



# **PLANNING COMMISSION**

## **WEDNESDAY, APRIL 10, 2024**

### **ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

1. Consideration of the March 13, 2024 PC Meeting Minutes



# PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

March 13, 2024 at 6:00 PM

City Hall Council Chambers & Remote Video Conferencing

---

*Draft PC Minutes are to be reviewed and approved at the April 10, 2024 PC Meeting.*

## CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

A regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission was held at City Hall beginning at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, March 13, 2024. Chair Andrew Karr called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m., followed by roll call. Those present:

Planning Commission: Andrew Karr, Jennifer Willard, Nicole Hendrix, Matt Constantine, Sam Scull, and Yana Semenova. Ron Heberlein was absent.

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Daniel Pauly, Kerry Rappold, Kimberly Rybold, and Mandi Simmons.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

## CITIZEN INPUT

This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Planning Commission on items not on the agenda. There was none.

## ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the February 14, 2024 Planning Commission Minutes

The February 14, 2024 Planning Commission Minutes were accepted as presented.

## PUBLIC HEARING

2. Stormwater Master Plan (Rappold)

Chair Karr read the conduct of legislative hearing rules into the record and called the public hearing to order at 6:07 pm.

Kerry Rappold, Natural Resource Manager, noted the Staff report, conclusionary findings, and public record for the Stormwater Master Plan had been provided to the Commissioners. He noted the project team had been working on the Master Plan for about three years. A lot of great work had gone into the updated Plan, which included some things that had not been done with the previous Master Plan and would be covered in tonight's presentation. He initiated the presentation of the Stormwater Master Plan Update via PowerPoint as follows:

- Tonight’s topics would include the public engagement done in 2021 and the follow-up; the Master Plan development process, including how information was gathered and the capital projects and policies were developed; regulatory drivers regarding the City’s responsibilities in terms of the Clean Water Act and complying with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit (NPDES); a description of some capital projects and the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) being brought forward and ultimately implemented over the next 20 years; and next steps.
- In 2021, a virtual open house was held and a survey was posted on the *Let’s Talk, Wilsonville!* website for about six weeks, with over 90 respondents providing feedback. Overall, the public held a very favorable impression of the City’s stormwater system. Staff did a lot to adequately maintain the system, considering both the existing infrastructure and planning for the future which was reflected in the type of system the City had. Staff did not receive a large number of complaints, and issues like flooding that other communities dealt with were not a problem. (Slide 3)
  - Areas of concern and discussion topics people raised included water quality, flooding, protecting the City’s habitats, especially related to receiving waters, whether at Boeckman Creek or the Coffee Lake Wetlands.
  - A follow-up survey was currently posted and would remain up until the middle of April, on *Let’s Talk, Wilsonville!* to determine if points of view had changed over the last three years. The survey would also give people an idea of the project list Staff was looking to adopt with the updated Master Plan and give them a chance to inquire about other topics they might be interested in learning about. The follow-up survey would help bring the public engagement full circle.

Angela Weiland, Brown & Caldwell, continued the PowerPoint presentation, noting the Planning Commission had seen some of these slides previously, and provided the following comments:

- The three-year Master Plan process began with a thorough needs assessment, utilizing the public survey to solicit public feedback, and an internal survey to engage members of the Engineering, Community Development, and Public Works Staff and to better understand the issues and the project needs that would really drive the Master Plan’s development. (Slide 4)
  - A series of site visits was conducted, and different problem areas were investigated. From that effort, the project team moved forward into a series of technical evaluations.
    - Hydrologic and hydraulic modeling efforts were examined. The model developed with the previous Master Plan in 2012 was updated to reflect current development conditions and better assess locations which might have potential capacity deficiencies in the system.
    - A subcontractor assisted with a thorough stream assessment, conducting field walks to look at certain areas of the stream channel to identify those at risk of hydromodification or excessive erosion, and those that would benefit from a vegetation management program to remove invasives and preserve stream integrity.
    - Water quality retrofit opportunities were evaluated to determine which water quality projects could be installed to treat otherwise untreated stormwater runoff and to also identify locations where existing facilities could be retrofit to improve function and water quality treatment.
  - Following the technical evaluations, a series of project opportunity areas was developed which included a long list of locations. The consultant team worked with the City to refine the list and identify how those different project needs could be met in the context of this Master Plan.

