



PLANNING COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2023

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the October 11, 2023 PC Meeting Minutes



**PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
October 11, 2023 at 6:00 PM**

Draft PC Minutes are to be reviewed and approved at the December 13, 2023 PC Meeting.

City Hall Council Chambers & Remote Video Conferencing

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, October 11, 2023. Chair Heberlein called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m., followed by roll call. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ron Heberlein, Jennifer Willard, Andrew Karr, Kathryn Neil, and Nicole Hendrix. Kamran Mesbah was absent.

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Daniel Pauly, Kerry Rappold, Amy Pepper, Zach Weigel, Mike Nacrelli, and Mandi Simmons.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

CITIZEN INPUT

This was an opportunity for visitors to address the Planning Commission on items not on the agenda.

There was none.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the September 13, 2023 Planning Commission Minutes

The September 13, 2023 Planning Commission Minutes were accepted as presented.

WORK SESSION

2. Frog Pond East and South Implementation-Development Code (Pauly)

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, thanked Development Engineering Manager Amy Pepper, Natural Resource Manager Kerry Rappold, and City Engineer Zach Weigel for their input, support, and collaboration on the Frog Pond development standards. He presented the updates on the draft Development Code Amendments via PowerPoint, reviewing the key concepts related to housing variety, which included unit categories, urban form, minimum and maximum target unit categories, and described specific elements still being explored. (Slides 8-11) Questions for the Commission's feedback/discussion were as follows:

- Thoughts on measuring one of the variety requirements on a larger scale than subdistrict?
- Does the Commission support 60% as the max limit of a single unit category?
- Does the Commission support the concept of variation of minimum requirements based on amount of different Urban Form Types?
- Other input on topics still being refined?

Comments from the Commission and responses to Commissioner questions were as follows:

- Mr. Pauly described gap units, using the example if 25% of the units had to be a certain housing category/type, and developers were pushing for the rest to be detached homes, but the maximum number of detached homes plus that minimum 25% requirement did not add up to 100%; gap units were those that could not be part of that maximum and were not required to be part of the minimum. So, what happens to those ‘undesigned’ units?
 - Developers did not necessarily get to choose to put whatever they want in as gap units, but that was what Staff was testing. The concept was developers have choices with the gap units, but did the standards, as written, unintentionally require those gap units to be something.
 - He confirmed the minimums and maximums regarded the housing categories, (Slide 4) and affirmed the example that if the minimum for Category B was met and the maximum had been met for Category D, the developer would have to fill the gap with units from Category A or C; or the minimum is not really a minimum, so more Category B units would be required.
- Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, added Staff was trying to test the Code to understand if they were unintentionally pushing something in addition to the minimums being set, knowing they were also placing a maximum on any housing type. For example, it was not just a maximum on Unit Category D, but that any unit type should be 60%, and with 25% that would be 85%, so was Staff inherently requiring a specific housing type in that 15%? If so, and Staff said the minimum was really not 25% but 40%, then no flexibility was being provided to the developer. Staff wanted to test with the Code to ensure there was still some flexibility for a variety of housing types beyond just the minimum thresholds the City wanted to see in the area.
 - Mr. Pauly noted what Staff tended to see were things like minimum unit count, proximity to other unit types, and site planning seemed to resolve this issue on its own, but Staff continued to be very conscious of it to see if that actually holds true as they test different scenarios.
- Writing or modifying Code was suggested to account for exceptions to ease the requirements on individual tax lots who develop first, as done in South Frog Pond.
 - Mr. Pauly noted challenges in Frog Pond East with one subdistrict with mixed use that was more difficult because it was broken up by a wetland and other tax lots, making it more difficult to make minimums and maximums work.
- Writing Code in a more generic fashion was also suggested to allow for exceptions that could be discussed at a later date. Or was Staff literally trying to account for all the different exceptions?
 - Mr. Pauly believed it was a balance. The Code was drafted to take a discretionary path if some things did not work; however, one or two fairly straightforward, known exceptions could be easily written into the Code so they would not have to artificially go through a discretionary process later.
- Mr. Pauly clarified one of Metro’s conditions with the urban growth boundary (UGB) expansion in 2018 was that there was a minimum of 1325 units. Staff had modeled this, assumed 125 of those units would likely be in the mixed use on Brisband, then 1200 units would be spread out across the rest of the Master Plan to add up to the 1325 minimum.

