# Tualatin Planning Commission

**MINUTES OF OCTOBER 18, 2023 (ADOPTED)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TPC MEMBERS PRESENT:** |  | **STAFF PRESENT:** | |
| William Beers, Chair |  | Steve Koper, Asst. Community Development Director | |
| Janelle Thompson, Vice Chair |  | Nic Westendorf, Public Works Deputy Director | |
| Randall Hledik, Commissioner |  | Maddie Cheek, Management Analyst | |
| Daniel Bachhuber, Commissioner |  | Lindsey Hagerman, Office Coordinator |
| Zach Wimer, Commissioner |  |  |
| Brittany Valli, Commissioner |  |  |
|  |  |  | |
| **TPC MEMBERS ABSENT:** |  |  | |
| Ursula Kuhn, Commissioner |  |  | |

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. and roll call was taken.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Commissioners unanimously voted to approve September 2023 minutes with edits recommended.

**COMMUNICATION FROM CITY INVOLVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS**

**None**

**COMMUNICATION FROM CITY STAFF**

1. **The draft Climate Action Plan (CAP) is complete and ready to be shared with the general public for feedback. The project team will summarize the information and process that shaped the development of the CAP and share information about actions included in the CAP that are relevant to the work of the Planning Commission.**

Maddie Cheek, Management Analyst I introduced herself and Nic Westendorf, Public Works Deputy Director. She provided an overview of the presentation on the Climate Action Plan. She noted it’s a long term plan with a goal to reduce carbon emissions to net zero by 2050. She shared the plan includes recommended actions to prepare for climate change (adaptation) and reduce emissions (mitigation).

Ms. Cheek briefly discussed the adaptation focus areas, the first being Natural System, Resources, and Infrastructure. The second focus area is centered on Health and Safety, while the third focuses on Economic Shifts. She then noted the mitigation focus areas, including the fourth Building and Energy Use, the fifth Urban Form and Land Use, and the sixth Transportation, and finally the seventh being Consumption. She highlighted that the Planning Commission’s primary areas of focus would be 5 and 6, which she would elaborate on in greater detail.

Ms. Cheek then addressed how Tualatin’s climate will change over the next 50 years with visual aids. These changes include more wildfires and smoke in the region, more days over 90 degrees Fahrenheit, and more frequent and intense flooding. She noted the adaptation actions will help us adjust to these changes and are informed by community feedback.

Ms. Cheek shared a graph of local and imported emissions sources. She highlighted local emission sources being building energy, transportation energy, waste disposal, industrial process and refrigerants from highest to lowest discharges. Imported emission sources include goods production, food production, fuel production, and air travel. She noted this information informed the mitigation actions needed to take to reach the net zero goal.

Ms. Cheek spoke about Focus Area 5: Urban Form and Land Use Strategy 5.1, *“Dense future development resulting in reduced future vehicle miles traveled.”* She noted the effects of urban sprawl and the goal of reducing vehicle trips by encouraging compact development that is comfortable to navigate as a pedestrian, cyclist, and transit user.

Ms. Cheek spoke about Strategy 5.2, focusing on urban/community forestry and carbon sequestration. She emphasized the importance of trees in providing shelter and carbon sequestration. Suggested approaches that include a canopy study as well as widening standards for planter strips.

Ms. Cheek spoke about Strategy 6.1, highlighting the importance of fuel switching to electric vehicles or low-emission fuels. She emphasized that, by 2035, all new vehicles sold in Oregon must be plug-in hybrids at minimum. Ms. Cheek pointed out that being proactive in installing infrastructure early is beneficial.

Ms. Cheek spoke about Strategy 6.2, *“Active transportation to reduce car miles and fossil fuel use.”* She noted an example to develop a complete streets policy as a way to prioritize and increase active transportation options and infrastructure.

Ms. Cheek outlined the upcoming stages of the Climate Action Plan acceptance process, underscoring the need for strong community support. These steps involve hosting an open house, presenting to City Council, finalizing the details, and subsequently moving forward with implementation. The presentation was then opened up to questions.

