participate in the current process to make decisions about modifying policy. Some standards were required by State law and then the City also had some leeway in making certain policy decisions. The

Option

Frog Pond East and South only had an area plan, not an adopted master plan, so the provisions for new master planning applied to East and South. If the boundaries of Frog Pond West were changed to encompass East and South, she believed the new density minimum would still apply to those areas and might then also apply to West.

- Community would have a voice in the process via the outreach plan and Planning Commission meetings.
- Mr. Dills clarified that infrastructure changes related to Option 3 would involve a process of first studying the capacities of the existing infrastructure and systems planned to date, including water, sewer, stormwater, and potentially a traffic impact analysis, to inform the City's decision about amendment of the Code.
 - Mr. Pauly confirmed looking at infrastructure was part of the project, noting the City had 20-year outlook plans for major infrastructure. Capacity, development, and market projections were continually considered to estimate needs and update infrastructure master plans, as well as how to finance them.
 - Ms. Bateschell noted changing unit counts in Frog Pond West could change the per-door infrastructure funding fee. Infrastructure analyses could inform the policy decision being made and/or be used to reassess the infrastructure fee and whether the infrastructure improvements were related to those framework projects that were part of that fee.
 - Mr. Dills stated the existing water and sewage systems in Frog Pond West were designed with looking ahead to accommodate Frog Pond East and South. Because there was a larger area of consideration involved, studies needed to be done to answer whether the existing systems could handle the extreme case of doubling the number of units.
 - Mr. Pauly noted that imposing a fee on projects that exceeded the capacity was also a key question to explore within the scope of all Frog Pond development. Any fee would have to be applied equally

across the different housing types and considering what made sense for different housing types would need to be explored. Development paying for itself was likely a policy that would move forward unless directed otherwise by City Council, perhaps to incentivize certain types of housing.

- Ms. Bateschell stated the minimum compliance for HB 2001 allowed for time to perform assessments on infrastructure with proposals for improvement in redevelopment areas. The City would want to be setting provisions during the master plan that the infrastructure was sufficient and that the City was comfortable with it. That analysis was already in the scope, but she would not want to rely on having such a provision when master planning in the beginning, especially since redevelopment would allow the middle housing types over time as well.
- Mr. Pauly added the City had the ability to figure out funding for any of the options in terms of supporting them with infrastructure, but there were many factors to consider, and further analysis would be done.

Commissioner Greenfield noted the great amount of community involvement in the density and lot size considerations made in master planning Frog Pond West, which ultimately resulted in a compromise in response to community input. He cautioned that choosing Option 3 would require a larger community input process than would be involved with Options 1 or 2 and would be like starting over with the zoning for the entire West development.

Commissioner Woods agreed, noting the Option 3 density would result in 25 units per acre, which would be a major issue.

Chair Mesbah noted when discussing the Equitable Housing Strategy and the changes to the State law, the Planning Commission and City Council decided to do what was right instead of just meeting the letter of the law. Option 1 met the letter of the law, but it opened all of the available lots to a duplex which was not designed for in the site design. Option 2 allowed the City to look at existing undeveloped areas and find where duplexes would work best in the design of the overall development, which seemed a more thoughtful approach to increasing density. He agreed Option 3 would completely open up the entire thing for reconsideration, and those who had invested in single-family houses in the neighborhood would likely be opposed. He believed all of the options required outreach, but Option 3 would require major outreach and re-discussion of the design of the Frog Pond West neighborhood.

Commissioner Heberlein noted when putting together the Frog Pond Master Plan, equitable housing was not a topic of discussion. The entire process focused on the need for more large lots to offset the high number of apartments. He agreed Option 3 was a test of the City's commitment to equitable housing. While technically feasible, did the City and the citizens have the will to make Option 3 happen?

Mr. Pauly clarified that while Option 2 did specify where some density went, duplexes still had to be allowed on every lot.

Commissioner Willard said that because Frog Pond East and South were not built out yet and would adhere to the new master plan rules per State law, she believed a more conservative approach would be appropriate in Frog Pond West.