- Ms. Bateschell noted the number from Metro included in the ordinance originated from the Frog Pond Area Plan, and what the Area Plan estimated for East and South.

Discussion and feedback from the Planning Commission on the questions presented by Staff were as follows (Slide 12):

Commissioner Hendrix stated she leaned toward the 60% maximum and was curious about the variation of the large scale of the subdistricts.

Commissioner Karr:

- Asked if variation meant just a larger scale in the subdistrict or within the subdistrict and within the larger?
 - Mr. Pauly responded developers could pick and choose. One concept could be to measure minimum by subdistrict and then do maximum across a larger geography, or the opposite; but however it was done, the intent was to ensure there was still that good level of variety within each subdistrict.
- Noted the lower the level it was measured, the more it guaranteed getting the same thing at a higher level. If the concern was for a variety without making it too onerous on the builders, the lower the level that variety was required, the more complete the development would be to have variety.
- Confirmed there were nine subdistricts.
 - Mr. Pauly clarified that generally, the subdistricts were about the same size. The smallest was Subdistrict S1, which was about five acres, but it was the oddball because it was just one property completely surrounded by streets which would have special provisions, because some of the variety requirements scale based on the size of development for feasibility purposes.
- Believed if variety requirements were measured at the subdistrict level, then it would have that same variety at a larger level. He was definitely supported the 60%, which seemed to make sense. The more variation in the urban forms, the better and it gave the developer more options.

Commissioner Willard stated the more she learned about the homelessness crisis and how it keeps festering, and how even Wilsonville residents were struggling with rent and housing costs, she believed the community needed to do all it could to increase the amount of available affordable middle housing, so whatever mixture achieved a goal of quantity of units and lower costs was her priority.

Commissioner Neil agreed, but also knew developers needed a bit of flexibility to be profitable. She believed if 60% of their units were used single dwellings, the gap should be more on the middle housing cluster type of homes and not larger townhomes.

Chair Heberlein:

- Said he had trouble seeing how housing variety at a larger scale than a subdistrict would be practicable. How could the City force variety in such a broken or segmented development? In Villebois, the City could identify exactly what goes where, right down to the house. In Frog Pond with so many different property owners, development would be “haphazard” and entirely dependent upon who sells, the developer, etc. He did not know how Code could be written in a way that variety would function at a larger level; it was hard to visualize.

- Mr. Pauly replied it could be like Frog Pond East, where a developer develops across multiple subdistricts.
- Responded he was not sure. He believed the 60% maximum limit on a single unit category was okay, but he would love to see some numbers to justify it was okay and to see some examples of what that would look like. It would likely be 60% single family.
 - Mr. Pauly responded not necessarily; there would probably be some 60% middle housing and some 60% apartments based on some of the models and ideas floated. He explained the models gave some good information but also some inaccurate information, so they were not quite ripe as far as sharing. The model does not really reflect a preference or direction Staff was headed.
 - Ms. Bateschell added Staff had essentially just seen first drafts and were starting to see what issues popped up and were working to resolve those issues, some of which would be brought back to the Commission in December. Staff would also share some example site plans of the entire Master Plan area to show demonstrations of the results of the Code, including examples of variety if the minimum versus the maximum density were used and hopefully some other alternatives to give the Commission a sense of what the standards would look like, and any refinements Staff considered to resolve any complications.
- She confirmed the Commission was comfortable with Staff testing between 50% and 60% as the maximum limit of a single unit category, noting Staff would return to the Commission with those results.

Dan Pauly, Planning Manager, continued the PowerPoint, summarizing the residential stormwater design standards, and noting the key updates since the Commission's July work session.