Chair Beers asked why so few of the actions align with City Council’s vision. Mr. Westendorf answered they referred to Council’s 2030 vision placemat to determine how many of the actions were directly supported by Council vision.

Commissioner Bachhuber asked if this plan was mandated by the state and the cost to produce this plan. Mr. Westendorf answered yes, and it cost $280K.

Commissioner Valli asked how aggressive this plan is. Ms. Cheek answered that many actions require policy direction from Council so it’s more of a road map and menu of options to pick from.

Commissioner Valli asked about funding. Mr. Westendorf answered the plan includes a section that provides information on funding mechanisms and staff resources. It is envisioned that Council will prioritize shorter chunks of the plan to implement in pieces.

Commissioner Hledik noted the plan was well written but noticed many actions recommended to reduce emissions have low benefit ratings in the key. He noted his opinion that it would be a beneficial next step to identify the actions that provide the “biggest bang for the buck”.

Mr. Westendorf noted the feedback being received from the plan review could provide that lens.

Vice Chair Thompson asked how much influence the plan will have for future projects moving forward. Mr. Westendorf answered it’s yet to be determined.

Chair Beers asked how the 2050 date align with State and Federal goals. Ms. Cheek answered that the net zero goal was identified under the Paris Climate Accord agreement. She noted they are working with Metro and DEQ on Oregon’s priority climate action plan in collaboration with several jurisdictions toward the same goal.

Commissioner Bachhuber shared his opinion on climate instability and a preference for resiliency.

Vice Chair Thompson shared how information in the plan was done well in communication to the general public.

Commissioner Wimer shared his opinion that it’s important to consider that some mitigated strategies may also increase our resiliency, like greater reliance on solar generation instead of relying on power generation that needs to be shipped in.

Commissioner Hledik asked about a strategy to reduce emissions from landscaping and why there is no cost benefit bar included for that. Ms. Cheek answered they budgeted a cost benefit analysis of ten strategies with their consultant.

Chair Beers noted that we might consider adding a transportation strategy that considers hydrogen as a potential power source. Under the Biden administration that has been a focus area for Class A type trucks.

Commissioner Valli asked what other cities surrounding the area have adopted a similar plan. Ms. Cheek and Mr. Westendorf answered the Cities of Milwaukie, Beaverton, Tigard, Eugene, Bend, Portland, Gresham, and Hillsboro as well as Clackamas and Washington Counties.

Commissioner Wimer asked how Tualatin’s plan compares as far as ambition, feasibility, and compatibility with other regional strategies. Would this plan be considered a reach, conservative look at what’s possible, or middle of the road?

Ms. Cheek answered that Climate Action Plans are typically quite aspirational, and our plan is ambitious and would be hard to meet. She noted that completing strategies will depends on what the community wants and what Council is willing to support. Mr. Westendorf noted Tualatin is aligned with surrounding cities and that we have all worked with the same consultant.

There were no other questions or comments on this topic.

1. **Informational update on Tualatin's Housing Needs Analysis, including recently completed work as well as future action items.**

Steve Koper, Assistant Community Development Director opened with an overview of the presentation. He explained a Housing Needs Analysis anticipates housing needs over the next 20 years, using Metro’s adopted population forecast. He shared this also examines demographic and socioeconomic trends related to housing needs. He stated this study also includes a Buildable Lands Inventory that determines whether Tualatin has enough land to accommodate forecasted growth.

Mr. Koper shared pictorial findings of the buildable lands inventory that included the Basalt Creek planning area. He highlighted that a significant portion of the Basalt Creek area is zoned as low and medium-low density, and the city has a shortage of buildable land for higher densities.

Chair Beers asked if all five acres of high density is dedicated to Plambeck Gardens. Mr. Koper answered yes.

Mr. Koper shared the projections of future housing needs which includes 40% single-family detached, 15% single-family attached, and 45% multi-family. He stated the goals for the various typologies were set as part of the housing needs analysis based on public input and Council goals. This is a projection of growth broken down to each type meeting Council goals.

Commissioner Hledik noted his assumption of the data was based on trends. Mr. Koper shared that the projections mirror what we are seeing in trends but are not based on them. The main difference from the trend line was single-family attached data which was historically at 5%.