- Capital projects, programs, and fact sheets were developed, as well as the cost estimates for each project, and included in the packet. Findings were documented in the report provided to the Planning Commission.
- Staffing projections examined whether additional staff would be needed to implement the proposed Master Plan and if the additional assets would require additional maintenance obligations for Public Works Staff.
- The projects were prioritized and then ultimately, the CIP was developed.
- The timing of the Master Plan presented a unique opportunity to integrate some of the technical deliverables associated with the City's NPDES, the municipal stormwater permit, and Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Implementation Plan. (Slide 5)
  - Each permit-related driver had different requirements that were due, and those requirements ultimately led the project team to identify specific project needs in the context of the Master Plan and also do a thorough staffing evaluation in order to look at the City's regulatory obligations and how the City would be prepared to implement its permit over the five-year permit period.
- After completing the technical evaluations, a series of 47 project opportunity areas were developed and were shown on the map. Each project opportunity area was thoroughly discussed, and project objectives were assessed. In many cases, a single project opportunity area could address multiple objectives, such as water quality and capacity. (Slide 6)
  - Through workshops with City Staff, the team was able to identify which project opportunities needed to be developed into a conceptual project. Those conceptual projects would be considered a funded project opportunity, projects that were costed and assumed in the context of the Master Plan.
  - Some project opportunity areas could be better assessed or addressed with a program or some annual funding mechanism that would be able to address the project needs more comprehensively and citywide, such as a vegetation management program and private water quality facility maintenance program.
  - Not all projects could be funded, so unfunded project needs or other project opportunity areas had been memorialized in the context of the Master Plan.
- In summary, funded capital projects were considered a one-time cost which could be phased in some cases. Cost estimates, conceptual designs, and fact sheets had been developed for 15 capital projects, which reflected 20 separately costed project phases, recognizing that some projects could extend for a longer duration and might be constructed in a phased approach. (Slide 7)
  - Four planning projects were included in the capital projects. Overall, capital projects were scheduled with the higher-priority projects constructed in the near term, or the next five-year period. Intermediate priorities were scheduled in the mid-term, and lower priority needs or those that would take a lot longer were scheduled in the long-term, or the final 10-year period.
- Six annual programs were identified. She noted Project P-4 had a large project cost, but it was a continuation of the 2014 Charbonneau Consolidated Improvement Program, which identified repair and replacement activities in the Charbonneau area. A few key project locations were in Charbonneau, and this program assumed continuation, not redundancy, in those pipe networks. The program was anticipated over a 20-year period. (Slide 8)
- Collectively, capital projects and program costs were about \$70 million. In conjunction, staffing allocations identified for both Public Works and Engineering would support either deferred maintenance or continued maintenance of new assets. Staffing was needed in the

Engineering/Community Development Departments to manage the proposed capital projects over the planning period. (Slide 9)

Mr. Rappold concluded the presentation by reviewing next steps, reiterating that a new survey and the list of capital projects had been posted on *Let's Talk, Wilsonville!* The City Council would hold a public hearing and first reading on April 1<sup>st</sup> and the second reading and adoption was scheduled for April 15, 2024. (Slide 10)

- After the Stormwater Master Plan was adopted, a rate study would be conducted to look at both the Stormwater Master Plan and the recently adopted Wastewater Treatment Plant Master Plan, as there was about \$200 million associated with the two plans. The discussion would look at the rate structure for utility fees and system development charges (SDC) to support the capital programs. (Slide 10)

Commissioner Constantine:

- Asked if all 47 problem areas that were targeted were completely addressed in the CIP.
  - Ms. Weiland replied yes, most were, noting in some locations, the uncalibrated model showed flooding in areas where no flooding had been reported, so those needs were not a priority.
- Noted a portion of the projects were funded but understood a lot of unfunded projects were included in the Master Plan.
  - Mr. Rappold clarified that even where a project was indicated as funded, that funding was dependent on the rate study and future rate increases. A portion of the CIP list could be accommodated, but this was a significant capital program.
- Pointed out *Let's Talk, Wilsonville!* had a closed survey that preceded the new survey, which was confusing. He asked if there was any point in having the closed survey on the website. People probably needed encouragement to participate and provide comments on stormwater, so improvements to make it more interesting were encouraged. He would not have known to look there, so even though there was a website to take a survey, promoting other ways to provide comments on stormwater was suggested.
  - Mr. Rappold replied the survey was on the City listservs. He would talk to the Staff person who updates the website about removing the old survey. An email about the new survey would be sent to the 90+ people who responded to the initial survey, asking them to provide additional comments by the middle of April, later this week.
- Believed the March 6<sup>th</sup> meeting date on the Staff report was wrong, adding the next Staff report stated March 13<sup>th</sup>.
  - Mr. Rappold clarified March 6<sup>th</sup> was the date the Staff report was submitted.