Kerry Rappold, Natural Resources Manager, noted this was kind of a unique process that he believed would be useful to other jurisdictions as well because while low impact development (LID) is required, without clear and objective standards, it was difficult for applicants to submit plans that were integrated and decentralized because there was no direction in terms of what needed to be considered for a development site. These design standards were really important as they would allow for a better discussion when working with various development sites in the community and provide more certainty in terms of the process.

Questions for the Commission's feedback/discussion were as follows:

- Concerns or comments about removing the previously drafted threshold requirement?
- Any additional concerns or questions about the draft stormwater standards?

Comments from the Commission and responses to Commissioner questions were as follows:

- Mr. Rappold explained the location prioritization list was created using locations that were most likely to be used in terms of having stormwater facilities and lent themselves to having them more readily placed in those locations. The locations were all equally important in the high priority. The list was a means of working through the development site in terms of where facilities could be placed, such as in the right-of-way, curb extensions, or remnant pieces of land, based on Staff's experience with other sites and where a facility was most likely to work.
 - Mr. Pauly noted the list would be like a checklist when reviewing the development.

- Mr. Rappold added the City had rapidly moved from encouraging LID, but now through the MPDS MS4 permit the City has to comply with, LIDs are required to be incorporated into development sites. Staff was trying to find the best means possible to make that happen.
- Mr. Pauly explained the size of the facilities would be dictated by the constraints around them; however, if any of the high priority areas were maxed out and there just was not enough land, it provided the flexibility to have a larger single facility, if that was the only option left.
- Mr. Rappold confirmed it gave more flexibility by only having locations. It was problematic to try to establish a percentage that would actually work, so the proposed update made more sense in terms of how it was required.
- What realistically prevents the developer from defaulting to lower priority.
 - Mr. Pauly replied when looking at a site plan, Staff could recognize pretty readily whether a developer was using stormwater facilities as dictated by the standards. Staff has tested it, and it seemed to work in that manner.
- Mr. Rappold noted Staff always had the prerogative of telling the applicant that the site design did not meet City standards, so they would have to try again. The expectation was that the applicant would give some type of accounting of how they had gone through the priority locations and describe why they did or did not use them, and Staff would expect to see something in terms of that explanation or description.
- He confirmed the Code included enough information for applicants to make a reasonable first pass. Staff has had detailed discussions about proposed sites, walking through the entire priority list and describing where facilities would be placed. He believed it would work well in that respect.
- In Frog Pond West, it looked like two of the developments in progress had some pretty large stormwater facilities that were close in proximity. Would those fall into this lower priority 2B as a separate landscape track for stormwater facilities if these standards had been in place at the time?
 - Mr. Pauly confirmed some of the sites in Frog Pond West were certainly a catalyst for what Staff tried to develop with the proposed standards as Staff had to work back and forth with developers to incorporate LID without any clear and objective way to achieve them.

Commissioner Willard:

- Understood and agreed with the need to provide clear prioritization but was not fully convinced the priorities in Section E, such as street trees and minimum open space, would take precedence over stormwater. She suggested the priorities be reassessed because they seemed to be saying two different things.
 - Mr. Pauly explained it was a balance, noting language in the Code essentially said, “if there is no other locations for them”, then they can take priority.
 - For example, if a fire hydrant could be adjusted slightly to not stop installation of a large stormwater facility, the hydrant should be moved. However, if the space was too constrained, and a fire hydrant was needed, it would take precedent, similar with street trees. If there was enough room to put the tree behind a sidewalk, or somehow design it in such a way to provide more space for stormwater, that would be done. Otherwise, a mound would probably be created within the stormwater area to put street tree to balance all the competing interests for one little amount of land.
 - Mr. Rappold added that urban canopy street trees were part of the stormwater management system and the City gave credits for street trees or trees within the stormwater standards.
- Supported keeping development costs low to get more affordable housing on the market.

