WILSONVILLE URBAN RENEWAL TASK FORCE

Meeting Minutes

Date: January 12, 2026
Location: Wilsonville City Hall / Hybrid on Zoom
Chair: Anne Shevlin
Staff Lead: Matt Lorenzen, Economic Development Manager

Present: Anne Shevlin (Chair), Stu Peterson, Steven Klein, Andy Kangas, Mark Hush, Ryan Schera, Lauren Jones, Adrienne Chaille, Jeff Shaffer, Stefan Myers, Remo Douglas, Dick Spence, Jon Legarza, Susan Myers

Present (via Zoom): Rebecca Tabor (delegate for Laura Edmonds), Josh Tompkins, Sam Thomas, Nick Triska

Absent: Andrew Karr, Rob Hatch, Gary Bennett, Christine Reynolds, Elizabeth Mazarra-Myers

---

1. Call to Order

Chair **Anne Shevlin** called the meeting to order and introduced the agenda.

Matt Lorenzen called roll. Attendance is noted above.

---

2. Coffee Creek Urban Renewal Plan Amendment – Land Aggregation

Staff Overview

Matt Lorenzen provided an overview of a proposed amendment to the Coffee Creek Urban Renewal Plan that would explicitly allow the urban renewal agency to undertake land aggregation activities. He summarized the rationale, including challenges related to fragmented land ownership, the prevalence of contractor establishment uses, and land value discrepancies that inhibit private-sector aggregation and industrial-scale development. Mr. Lorenzen emphasized that the amendment would provide *authority only* and would not authorize any specific property acquisition.

Task Force Discussion

Task Force members generally expressed support for adding land aggregation as a tool, noting the difficulty of achieving the Coffee Creek Master Plan vision under current market conditions.

- **Jon Legarza** stated that as a long-term Wilsonville resident, he supports providing the City with a tool to facilitate land aggregation.
- **Stu Peterson** asked whether there was a specific price point or funding amount under consideration. **Matt Lorenzen** responded that any pricing would be negotiated in the future and constrained by maximum indebtedness limits and the City's capacity to service debt.
- **Adrienne Chaille** asked about contingency planning if reimbursement through Business Oregon does not materialize. **Sam Thomas** responded that Wilsonville already has an RSIS agreement in place and that staff is working on an amendment to allow land assembly costs to be reimbursable. He noted the statewide annual reimbursement cap.
- **Susan Myers** clarified that no specific dollar figures are under consideration at this stage. **Matt Lorenzen** confirmed that the current request is solely for authorization to conduct land aggregation activities, and that any potential purchase would return to both the Task Force and City Council before completion.
- **Dick Spence** asked whether buyers or end users have been identified. **Matt Lorenzen** directed the question to brokers and developers present, asking whether there would be demand for a well-sized, well-configured, infrastructure-served site. Brokers and developers responded affirmatively.
- **Mark Hush** asked where existing businesses would relocate and whether there are case studies demonstrating success with this approach. **Matt Lorenzen** cited industrial land aggregation examples in Hillsboro and by the Port of Portland.
- **Mark Hush** further questioned what would prevent the market from leveraging the process to extract excessive prices. **Jon Legarza** noted that such considerations would arise later, if and when specific opportunities are presented.
- **Anne Shevlin** acknowledged the validity of the questions raised and returned the discussion to concerns about existing businesses.
- **Matt Lorenzen** reiterated that the City cannot condemn property and would only work with willing sellers.
- **Steven Klein** observed that many contractor-type businesses are successful due to favorable zoning and would be difficult to relocate, making displacement unlikely.
- **Susan Myers** asked whether Washington County could help create space for these businesses. **Adrienne Chaille** noted that Washington County understands the issue and is engaged in discussions with the City.
- **Stu Peterson** observed that many of these users are difficult to relocate and that landowners often have a captive audience, making change challenging.

