



Comprehensive Plan & TSP

PAC #6 Meeting

August 7th, 2025 – 6:00 to 8:00pm

MEETING SUMMARY

Attendees

Sherry (guest)
Ron La Blanc (new member)
Rachel Vickers
Jason Bristol
Other PAC members present

Don Hardy, Planning Director
Ryan Potter, Planning Manager
Kevin Chewuk, DKS Associates
Steve Faust, 3J Consulting

Project Update

Steve provided an overview of the Comprehensive Plan and TSP schedule. The UGB expansion adoption is targeted for June 2026, with some elements paused while the City coordinates with the Parks & Recreation Advisory Committee. The City is refining parkland needs based on the 2022 Parks Master Plan and preparing an adopted list for City Council. The expansion area's acreage and boundaries will be defined, supported by a \$250,000 TGM grant for concept planning.

Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) Expansion

The PAC discussed the UGB expansion process and timeline. Steve clarified that after City approval, the UGB must go to the County and receive state acknowledgement, along with the TSP and Comprehensive Plan. Concept planning can start before final adoption. Members emphasized the need to review subarea boundaries again once parkland information is integrated. Staff committed to presenting a proposed UGB expansion area at the January 2026 PAC meeting. Don outlined a best-case timeline: concept planning in 2027, with the Comprehensive Plan and TSP adopted by 2028.

Comprehensive Plan Updates

Don presented proposed map changes. PAC members requested larger maps and clear highlighting of changes when presented to the public.

Goals and Policies Discussion

Goal 1: Citizen Involvement – Members supported strategies for Spanish-language outreach and translation materials.

Goal 2: Land Use Planning – Members debated increasing density to meet state mandates while protecting Canby's character. They stressed balancing land efficiency with sufficient parkland

and greenspace, especially in high-density areas, and focusing increased density in core areas.

Goal 5: Scenic, Historic Resources – Members recommended maintaining Canby’s visual character and creating a concise, cohesive style.

Goal 8: Recreation Needs – Members supported adding parks in higher-density neighborhoods to create complete communities. Some wanted measurable markers for park additions; others opposed time limits that could set unrealistic expectations. Funding challenges were discussed, with Wilsonville’s parkland requirements cited as a model.

Goal 10: Housing – Members asked for clarification on “naturally occurring affordable housing” (NOAH) and raised concerns about property rights. They discussed refining language to encourage creation of a parks district.

Goal 12: Transportation – Members urged better alignment between zoning and the Comprehensive Plan and debated electric vehicle references. They stressed flexibility in zoning and removing redundant policies.

Transportation Projects and Programs

Kevin reviewed aspirational TSP projects, which are included regardless of funding. Members emphasized prioritizing sidewalks, safety improvements, separated bike facilities on safer streets, and designated truck routes. They expressed concern about high-density housing near industrial areas, sidewalk requirements for industrial development, and cost estimates for major projects. They also discussed railroad-related project feasibility and stormwater infrastructure costs.

Next Steps

- Community Summit #5 – August 19, 2025
- Possible additional PAC meeting before plan adoption
- PAC Meeting #7 – January 2026
- UGB Listening Session – January 2026
- Community Summit #6 – February 2026

Appendix

The City of Canby submitted two surveys to Advisory Committee members after meeting #6. The Comprehensive Plan survey was open from July 31 to September 16. The survey was used to get feedback from members on draft goals, policies, and strategies within the Comprehensive Plan. Written feedback that was sent to the project team is also included and organized within this section.

Canby Comprehensive Plan Draft Goals and Policies Feedback

Topic	Comments
<p>Goal 1: Community Involvement</p> <p>PAC members agreed that the goals, policies, and strategies were on the right track for Goal 1.</p> <p>Average Score: 96/100</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I appreciate the ability to watch city meetings real time, including Planning Commission, via YouTube.• Strategy 1.1 “Without domination by any given special interest group...” Perhaps this could be stated in a more positive fashion, “represent a diverse and balanced set of interests and ideas that reflect community priorities.”• Strategy 1.2 “Planning Commission meetings will (a) encourage public input and participation, both in-person and virtually; (b) ensure accessibility by non-English speakers, sight and hearing challenged, the elderly, and other community members (see Strategy 3.1); and (c) archive the meeting agenda with all meeting materials (including the entire agenda packet and any handouts/materials provided to the Commission during the meeting) to be accessible on-line.”• Strategy 3.3 Delete “strong”. Adverbs and adjectives connote values that cannot easily be measured. What if a “weak” organization had a good idea?• Strategy 3.4 There is no reference to existing HOA’s. How will they be accommodated?
<p>Goal 2: Land Use Planning</p> <p>Most PAC members agreed that the goals, policies, and strategies were on the right track for Goal 2.</p> <p>Average Score: 87/100</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Which departments or key roles will be responsible to ensure compliance? Are there measurable deliverables that can be defined? Word's like recognize, encourage, engage, etc. are wide open to interpretation.• For policy 2, should we have something that allows for or even encourages up zoning in certain circumstances, as we've talked about in Area J?• This looks good to me. I should like to point out that each strategy begins with an action verb,