Mr. Rappold explained that low impact development (LID), also referred to as green infrastructure, tried to replicate or mimic the way things would have been prior to development. The best way to manage stormwater was not to concentrate it or put it into pipes but disperse it. LID tries to capture runoff flows as close to where it was occurring, whether it was coming off a street or a roof or a parking lot, and intercept that runoff into these facilities, and not through a pipe system that took it to a big pond somewhere out of sight, out of mind. LID was a different approach in terms of trying to mimic what nature does.

Chair Heberlein called for public comment.

Mimi Doukas, AKS Engineering, distributed Preliminary Layout 30-Phasing Plan to the Commission, which she described as West Hills current schematic site plan. Fundamentally, the primary issue West Hills had concerns with was the ability to achieve the variety standards across the entire Stage 1 Master Plan area, instead of by subdistrict.

- West Hills was involved with the Azer property, believed to be the largest piece of property within the planning district, so the situation was kind of opposite from the one in Frog Pond South.
- She understood the current thought was to require variety across each subdistrict, but she believed the City would rather want to achieve the variety across the planning area, particularly because of the block variety standards, to avoid ending up with monochromatic development.
- West Hills located multifamily along the western edge on the site plan. Like every type of development, multifamily has parameters that are pretty unique, in that you do not see a single apartment building floating out in the middle of the neighborhood. They were typically developed by commercial developers with 200 dwelling units per development, which was what it took to have proper amenities, proper management, and a marketable project in the future if one wanted to sell it to another commercial real estate group. So, there was a certain amount of mass that went into a multifamily development. If West Hills had to achieve the multifamily in the middle subdistrict, it would be one or two apartment buildings sort of floating out in space, which was not how the real estate market works.
 - Multifamily was one housing type that does not want to be dispersed across the whole district. West Hills can achieve the mix of categories across the entire Stage 1 planning area in a pretty comfortable way and in a way that creates good urban design and provides good block level variety, but it matches the market.
- One of West Hills' big concerns was how did the goals and policies the City wanted to achieve align with the marketplace to actually have development that could move forward, as far as selling homes, building apartments and bringing people to Wilsonville. There was a balance point in there.
 - If West Hill could achieve those variety standards across the whole Stage 1 master plan, then they could achieve some of the things shown in the distributed sketch, which was a quality sketch with place making, and things like that.
- West Hills could probably deal with the rest of the metrics, the 60%, the different categories. The middle housing category was a struggle. It was not as tested in the marketplace and not as commercially viable, but West Hills had got a way to get there with some ADUs they were incorporating. The attached housing, townhomes, were no problem as long as they could be dispersed across the Stage 1 master plan. Fundamentally, their main struggle was the site planning, particularly for multifamily had some particular constraints to it.

- Regarding Stormwater, the commissioners have talked about affordability and making sure the output of this district is maximizing, and stormwater was really important. The more facilities there were, the more they spread across the district; the costs go up, efficiency goes down, and the land devoted to stormwater increases, and the cost gets spread across the homes ultimately.
- The Azer site has the BPA powerlines which was a fantastic place to put stormwater in a super efficient way that preserves the buildable land within the district. As the language was currently proposed, it would make it very hard for West Hills to propose that type of facility, and that was a really perfect opportunity for an efficient stormwater facility.
 - The other place West Hills had stormwater located was next to the wetland on the southwest corner of the site. Next to a wetland, a facility could be constructed to mimic that wetland, have the visual appeal of a wetland, and be scaled to be efficient, lower management, lower maintenance in the right location. Wetlands are typically where stormwater wants to go because they were the low spots.
- Those were West Hills' concerns with the stormwater; it seemed like the stormwater was a one size fits all kind of approach. While it had the priorities, it seemed to be excluding these opportunities for efficiency that West Hills believed was in everybody's best interest.

Ms. Bateschell stated Staff may want to have time to review the provided site plan in conjunction with the site plans Staff was reviewing and testing against the standards and provide responses to the information received tonight when returning to the Commission in December.

Chair Heberlein believed it would be beneficial to have longer, dedicated time for Commissioner discussion with Staff to get into the details and work through some of the issues.