Chair Mesbah inquired if achieving eight units per acre would preclude joining Frog Pond West with either South or East to create a bigger neighborhood. Was there an option to expand the neighborhood boundaries?

- Mr. Pauly responded the standards from the State were different for existing master plans, but the current adopted rules obligated the City to plan infrastructure for 20 units an acre in Frog Pond East and South. The substantial differences in density requirements would not lend to combining neighborhoods, though wayfinding, design elements, etc. would make the three neighborhoods mesh together.
- Ms. Bateschell confirmed that Frog Pond West had an adopted master plan and therefore, different provisions. Frog Pond East and South only had an area plan, not an adopted master plan, so the provisions

for new master planning applied to East and South. If the boundaries of Frog Pond West were changed to encompass East and South, she believed the new density minimum would still apply to those areas and might then also apply to West.

Commissioner Greenfield stated that the compromise made in planning density in Frog Pond West was being changed to increase the density in a way that would not have been acceptable when creating the original master plan. He had wanted more density in West at the time, but the community outreach process impacted the outcome. The State's requirement to increase densities in both West and East required more community discussion, emphasizing the City was under the State's requirements and noting the Council's commitment to equitable housing, which was not taken into account in master planning Frog Pond West. Any mitigation in West to better account for equitability would involve a lot of community persuasion.

Mr. Pauly asked the Commissioners to state their preferred option and why, as well as any feedback they wished to forward to Council.

Commissioner Greenfield noted he was in favor of Option 2, but would like it to include the intention to increase the number of units in the middle- and low-density neighborhoods and to leave the small lot size neighborhood subdistricts as they were.

Commissioner Woods preferred Option 2, stating that even though the City would not have to allow any more than duplexes for middle housing, he believed it was the best overall choice.

Commissioner Willard stated her last preference was Option 3. She had started the discussion preferring Option 1, but after learning of the compromises mentioned by Commissioner Greenfield, she was leaning toward Option 2, and so she was in between Options 1 and 2.

Commissioner Tusinski also preferred Option 2, stating it would keep the original intent of the neighborhood intact and would be more palatable to existing homeowners.

Commissioner Gallagher favored Option 2, stating that Option 3 was a "no." She expressed concern over green space and tree preservation and noted there might be more control over those issues with Option 2.

Commissioner Heberlein believed Option 2 was the minimum standard that should be aimed for and noted his residence was across the street from the development. If the City was serious about equitable housing and meeting the needs of all of the residents, then effort should be focused on Option 3. He agreed with Commissioner Greenfield about wanting a more distributed allocation of density throughout the entire Frog Pond development, but as three years had passed since the original planning, this was an opportunity to revisit that conversation with a different lens.

Chair Mesbah:

- Said he saw Option 1 as only meeting the letter of the law. While he did not know what the market preference was in the neighborhood, he was not convinced duplexes would be built over single-family homes and was open to seeing a market analysis. He believed Option 2 was the minimum that should be done as a city. He agreed with Commissioner Heberlein about considering Option 3 to address equity and inclusion. He further added there was a need for a commission to inform, educate, and build consensus around inclusion and equity, rather than trying to build inclusion and equity by force. Jumping to Option 3 did not seem realistic at this time for a built neighborhood, but hearing from residents of the city would inform where the community stood. He inquired how many lots had been built in Frog Pond West and how many lots remained to be built.
 - Mr. Pauly replied approximately 75 to 100 lots had been built, with the greatest number being built by Pahlisch Homes in Morgan Farm along southwest corner next to the creek, as well as the Street of Dreams and the homes just north. He confirmed about 500 lots remained. Quite a few houses would be

built between now and when the City adopted the Code Update around the fall, but once the update was in effect, any vacant lot in those existing subdivisions could potentially be changed to whatever was allowed by the Code update.

- Commissioner Heberlein confirmed that three-quarters of the development would be influenced by the Commission's decisions.
- Stated the low number of lots built made Option 3 more realistic than he had previously noted, but his preference was Option 2.