- **Andrew Kangas** emphasized that the market would have developed the area already if willing sellers existed and asked what impact this tool has without eminent domain authority.
- **Ryan Schera** responded that while land ownership is a primary challenge, zoning, infrastructure, and circulation requirements also constrain development. **Stu Peterson** concurred.
- **Ryan Schera** stated that while these broader issues remain, adding land aggregation authority provides another useful tool.
- **Susan Myers** asked whether the Task Force could recommend the amendment language and also recommend that Council revisit development standards in Coffee Creek. **Matt Lorenzen** confirmed this was possible.
- **Ryan Schera** noted that even with larger parcels, infrastructure and circulation requirements can significantly reduce net developable area, drawing parallels to Basalt Creek.
- **Susan Myers** summarized the discussion as general support for City-led aggregation activities, coupled with a desire to examine developer-identified constraints and the need for relocation options for existing businesses.
- **Matt Lorenzen** explained the role of the FD-20 zone and challenges transitioning from unincorporated to urban development, noting that statutory displacement compensation is already included in the Urban Renewal Plan.

Consensus and Direction

Anne Shevlin stated that while additional work remains, adding this language appears to be the appropriate next step and asked whether there was consensus in the room. The Task Force concurred.

Action Direction: The Task Force supports recommending the proposed land aggregation amendment language to City Council and encourages future Council consideration of broader development constraints in Coffee Creek.

---

3. WIN Program – Scoring Criteria and Process Review

Staff Overview

Anne Shevlin introduced Agenda Item #2. **Matt Lorenzen** described the intent, purpose, and mechanics of the Wilsonville Investment Now (WIN) program, including scoring criteria and recommendations from the 2022 Urban Renewal Strategic Plan. Mr. Lorenzen posed two questions to the Task Force: how much additional weight should be given to local business tenure, and whether an additional vetting or public input step should be added prior to Council consideration.

Scoring Criteria Discussion

- **Jon Legarza** recommended a tiered system that prioritizes retention of long-standing local businesses.
- **Stu Peterson** asked how the tax rebate functions in a multi-tenant building. **Matt Lorenzen** explained that only the portion of the building occupied by the applicant is included, with tax calculations determined by the County Assessor.
- **Adrienne Chaille** asked whether job retention could be included as an evaluation criterion. **Matt Lorenzen** explained that while job retention is important, urban renewal incentives depend on tax increment growth generated by new investment or expansion.
- **Susan Myers** asked whether Wilsonville's strong market position reduces the need for aggressive incentives. **Matt Lorenzen** responded that the goal is to ensure the program is appropriately positioned if and when opportunities arise.
- **Nick Triska** observed that scoring categories below capital investment primarily affect smaller applicants and favored bonus points for long-tenured businesses.
- **Josh Tompkins** described qualifying applicants under the current system as rare and suggested lowering thresholds to encourage participation.
- **Nick Triska** asked whether a modest points bonus would materially affect outcomes and inquired about the makeup of past applicants. **Matt Lorenzen** responded that applicants span a broad range and that non-capital categories become more significant for smaller companies/applicants.

Anne Shevlin asked whether staff had sufficient direction to proceed. **Matt Lorenzen** requested more concrete recommendations.

- **Ryan Schera** asked **Matt Lorenzen** what outcome he would prefer.
- **Steven Klein** suggested increasing points for capital investment.
- **Jon Legarza** proposed several possible approaches.

Hearing interest in reevaluating the entire scoring system, **Matt Lorenzen** proposed advising City Council accordingly and requesting direction to reconvene the Task Force.

Action Direction: Staff will advise City Council that the Task Force recommends a comprehensive reevaluation of the WIN scoring system and seek direction on reconvening the Task Force for that purpose.

Additional Vetting / Public Input Step

- **Lauren Jones** raised concerns that additional vetting or public input could introduce subjectivity into an otherwise objective process.
- Multiple Task Force members expressed agreement.
- **Adrienne Chaille** noted that staff, the Urban Renewal Task Force, and City Council already provide substantial oversight.

- **Jon Legarza** stated that additional steps could slow and politicize a process that must remain responsive to business timelines.

Anne Shevlin asked whether any members supported adding the additional vetting step; no members indicated support.

Action Direction: The Task Force does not support adding an additional vetting or public input step to the WIN program and requests that staff convey this position to City Council.

---

4. Other Urban Renewal Matters

Matt Lorenzen briefly reviewed miscellaneous urban renewal-related matters.

---

5. Adjournment

Chair **Anne Shevlin** adjourned the meeting.