Mr. Pauly agreed, noted Staff has looked similar site plans and kept those things in mind as Staff has been testing, so it made sense to test some of the items noted tonight. He appreciated West Hills' feedback and continued collaboration.

- He clarified for the record that Ms. Doukas' intended to say that cottage clusters were not as tested in the marketplace, not "middle housing" as townhouses were tested.

Dan Grimberg, West Hills Land Development, noted West Hills very much want to be part of Wilsonville and the Frog Pond East and South, adding West Hills has been a big partner with the City in producing housing. Frog Pond East and South have been very difficult because there were a lot of new concepts that were not necessarily tested. As a builder/developer, West Hills builds to market, they did not create the market, so whatever was done had to be market acceptable. The City was talking about big investments, and maybe it works, maybe it doesn't—that doesn't work in development.

- He noted the site plan distributed to the Commission was Site Plan #30. West Hills has been working on this for a year and has had a number of meetings with the City and addressed many discussion items from Staff. He suggested reviewing the plan, which included all the variety of housing: small and a bit larger single-family, three-story, alley-loaded, and front-loaded townhomes, apartments, and mixed use, all on only 55 acres. There were a lot of different price points and a lot of different buyers. West Hills was doing the best it could, but it needed some flexibility.
- The focus was not maximum limit percentages and categories but what was the community going to look like, what is the market, etc.; that is what West Hills has been testing on this variety every day and he believed they had a good site plan. He would like an hour or half hour of the City's

attention to explain their site plan and why it worked. It was difficult to stand up at the end of a meeting and say this does not work.

- West Hills was also very concerned about the cost of housing and with a lot of these policies, the cost of doing them did not seem to be a concern.
- The size of the ponds and dispersing them throughout the site can affect the availability of land for development which affects the cost of housing. West Hills tested the Code on an earlier version and lost 15% of the density, which was a big hit; it did not work. In response, Staff removed that condition but said they did not want to see any large ponds even with all of West Hills' low-impact development. He was not sure what "large pond" meant, but that was a normal treatment in the Metro area even with LID.
 - Some jurisdictions had moved from small ponds to large ponds because they were more efficient, provided better water quality, were easier to manage, and had lower maintenance costs. And now, this was going the other direction and it does cost money.
- He reiterated that West Hills would like to meet with the Commission to discuss the policies further.

Ms. Bateschell explained there was no standard policy or procedure around meeting with developers in work session. Staff has been meeting regularly with different members of the West Hills team, and there has been a lot of discussion on these things, including the stormwater policies. and that was partly why Staff was testing the different layers of Code, and this took time.

- Staff has heard loud and clear from comments during meetings the concerns around certain standards, certain housing types, those percentages, how different lot standards intersects with housing variety standards, middle housing standards, etc. Staff has been testing what the potential outcomes were when those things are layered on top of each other. Another challenge was Staff could not be as prescriptive around what houses go where because of new State law. Staff understood the Commission wanted to achieve certain housing types and certain amounts of certain housing types; this approach had not been done before.
- Staff wanted to understand what the complications were and where it started to fall apart, and that was where Staff started to see that maybe 50% was not the number, maybe it should be 60% to have some flexibility in what happens with the gap in housing numbers. Staff was looking at all the different standards and what was happening when the model and the site plans came back to see what was not working.
- Once Staff had something that worked with Code, as discussed by the Planning Commission and directed by City Council, a financial analysis would be done to understand the cost to build the different housing types modeled in the site plan and whether it would be feasible. Understanding the developer's building cost would help to understand the potential price of those homes. Staff would also do an assessment to understand the cost of different housing types selling in the area and within the Wilsonville market area, and what the cost would be to a buyer or renter.
 - Staff would want to understand how expensive the new housing variation standards variations would make on development, the effect of too many unit types coming into the market all at once, and so forth.
- This was a new era of codifying housing and housing need, and it was more difficult than it has been in the past, so would be a challenging topic for everyone to work through. That was why Staff was doing all the additional analyses and trying to bring the Commission this additional information so that the City could make sound policy.