Commissioner Gallagher agreed with Chair Mesbah, taking back her previous statement regarding Option 3.

Commissioner Greenfield stated he believed it was possible to devise a hybrid of Options 2 and 3.

Mr. Pauly inquired whether the Commission believed the density increase as noted in Option 2 should be middle housing units or if it could be any type of unit.

Commissioner Greenfield responded that the purpose was for middle housing.

Chair Mesbah rephrased the question, asking whether the middle housing should be limited to duplexes or open to quadplexes, triplexes, and the other types of middle housing types.

Commissioner Greenfield noted he would be open to more than duplexes, but he was not sure he would go all the way to quadplexes.

Ms. Bateschell clarified that the State only required a minimum density in the master plan areas, and the number of units in different subdistricts could be increased without making a distinction on what those units needed to look like. She confirmed that Mr. Pauly was asking if the additional density beyond what was originally in the plan should be middle housing or to just additional units or single-family dwellings instead.

All the Commissioners agreed they should be middle housing units.

Mr. Pauly thanked the Commissioners for their clarification and input, stating the information would allow the project team to move forward and present to Council, and continue to refine the process.

Ms. Rogers continued the PowerPoint presentation, highlighting the Villebois Village Master Plan and Old Town Neighborhood Plan, noting their backgrounds, key components, and the amendments expected to those Plans and the Development Code, with additional comments by Mr. Pauly. (Slides 16 and 17)

Discussion and feedback from the Planning Commission on the rezoning in the Villebois Village Master Plan and Old Town Neighborhood Plan were as follows with responses by Staff to Commissioner questions as noted:

Commissioner Woods asked if preserving the Old Town Neighborhood's character would be taken into account when considering rezoning to ensure that new homes fit the look of the area.

- Mr. Pauly confirmed the intent was to continue with the Old Town Neighborhood design regulations, but they would need to apply uniformly to middle housing as well as single-family dwellings. Single-family design standards would need to be changed to residential design standards to guide the development.
- Ms. Rogers added that if developing anything other than a single-family detached house, property would still have to be rezoned to go through the development process. The Code update would not necessarily change what zoning applied to the property, but rezoning ahead of time might make the development process easier.
- Mr. Pauly noted having a public process on only one option was awkward, so making the process simpler and having standards everyone could agree upon now would ease future development projects.

Ms. Rogers continued the presentation, noting the project team was currently in the Siting and Design Standards phase, which was being led by SERA Architects. SERA was developing the middle housing siting and design standards and had produced a memo on background research to ground the development of those standards in best practices and in the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan, as well as the City's goals and actions related to equitable housing. The memo summarized the findings and how the research might influence the process of developing new standards or amending the existing standards. No specific information was available to present on the Siting and Design standards yet, but more details would be provided at the next meeting. (Slide 20)

Commissioner Greenfield noted the siting requirements would impact the housing types and number of units that were feasible on a given lot and were quite germane to the how much density could be squeezed into a given area. Siting requirements would influence how the developers would actual respond to the allowed densities.

- Ms. Rogers agreed, noting at minimum, the City generally had to apply the same standards to middle housing as were applied to single-family detached housing, but SERA Architects would look at whether some of the standards might make it so no middle housing could possibly be built. SERA would also look at how siting and design standards could be used to make the implementation of middle housing more palatable and to potentially ease the transitions between single-family and middle housing. It would be important to consider how Frog Pond West could potentially be built out in terms of density and how density corresponded to the siting standards.

Commissioner Heberlein added that the City had done a great job to date of ensuring good design standards with high quality housing products. He believed middle housing could be allowed while maintaining that same quality of design and aesthetics.

Mr. Pauly highlighted some key concepts regarding additional research Staff had done as a follow up to the Old Town discussion in November with regard to attached versus detached plexes, as well as information regarding middle housing land divisions. Staff suggested expanding the definition of cluster housing to still allow the flexibility of the detached units, but not call them duplexes. Given the complexities of subdividing land combined with detached units and the uncertainty of what the legislature might adopt, Staff recommended tabling the issue regarding middle housing land divisions at this time.