	<p>"Use," "Allow," "Employ", etc. Not all sections of the document follow this format.</p>
<p>Goal 5: Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces</p> <p>Most PAC members agreed that the goals, policies, and strategies were on the right track for Goal 5.</p> <p>Average Score: 88/100</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.1 maintain and expand (Don't we already have a list?) Again, words like consider, assist, and cooperate feel very loose to me. "Enforce" is clear. • Policy 6 doesn't have any strategies, but just one comment. Maintaining existing trees in a larger scale subdivision is not practical. With grading and roots being disturbed, whatever does end up left will just blow down within a few years. It would be better to focus on, and encouraging, planting new trees as part of the development. Otherwise "saving all the existing trees" becomes a barrier to development and thus limits the housing supply. • Can historic properties be sub-divided? • Should cemeteries be called out? (Some cities have struggled with cemeteries and subdivision rules.) • Strategy 1.2 "1.2 Designate the Heritage and Landmarks Commission as the cognizant entity to support the preservation and restoration of historic properties, to promote public education programs, and to coordinate communications with state and national historic preservation organizations." • Strategy 2.2 Does it make sense to include enforcement of the sign code in the Comp Plan? Isn't enforcement a given as a result of a sign code? • Strategy 2.3 Should this include design and placement of landscaping? A couple of sequoia's or Douglas fir will certainly block view corridors. • Policy NO. 5 What about endangered species? Mammal, insect, plant...
<p>Goal 6: Air, Water and Land Resources Quality</p> <p>Most PAC members agreed that the goals, policies, and strategies were on the right track for Goal 6.</p> <p>Average Score: 86/100</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.1 is the kind of language that is clear guidance. The rest seems like a gathering of suggestions. • Concerned about "light pollution"... would prefer to eliminate that issue as a matter of future design. We've given up security to "light pollution". • For 1.3, I'm fine with "encourage" the use of pervious surfaces but would not like to see this" required." Policy 2 & 3 are duplicates. Does Policy 4 also influence the city's choice of

	<p>required streetlights? I hope so as this is a big source of light throughout the night.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy 1.1 “Allow functional septic systems to remain in use, where practical, and require failing septic systems within the City to connect to the City Sewerage System.” • Strategy 1.2 “Assure sanitation standards and requirements are achieved, within and adjacent to the City, by working with Clackamas County sanitarians.” • Policy NO. 5 How will you measure VOC’s? Who will be responsible for this task? Will this apply to the wastewater treatment facility? If not, clarification is needed.
<p>Goal 7: Areas Subject to Natural Hazards</p> <p>PAC members agreed that the goals, policies, and strategies were on the right track for Goal 7.</p> <p>Average Score: 89/100</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.1 - why would we plan to re-direct funding from projects that benefit people that have worked hard to be successful so that we can pay for work on areas for those less fortunate. Governments should not be doing this. Charities should. this is thinly veiled to redistribute wealth. • For 5.1, I thought we already required power lines to be underground on new developments, but this says "consider" doing that. I'm confused by that, but maybe I'm wrong about the current requirement. • All the policies and strategies begin with action words, excellent! • Do you want to mention ICS (Incident Command System)? Educating the community in ICS 100 and 200 would be a innovative community engagement effort.
<p>Goal 8: Recreational Needs</p> <p>PAC members mostly agreed that the goals, policies, and strategies were on the right track for Goal 8.</p> <p>Average Score: 78/100</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore, Explore, Explore. I wish for more clear and complete language. There is no way to evaluate if we have been successful or accountable to these stated goals. • Lose 3.4 and 3.5 - we need to stop spending tax dollars on pie in the sky stuff with little benefit to the community as a whole. We need to investing parks money where there is return on investment - where sporting fields/facilities will be used by more people and bring economic return to the businesses in the community. • I fully support strategy 2.3.2 and policy 3.2. I don't see the need for policy 3.5. • The numbering format seems inconsistent. Should it begin with Policy NO. 1? Policy NO. 2?