Amanda Guile-Hinman, City Attorney, noted there was value in having some leniency in the typical rules for discussions during the work session items, but the important thing for the Planning Commission to remember was when West Hills provides comment, they are talking only about the area they have under the contract, and the standards would address a much larger area.

Commissioner Willard stated it would be great to see a site plan and what the average cost per unit would be compared to one that meets the block variability, stormwater distribution and housing variety to see what adhering to some of the policies did to the bottom line.

Chair Heberlein agreed that was a great idea.

3. Stormwater System Master Plan (Rappold)

Kerry Rappold, Natural Resources Manager, stated in 2021, the City started this project to update the 2012 master plan and tonight's presentation was intended to give the Commission a quick preview of important information in the draft Stormwater System Master Plan, which Staff hoped to finalize by the end of November. He noted master plan updates were typically done every ten years and that the Executive Summary and Capital Improvement Plan were in the packet.

Mr. Rappold and Angela Weiland, Brown & Caldwell, presented the Stormwater Master Plan Update via PowerPoint, reviewing the public outreach received in 2021 regarding stormwater management in Wilsonville; the Master Plan development process, which involved evaluating problem areas, identifying solutions, and getting Staff input; regulatory drivers and the overlap between the Master Plan, NPDES MS4 Permit/SWMP and the TMDL Implementation Plan; technical evaluations; and the development and an overview of the Capital Program. Two of the proposed capital projects at Day Road and Morey's Landing were described, as well as the implementation of the Capital Program and the next steps to finalize the draft, which included hosting a virtual open house in December and a rate study.

Comments from the Commission and responses to Commissioner questions were as follows:

- Ms. Weiland noted the outcome from the surveys showed Wilsonville citizens were very well educated and informed about stormwater, its implications, and what assets and infrastructure were related to making sure stormwater was not a detriment to receiving water health. Some feedback was related to problem areas and was directly incorporated into the problem area list. Some reported issues stemmed from areas that would be redeveloped in the near term and did not necessarily translate to a project but were documented in the Master Plan to be recognized.
- Morey's Landing was an example of incorporating innovative solutions into the Master Plan, where the pipes could have been upsized to alleviate the bubbler, but the project team wanted to recognize that water quality in a developed area had inherent aesthetics and livability benefits to the city, not just to comply with permits.
- The elevations and patterns of the BPA easement corridor were considered, and the team tried to incorporate the use of the City's stormwater design standards and the sizing of that area and really honed in a bit more on what those kind of multi-objective solutions look like.
- A primary area of focus was Memorial Park and Library Pond, which has been a stormwater feature and where the City did a lot of stormwater monitoring. The project team wanted to look more specifically at the sizing and ability of that facility to accommodate redevelopment

and growth, so one project was a retrofit of that facility to make it more functional from a maintenance perspective, allow better access, and allow it to be redesigned in a way that coincides with the City's design standards and brings it a bit more up to the present.