Commissioner Scull:

- Stated there were a lot of county property and county wetlands mixed into the Master Plan and asked if any of the quantity or type projects would be shared with the County. He also inquired how the Master Plan would interface with those county wetlands.
- Confirmed he was referring to shared projects in Basalt Creek, Coffee Lake Creek, and areas like that because on the west side of town, the wetland ran right down the middle of the area.
  - Mr. Rappold replied there were no specific shared projects with regard to ultimately implementing them, but development of the Basalt Creek area would be coordinated with the

City of Tualatin, for example. Staff had previously held discussions with Tualatin's Staff about their design standards and how they related to the Wilsonville's standards.

- The County might have more of a role in coordinating development when City Staff looked at actual development within that area. Even the areas currently being developed in Tualatin would drain down through Tapman Creek and into Wilsonville. Ms. Weiland and her team actually worked on the City of Tualatin's Stormwater Master Plan, which was advantageous in terms of looking at the modeling for that area and other aspects. The City would do as much as possible to coordinate, but the projects would be implemented through the City of Wilsonville.

Commissioner Hendrix appreciated the comprehensive report and the follow-up with community input and the survey. She understood the National Community Survey included questions about water and stormwater specifically-and rated the quality of service. She suggested it could be another data point to factor in when analyzing community input. She did not know how big the survey sample size was, but it was probably larger than 90 people.

- Mr. Rappold replied the City received good responses to the National Community Survey, but the results had not been specifically included as part of the public engagement analysis.

Commissioner Willard:

- Noted the program costs for the ongoing program in Charbonneau to correct all the stormwater deficiencies were the bulk of the CIP costs. She asked if the rates already incorporated the known, expected, ongoing 30-year Charbonneau program or if those costs would be additional and expected to influence the rates further.
  - Mr. Rappold explained that typically when looking at the rate structure, the City would probably target the near-term and mid-term projects. Otherwise, rate increases would be really substantial. He would have to ask the City Engineer about Charbonneau, but typically, the City reevaluated the project lists every five to ten years.
    - The Stormwater Master Plan would be revisited in 10 to 15 years, which was typical. Even though the Master Plan was a 20-year plan, the rate structure would be closer to a 10-year period. The lists would continue to be revisited on a yearly basis in addition to the five-year look, just to keep what was being done with the rates manageable.
  - Ms. Weiland added that the 2014 Master Plan was established with a 30-year outlook. Some projects had been completed since then, and some were accounted for financially in the capital project list. When assessing the costs for continuing the Charbonneau program through a 20-year period, the remaining pipes and structures were included. The benefit of rolling that into the Master Plan was because of inflation, so the Master Plan costs were quite a bit of different than what they were in 2014. All of the assets were summarized and costed out by averaging over the 20-year period, and the rate study would refine those cost estimates a bit more.
- Understood the year-over-year program costs would not change outside of inflation.
  - Ms. Weiland explained that would be based on how much had been constructed to date and how much had been pulled over into a dedicated capital project account.

Commissioner Semenova:

- Appreciated that the ongoing Operation and Maintenance costs were considered, which were often overlooked in capital investments.

- Asked if the public input received was a good representation from all areas of Wilsonville or if the team knew how the respondents were distributed throughout the city.
  - Mr. Rappold replied he did not know what the distribution was offhand; however, based on the comments received, people were commenting on quite a few different places in the city. He did not know if that equated to where the respondents lived or just what they were seeing.
  - Ms. Weiland added the survey did ask if the respondent was a business or resident and for their general location, such as whether they were on a water body, on the east or west side of town, etc.
- Explained she was curious if the respondents were able to see the project locations on a map and provide where they were responding from, hopefully to provide more responses.
- Asked if a summary table was included of all the projects and programs, as well as the costs, such as whether it was cost avoidance, as well as the benefits and the repercussions of not doing the projects. She believed a table format would be a clear and concise reference.
  - Ms. Weiland stated the Executive Summary contained a summary table with the costs and objectives. Table 7-1 was a larger version of that table with the CIP that better described the projects and discussed the scheduling. It did not include what would happen if a project was not completed.
- Believed including what would happen if a project was not completed would help people evaluate the benefits, especially if rates were going to increase.
  - Ms. Weiland replied it would be easy to add that information and noted the fact sheets associated with each capital project did contain a bit more background information.
- Hoped for a one-stop shop putting it all together to make it easy for people and help them make quicker decisions.