	<p>Then, all the subsequent strategies would be formatted according...1.1, 2.1, 2.2, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does advise and support the CAPRD mean the city will assist with funding? How does that work with the Budget Committee and Council? Can the Comp Plan commit funding in the future? • This is the first time the draft Comp Plan that uses the term “Canby community”, how is that defined? • The citizens of Canby appear to want the City of Canby to operate a Parks and Rec Dept., but they do not want to pay for it. It might be advisable to have a goal that focuses on public education and awareness to build public support for a more centralized and coordinated approach. Policy 1.3 addresses “marketing”, not public engagement. One cannot “market” a program or facility that does not exist. • There should be a goal to undertake a comprehensive needs assessment, perhaps including best management practices for a city the size of Canby. It would also discuss the advantages and disadvantages of a new city dept. vs. a special district with proper funding. This study would create a road map for further public discussion and engagement. There are examples of award winning parks and rec organizations in Oregon, both city operated and special district operated. • I would be remiss if I did not call out the need for public art and urban forestry management. Canby should be a “Tree City USA” as it is located in the center of nursery operations that produce plant materials (trees, shrubs and perennials) that are shipped across the country. • Strategy 2.4 Why wouldn’t revenue bonds be used for capital maintenance?
<p>Goal 9: Economic Development</p> <p>PAC members agreed that the goals, policies, and strategies were on the right track for Goal 9.</p> <p>Average Score: 89/100</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lose 3.3 - those programs are expensive and have little ROI to business owners. move 3.6.2 to Goal 8 page. • The city taking the lead on putting in enabling infrastructure, like Sequoia Parkway in the original industrial park, would be good in the UGB expansion land east of Mulino Rd. • Format numbering seems inconsistent, see Goal 8 comment.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the number (quantity) of jobs per acre as meaningful as the type (quality) of job, ie professional, high paying, etc.? • Policy NO. 1 “Target and focus future industrial expansion east and north of Mulino Road.” • Strategy 1.2 “Support Business Park expansion with transportation and infrastructure improvements.” • How do you define “employment land”? Would the public understand this concept without further explanation? • Strategy 5.1 “Review and develop funding opportunities for off-site infrastructure improvements to support expansion of businesses through the use of public, private and/or public-private financing methods.” • Policy 6 “Support expansion and diversity of health related services.” • Policy NO 2 “To Encourage commercial development in downtown and other appropriate locations.” • Policy NO 2.1 How will you address vacation rentals? • Policy NO 2.2 Will you consider creative use of existing ROW? Pocket parks? Increased landscaping and ped/bike amenities? • Goal 3 In addition to increased employment, do you also want to encourage more private investment? • Policy NO 3.1 Have there been substantial permitting issues? Many small businesses are unaware of regulations and act surprised when the city calls them to their attention. Should an effort be made to develop and implement better awareness and “civic education” through a joint city/chamber program to reduce “permit friction” and promote harmony with new or expanded business operations? • Policy NO 3.3 Does the school district have any programs for distributive education that prepares students to enter the workforce? • Policy NO 3.5 What are examples of “innovative techniques”? Will these require legislation at the local level and state level? Don’t count on an federal assistance in the future...
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy NO 3.6 Seems like a good opportunity to establish a regional coalition, where Canby takes the lead.
<p>Goal 10: Housing</p> <p>PAC members mostly agreed that the goals, policies, and strategies were on the right track for Goal 10.</p> <p>Average Score: 83/100</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 3 Encourage the development of housing for renters, the elderly, those living with disabilities, and low-income community members, and integrate the housing into a variety of residential areas throughout the city. How specifically will we "encourage"? • Fully support Policy 4 and the strategies • Does Clackamas Community College have a construction/building trades program? If so, could they take on local residential rehab projects? • Will local banks consider a downpayment assistance plan? Local banks could combine resources to establish a fund to assist qualified individuals purchase their first home.
<p>Goal 11: Public Facilities and Services</p> <p>PAC members agreed that the goals, policies, and strategies were on the right track for Goal 11.</p> <p>Average Score: 94/100</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What about conservation measures and incentives? Water, electricity, etc.
<p>Goal 12: Transportation</p> <p>PAC members agreed that the goals, policies, and strategies were on the right track for Goal 12.</p> <p>Average Score: 88/100</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am curious why there isn't a specific goal regarding ODOT, holding their feet to the fire with respect to 99W issues. What effort does the city make to provide input into the STIP (State Transportation Improvement Plan)? Who should be assigned to this task? • How will the city adjust transit operations as the federal assistance is reduced? • With regard to the Canby Transportation System Plan, there is an overwhelming amount of information. I observed citizens at the open house ask questions. It is obvious that they do not fully understand the map and the list of aspirational projects. It might be helpful to break this into chunks and create a public education/awareness program. The projects are very exciting and reflect plenty of good staff work. However, there is a gap of understanding among the general public.