- Mr. Rappold explained that the responsibility to replace and maintain LID media depended on the reason the facility was installed. Case in point were the facilities along Garden Acres Rd which were part of a capital project, so that was the City's responsibility. In Frog Pond West, however, the facilities were part of the actual development of that area, and even though the facilities were placed in the right-of-way, they were still privately owned and maintained because the part of the development.
 - The City was still in a process of trying to catch up and retrofit areas from a number of perspectives. There were still a lot of area within the city that had no active stormwater management, such as outfalls along the Willamette River, where significant areas did not even have for detention facilities.
- What was the rationale for the P1 through P5 funding levels, which seemed low; like it would be one project a year for each of the items or maybe two on P1?
 - Mr. Rappold replied some of it was related to Staff's discussions and the capacity available to deal with the project items. Staff wanted to create funding pots of money to avoid pushing the rates too far out the line.
 - Ms. Wieland added the P1-P5 projects were intended to be annualized, going into a pot of money that eventually grows over time. Over the course of a few years, then maybe that opportunistic transportation project would present itself where an overlay could be put on the road and obtain different benefits and monitor it as a pilot study. It was hard to define such opportunities up front or know how many there would be, but they wanted to aside some level of funding to recognize it as a goal, while also allowing for accrual and accumulation over time.
 - Public Works Maintenance was asked how often and how much it cost to go out an fix local drainage improvements, whether independently or through an on-call situation, and the \$100,000 amount was in alignment with the level of effort involved.
- It would be interesting to see the rate study as the draft progresses. Understanding the level of stormwater capital projects the City has funded over the last 10 years, how does the millions of dollars in this capital project list align with historical efforts and would there be a ramp up in rates or other funding mechanisms over the next 20 years to get them funded?
 - Mr. Rappold responded that would have to be discussed with City Council to get their input on what levels could be set in terms of how the list was considered, from a 5-year, 10-year, 20-year perspective, but those were always adjusting. Sometimes, the City was just in a response mode, unfortunately, such as the many times having to deal with the outfalls on the Willamette River. Some of it, Staff could gauge, but some was more immediate in terms of how they had to deal with the situation.
- Mr. Rappold explained that in general, all water quality facilities would provide treatment for the usual pollutants associated with sediment and bacteria, and now there were new requirements regarding mercury. Most of the mercury in stormwater runoff came from the atmosphere, so not a lot could be done to prevent it, but the City could work to treat it.
 - The facilities would essentially treat the same pollutants no matter their location, but it was important to prioritize areas where there were very few stormwater facilities, like in Morey's Landing and the entire area south of Wilsonville Rd on the west side of the city.

- Ms. Weiland added that LID and vegetated stormwater facilities provided truly good pollutant removal in accordance with effectiveness information that was well documented. Different processes were used, and vegetation enhances uptake. Through these facilities, retention and infiltration of stormwater was encouraged, which was another means to remove pollutants before they discharged via overland flow or pipe flow into receiving water, so the types of facilities proposed were intentionally in alignment with the City's design standards and MS4 permit requirements.

4. Wastewater Treatment Plant Master Plan (Nacrelli)

Mike Nacrelli, Senior Civil Engineer, and Dave Price, Senior Civil Engineer, Carollo Engineers, presented on the update Wastewater Treatment Plant Master Plan via PowerPoint, reviewing key components of the Master Plan which would accommodate expected demand for build out by 2045. Highlights included details regarding the completed facility capacity assessment, costs and a schedule for the updated Capital Improvements Program (CIP), an alternatives evaluation and a breakdown of costs by project, estimated cash flow, and the next steps for advancing the Master Plan for adoption.

and the additional changes since the last work session with the Commission.

Discussion and feedback from the Planning Commission was as follows with responses by Staff to Commissioner questions as noted:

- In September 2022, the estimate was \$75 million which moved to \$120 million in the span of a year with the increased industrial discharges.
 - Mr. Nacrelli noted an oversight in the presentation, stating the \$75 million had not included the engineering portion, it was only construction. The actual cost should have been in the \$90,000s.
- If the project were not space constrained, what would the project cost and overall plan look like? Would clarifiers be added instead of adding a membrane bioreactor (MBR)? Considering the huge sum of money involved, maybe it would be cheaper overall to acquire some additional land south of the existing facility to add more equipment, rather than this huge increase for the MBR. The river was south of the facility, but there were a lot of trees that could be cut down.
 - Mr. Nacrelli responded Staff could cost out what a conventional expansion would take and how much land would be required; however, the direction provided was that there was no room to grow.
 - Ms. Guile-Hinman understand the facility was all surrounded by Boones Ferry Park, and there were deed restrictions that did not allow the City to use it for anything other than a recreational use.
 - Mr. Nacrelli clarified the land on the east side had a large grade adjacent to where the new aeration basin would go in the northeast corner.
 - Mr. Price added a significant retaining wall would have to be built there in order to put in the additional aeration basin, so the area was already tight due to the slopes.
- At a high level, it would be good to double check that there is no physical space to put in a conventional facility, because this was a huge sum of money, especially with the \$60 million outlay in 2030. It would be good to make sure the City was looking at all the options out there.