Mr. Koper discussed the housing capacity results which is determined by looking at buildable lands multiplied by the zoning density. He then went on to discuss affordability of housing, while pointing out that interest rates for loans had fluctuated since the data was collected. A significant insight from the table was that individuals residing in Tualatin need to earn median income or higher to afford market rate housing. He presented a graph illustrating the distribution of households based on their income levels. Mr. Koper emphasized that half of Tualatin’s population many not earn enough to afford market-rate housing. And that another 15% of the population is considered middle income. This group doesn’t qualify for subsidies and may not be able to afford the majority of what’s available in the housing market.

Mr. Koper discussed the process for developing housing strategies in compliance with State law. He outlined the four steps which involved extensive discussion, leading to recommendations that were presented to the City Council for adoption. He also provided an overview of how the strategies and actions within the Housing Production Strategy work.

Mr. Koper explained part of implementing the Housing Needs Analysis is to adopt the document into the Comprehensive Plan, including updates to goals and policies. He also shared that strategic actions that require further study were added as part of the Comprehensive Plan update. He shared an example strategic action that calls to evaluate opportunities to increase development densities. He noted Tualatin applied for, but did not receive a grant to further pursue this strategy. Mr. Koper shared that another strategic action was to do a funding plan. The city embarked on this exercise to evaluate different funding mechanisms in support of housing and their feasibility.

He highlighted the state’s schedule for housing capacity analysis updates and mentioned that Tualatin is slated for a housing update in 2026. He explained the advantages of waiting for this update.

Commissioner Bachhuber asked if there is a penalty if don’t have it adopted by 2026. Mr. Koper answered there is not, but there may be some potential to push out the due date based on grant funding.

Commissioner Bachhuber asked how much the first one was. Mr. Koper answered it was combined with Economic Opportunities Analysis and roughly $80K. A guess is $50-60K for a standalone.

Commissioner Hledik asked if the cities due in 2023 delinquent. Mr. Koper answered yes but some may be completed or close to be done with waivers.

Mr. Koper discussed the state’s update to the regional housing needs projection. Statewide Goal 10 is implemented through Oregon administrative rules. The old approach did not include a regional housing estimate, however the new approach would include a regional housing estimate that is allocated to individual cities and counties. He summarized the components of the revised methodology that also considers a community’s range of median family income. He pointed out that Tualatin will be one of the first cities to navigate this new framework to address housing needs.

Commissioner Bachhuber shared an example a project of converting a church to multi-unit housing and spoke about the long permitting process.

Chair Beers asked does the new calculation methods change the buildable land index. Mr. Koper stated probably not but noted that Metro is reviewing buildable land at the regional level to justify urban growth boundary expansions.

Commissioner Hledik wondered if house bill 2001 would affect calculations for low to medium density zoning. Mr. Koper answered the rules are limited to 3% annual growth rate and shouldn’t present a large impact.

Mr. Koper summarized the presentation for Tualatin’s Housing Needs Analysis and noted the next HNA will need to be completed by January of 2026. He again emphasized that the update will calculate Tualatin’s share of the region’s housing needs.

Commissioner Bachhuber asked the pricing of the new homes in Autumn Sunrise that are being built. Mr. Koper answered town homes start in the $500K and detached up to $700K.

Commissioner Valli asked what the criteria is for the cities that are included in the projected total housing units forecast chart, that demonstrates the change to projected regional share of needed housing. Mr. Koper shared examples of cities who have recently done a Housing Needs Analysis done in 2019-2020.

Commissioner Bachhuber asked if Dallas’ projection was low because their employment is low. Mr. Koper shared that he didn’t know, but that there could be a few possible reasons.

Commissioner Valli what does a housing needs analysis look like if a city has no developable land left. Mr. Koper answered that you would compare the projection against available land and the corresponding zoning. It’s possible that the report finds we have a deficient of some zoning and a surplus of other zoning. These findings will help determine if re-zoning land may be recommended to accommodate housing need.

**ADJOURNMENT**

A motion to adjourn was made by Vice Chair Thompson. The motion was seconded by Chair Beers. The Planning Commissioners unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting at 8:35 p.m.