Commissioner Karr agreed the report was very comprehensive and had a lot of information to absorb. He liked the idea of a summary table, noting eventually the City would have to “sell” the rate increase to the public. A summary table would be easier to publish and provide a way to show what the rate increase would help with or prevent, which would go a long way toward easing the public’s mind at that point. He thanked the project team for their hard work, adding the Stormwater Master Plan would continue to help Wilsonville be a livable city.

Chair Karr confirmed there was no public comment and closed the public hearing at 6:35 pm.

**Commissioner Hendrix moved to adopt Resolution LP24-0002, recommending approval of the Stormwater Master Plan as presented. Commissioner Scull seconded the motion.**

Chair Karr noted Resolution LP24-0002 met statewide and City Council goals by its conformance to the Comprehensive Plan with its citizen involvement; responsible urban growth management; continued assurance of public facilities and services; its encouragement of parks, recreation, open spaces, and environmental resources; and its concern for air, water, and land resource quality. This process began January 11, 2021, with a survey and a consultant team. On October 11, 2023, and February 14, 2024, the Planning Commission held work sessions that culminated in today’s completed Stormwater Master Plan.

**A roll call vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.**

## WORK SESSION

### 3. Housing Our Future (Rybold)

Kimberly Rybold, Senior Planner, noted at the last work session on this topic in June, the consultant team had been present with more data and would return to speak to the Planning Commission in the future. The Housing Our Future project was built on prior City work that involved housing planning, including the Town Center Plan adopted in 2019, the Frog Pond West and Frog Pond East and South Master Plans, the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan adopted in 2020, and the Middle Housing implementation adopted in 2021, to assess what actions the City needed to take over the next 20 years to ensure housing opportunities continued to be provided for the Wilsonville community. The project was also required for continued compliance with Statewide Planning Goal 10, which related to housing.

- She updated on the progress of the Housing Our Future project via PowerPoint, describing the project components, project phasing, takeaways from the Phase 2 engagement, as well as the upcoming Phase 3 engagement, the formation of the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) and upcoming events.
- The Planning Commission's joint work session with Council on July 15<sup>th</sup> would be the Commission's next discussion on Housing Our Future.
- Staff asked the Commissioners to decide who would like to serve on the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) and to ask questions and provide feedback on the project.

Commissioner Willard volunteered to serve on the PAC, with Commissioner Scull volunteering to serve as backup.

Commissioner comments and Ms. Rybold's responses to Commissioner questions were as follows:

- Ms. Rybold explained that for a renter household, the "burden of cost" included rent and utilities. For a homeowner household, the cost included the mortgage principle, utilities, and other regular ongoing housing costs, like mortgage interest, taxes, and mortgage insurance, but not one-time expenses, such as replacing the roof.
- Ms. Rybold agreed the acronym PAC could be confused with political action committees, noting the name of the committee could be reconsidered as it rolled out.
- The incentive of awarding ten \$50 gift cards to participants who shared their housing story was appreciated.

Commissioner Willard:

- Asked if the committee's industry experts would include planning professionals from other communities, as her commute took her through Hillsboro twice a week, and she had observed the successes Hillsboro had with duplexes and other middle housing. She compared that to what Wilsonville was being presented with in Frog Pond, commenting that she would love to chat with Hillsboro's planners.
  - Ms. Rybold explained the committee was still in draft form and she could raise the question and get feedback from the consultant team, who had worked on similar strategies in other communities across the state.
    - A lot of work had been done on the planning side, which the Planning Commission was familiar with, but the feasibility, or dollars and cents side was important to understand from a planning standpoint because it helped determine if they were doing the right things. Staff



hoped to invite a couple developers who worked on the market side, particularly one working in or exploring the middle housing space. Even if the experts did not fully participate in the committee, which could be a big ask, perhaps there could be a place for an interview with one or two key jurisdictions that were experiencing success.

- Added that even just some benchmarking information would be good because she would love to see what was in their Master Plan, how it actually played out in real life, and what language and strategies they were able to use to get it in the built environment.

## **INFORMATIONAL**

4. City Council Action Minutes (January 29 & February 22, 2024) (No staff presentation)
5. 2024 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

## **ADJOURN**

Commissioner Willard moved to adjourn the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 6:59 p.m. Chair Karr seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

By Paula Pinyerd of ABC Transcription Services, LLC. for  
Mandi Simmons, Planning Administrative Assistant