<p>Goal 13: Energy Conservation</p> <p>PAC members mostly agreed that the goals, policies, and strategies were on the right track for Goal 13.</p> <p>Average Score: 80/100</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 1.2 How???
<p>Goal 14: Urbanization</p> <p>PAC members agreed that the goals, policies, and strategies were on the right track for Goal 14.</p> <p>Average Score: 92/100</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were no responses
<p><i>Is there anything else you would like to say about the draft Comprehensive Plan goals, policies, and strategies?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, I continue to be discouraged by the lack of measurable goals. They are often so broad that they will not likely be implemented, and if we made some progress on them, we wouldn't know if we had been successful. • We need to make sure we're focused on building a community focused on families and people that are doing the right things, working, contributing, keeping things clean. We need to stop focusing on planning communities for people that are not working, contributing etc... I know it sounds callous, but if we keep developing plans to "include" people that are lazy, not contributing, etc., it makes it just that much easier for them to do so. Make a community that has safe, clean and is PRIMARILY focused on the people that are paying for it... rather than making it "inclusive" to people that don't. It will incentivize people to improve so they can enjoy the benefit of the community, rather than just get something for nothing. • Thanks for all the hard work. I look forward to the comprehensive plan update getting completed by the end of the year.

Canby Transportation System Plan Projects and Programs Feedback

The Transportation System Plan survey was open from August 2 to September 15. The survey was used to get feedback from members on draft transportation projects and programs.

Topic	Comments
Corridor #1 - OR 99E Improvements from SW Berg Parkway to Territorial Road	
What projects are most important?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1i • Get rid of 1.c, 1.d, 1.f, 1.i - waste of \$\$\$ people will just walk around... they already can see/hear the huge red blinking lights and the traffic arms. spending nearly a quarter of a million dollars to try to save idiots from cleaning themselves out of the gene pool is a waste of money. • 1a, 1j, 1h, 1k
Are any projects missing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no responses.
Corridor #2 - Territorial Road Improvements from N Birch Street to Haines Road	
What projects are most important?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2f • 2b, 2c, 2e, 2f
Are any projects missing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2c sidewalks on the south side should be included since bike/ped facility should be included on Territorial and Holly roundabout or intersection improvements. This is possibly the most heavily travelled intersection on the northside. Also, it seems wrong not to have sidewalks around a senior center. This sidewalk is required to be present before a crosswalk can be installed at the Territorial and Holly intersection. ADA access to a senior center is required is it not?
Corridor #3 - N Birch Street and N Cedar Street (Corridor #3) Improvements from Territorial Road to 3rd Avenue	
What projects are most important?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no responses.
Are any projects missing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no responses.
Corridor #4 - SW Berg Parkway and 3rd Avenue Improvements from OR 99E to N Ivy Street	
What projects are most important?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4a has long been promised - assume this applies to extending to NW 3rd Ave - but NO BIKESTUFF - this is going to an industrial park!!! 4b - no bike stuff - this is the heavy trucking access to the industrial park. 4c - same thing - don't encourage bikes on a street that is a truck route!
Are any projects missing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no responses.
Corridor #5 - Walnut Street Improvements from OR 99E to 1st Avenue	
What projects are most important?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5a • separate bike lanes OFF pavement shared with trucks - put them on shared pedestrian walkway set back - maybe behind a bio-swale - from pavement designated as a truck route.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is already under way but needs finished in 2026. 5c: I thought the roundabout at 1st and Walnut was no longer in the plans.
Are any projects missing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no responses.
Corridor #6 - Holly Street Improvements from 22nd Avenue to Knights Bridge Road	
What projects are most important?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6b. Also, 6a is heavily travelled by both autos and bikes and runners and peds and will only get more heavily travelled. Many commuters including bikes and peds use this very dark and notoriously foggy stretch of road in winter months. Please note very poor sight line and no shoulder on either side of the rise in elevation on Holly between 22nd and Territorial.
Are any projects missing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6b should include bike/ped facility at the roundabout if it doesn't already. Unfortunately this is pending sidewalks in all directions which would need to be strategized in the process. Is there a recommendation to help facilitate this. This intersection is also part of the recommended routes for biking through Clackamas County. Both Holly to the Canby Ferry and Territorial (via New Era through to Knight's Bridge Road).
Corridor #7 - 10th Avenue/11th Avenue Improvements from N Birch Street to N Redwood Street	
What projects are most important?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no responses.
Are any projects missing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no responses.
Corridor #8 - 4th Avenue Improvements from Pine Street to N Redwood Street	
What projects are most important?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8a
Are any projects missing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no responses.
Corridor #9 - N Pine Street Improvements from 4th Avenue to Territorial Road	
What projects are most important?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no responses.
Are any projects missing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no responses.
Corridor #10 - N Redwood Street Improvements from 11th Avenue to Territorial Road	
What projects are most important?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10a
Are any projects missing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no responses.
Corridor #11 - N Locust Street Improvements from N Birch Street to N Redwood Street	
What projects are most important?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no responses.
Are any projects missing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no responses.
Corridor #12 - 3rd Avenue Improvements from Elm Street to Ivy Street	
What projects are most important?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 12b assume you mean NW 3rd Ave and NE 3rd Ave... there is a SE 3rd and SW 3rd....
Are any projects missing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no responses.
Corridor #13 - Township Road Improvements from Ivy Street to Mulino Road	
What projects are most important?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 13b