The Commission agreed the definition and language around cluster houses should be revised to replace the idea of a detached plex.

- Mr. Pauly explained the definition was revised to address common use of the language, for example, most people consider a duplex as one building with multiple units, and because the revised definition offered the City flexibility about when detached duplexes or cluster housing would be allowed. Further discussion would be needed in the future regarding to what extent cluster housing units should be allowed once more was known about land divisions.

The Commission agreed to defer the topic of middle housing land divisions in order to get legal questions answered and see what potential changes occurred in State law.

Commissioner Heberlein noted it was difficult to identify a level of priority for land divisions without good examples of what it looked like. He questioned the need for land divisions if cluster houses were allowed.

Mr. Pauly concluded that the next presentation would provide more information regarding the site design standards.

III. INFORMATIONAL

A. City Council Action Minutes (Nov. 2 & 16, 2020 and Dec. 7 & 21, 2020)

Commissioner Greenfield commented that he missed the former liaison position with the City Council which provided a direct communication avenue with more immediate feedback. He asked if it was possible to reinstitute the Council liaison.

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, responded that she was unaware if there was desire for a Council liaison but stated she could ask the new Mayor. She added that there were a number of coordinating committees and many things the Councilors already spent their time doing. Having another meeting was often difficult or conflicted with other obligations and responsibilities. She would let the Council know the Planning Commission was interested in a liaison.

Commissioner Greenfield commented that the Council had access to the Planning Commission's meeting video and minutes, and the Commission had access to the Council's as well. The issue was the immediacy of being able to cross-communicate.

Commissioner Heberlein suggested Council member participation could be on a quarterly basis or twice a year rather than a monthly commitment.

Commissioner Greenfield added that perhaps a different Councilor could participate each month.

Chair Mesbah noted the most productive liaison he had been part of was the joint meeting work sessions with the Council. He added the Planning Commission could initiate cross-discussions by showing up at Council meetings.

Commissioner Greenfield stated he would not feel appropriate making comments at a City Council meeting while implicitly representing the Planning Commission when he was not authorized to do so.

B. 2021 PC WORK PROGRAM

Miranda Bateschell provided an update on the creation of a diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) task force for the City, as recommended by the Commission alongside the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan. She noted City Council had discussed DEI with community members through a listening session held in December via Zoom, as well as a January 11, 2021 follow-up meeting based on the feedback and recommendations received. The task force was to be facilitated by Bill de la Cruz, who was hired as a consultant to help engage further community conversations that would provide input on the task force's purpose, applicant solicitation, and other details. More information on the task force was being put together and would go out soon.

Commissioner Woods added there was much interest in the task force from the people of Wilsonville, and he was happy to see the City embrace the concept. He also noted DEI was an important factor in equitable housing.

Commissioner Greenfield agreed, but noted that he did not agree with the term "task force," which he believed implied a task that could be completed in a given number of meetings with an end point. DEI was an ongoing concern without an end-point, and he strongly recommended some form of a standing committee rather than a task force.

Commissioner Woods noted the task force concept was just the beginning, with the goal of making the recommendation for a permanent DEI committee to Council.

Ms. Bateschell stated that Staff wanted to engage the community rather than fully direct what was to come out of the creation process. Because of that, Council had not yet determined that it was a standing committee, but was looking to a task force to help provide a framework or a set of actions to be taken on by the City. One of the recommendations would potentially be for a standing committee or board of some type focused on DEI to provide recommendations and assessments on the City's work and decisions. A similar process was facilitated in

Lake Oswego and resulted in the recommendation for a permanent committee. She acknowledged that a permanent committee for the city was a likely outcome, but it was still early in the process.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mesbah adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

By Paula Pinyerd of ABC Transcription Services, Inc. for
Tami Bergeron, Administrative Assistant-Planning