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the area where Township passes thru the Pioneer Industrial Park - need to get the bikes off the truck route shared pavement - get them up on a designated bike and ped sidewalk separated by something... don't have bikes separated from heavy trucking with only a white line.
Are any projects missing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no responses.
Corridor #14 - 4th Avenue Improvements from the Logging Road Trail to Mulino Road	
What projects are most important?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 14a same as other comments -- this goes thru the Pioneer Industrial Park - get the bikes off the pavement shared with trucking
Are any projects missing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no responses.
Corridor #15 - 1st Avenue and Haines Road Improvements from SE Hazeldell Way to Territorial Road	
What projects are most important?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No bikes on same pavement with trucks - keep separate. 15c is the most important to me. Trucks will soon be entering this intersection from Mulino and, the sight distances, coupled with the speed through there, make it very challenging and dangerous. With the UGB expansion of industrial land, there will be even more trucks using this intersection. Minimally, I think it needs to be a 3-way stop
Are any projects missing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no responses.
Corridor #16 - Mulino Road Improvements from 1st Avenue to 13th Avenue	
What projects are most important?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 16a
Are any projects missing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no bikes on same pavement with trucks.
Corridor #17 - 13th Avenue Improvements from Redwood Street to Mulino Road	
What projects are most important?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 17a Assume this is SE 13th Ave - no bikes on same pavement as trucks.
Are any projects missing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no responses.
Transit Service Enhancements & Demand and System Management Enhancements	
What projects are most important?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no responses.
Are any projects missing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These are expensive and low ROI - waste of money.
Is there anything else you would like to share?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I find this survey difficult to digest. I do not understand the language "Collector Street", "Pedestrian Facilities", and "Partial Diverter". I'd like to help, but there does not seem to be any good way for me to provide advice through this survey. It would help me to have someone explain these projects. I'd also suggest a question

	<p>as to which projects we would discourage or lower in importance. - Thank you</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The TSP has A LOT of pavement indicated to have bikes sharing the same pavement as heavy trucking - separated by a white line. BAD planning. At the same time, the plan calls for spending \$\$\$ on crossing guards at locations where pedestrians that have made a decision to NOT die - they already see the signals and arms for the cars and choose to stop. Spending money to create barriers for people that choose to die or are too stupid to interpret the current systems as signaling a danger to them - they are just going to walk around.... the only way to completely stop them is isolate with fencing, the entire length of the rail right of way and create gate systems that disallow a human to pass when trains are present. Any expenditure short of that absolute method is a waste of tax dollars. • Thank you.
--	--