- Mr. Nacrelli stated they could run the numbers and understand how much space would be needed, but he was pretty satisfied with the property footprint; perhaps he could come up with a map that extended beyond the area.
- If deed restrictions prevented the City for adding land, no additional analysis was needed, but if there was space or an opportunity to be creative, then be creative about a more conventional plant. If not, then just let the Commission know.
 - Mr. Price added access was also required on the site for trucks with trailers, so there was limitations with travel ways and the plan did not show the slopes on three sides of the site. Based on the team's analysis, there were not too many square feet on the site that were not already being used. When the facility was upgraded in 2011/2012, one notion was that beyond the three existing aeration basins and clarifiers that the next step was to put some [inaudible] but he believed that project predated the collection system at the time, so it did not evaluate the full indications of what that might be. He wanted to make sure the Commission considered the conventional options as well as the expectations coming out of the Master Plan update and whether things could be [inaudible] or reduced. A scenario that would reduce the cost of Phase 1, but would be at least \$10 million to eliminate the need for some of those future projects, which would be something to think about, because in that scenario the City would be running kind of a combined conventional/membrane plant. The two distinct clarifiers would not go away until Phase 3. The project team was trying to preserve the City's conventional facility for as long as possible, but it would cost to maintain the existing facilities and give you less energy for chemicals to operate that facility than a more complicated, high intensity system line an MBR.
 - Mr. Nacrelli suggested they could add property lines and contours to the site plan. (Slide 9)
- Regarding an increase in industrial discharge, what was the current industrial discharge versus what was in the plan versus what is the maximum? And where was the City in that window, right at the maximum of what was theoretically possible from the permits in this plan, or some amount lower than that? That information would be helpful to have for the next go around.
 - Mr. Nacrelli believed they could provide those numbers, which would be in the Master Plan attached to the Staff report. He confirmed the assumption was that all the City's permanent industries would be discharging the maximum amount, which they were not currently doing, so that was a pretty significant impact, especially since they were higher dischargers. The lows were just as important to evaluate capacity. Those numbers would be incorporated into the slides.
- Incorporating the risks of not implementing the recommended plan in the master plan was suggested. Communities along the Willamette were having wastewater failures and having boil orders for water. Articulate the consequences of not doing this to our river environment would be great.
 - Mr. Nacrelli responded a chapter in the regulatory constraints essentially stated that once you start exceeding your limits, you get financial [inaudible], and the City could get to a point where a moratorium would have to be issued until the issues were fixed.
 - Mr. Price added that typically with improvement at this scale, community outreach would be incorporated into the more detailed planning and design steps to help educate people about rates and charges and to make sure the message got out there about why these improvements were needed.

- With only two funding sources noted, rates and SDCs, at the current rates and expected SDCs, what was the City's shortfall and how would that shortfall be made up?
 - Mr. Nacrelli responded [inaudible] not part of the Master Plan's scope, noting the rate study would delve into those details.
 - Mr. Price added also need to consider the condition-related verses capacity-related improvements.
- Mr. Nacrelli confirmed the rate study would be completed after City Council adopted the Master Plan.
 - A comment was made that the City was creating the Master Plan without knowing how to pay for it, which was not how budgeting worked in real life.
- Zach Weigel, City Engineer, added further context on how the master planning worked. The City was going to grow to a certain population, and these projects were needed for the treatment plant to meet the population demand. When master planning, the needs were identified, then a rate study determined the impact on fees and development costs.
- Mr. Weigel confirmed a certain portion of development fees went toward wastewater, and each CIP project would be split on base with a portion that serves new development and serves existing customers, and that portion of new growth gets figured into the SDC cost.
- SDCs affect affordability.
- The Commission discussed growth rates when the housing report came out, and the City's actual growth numbers were outpacing Metro's projections. Which numbers were used in the Master Plan engineering?
 - Mr. Weigel stated the project team used the same numbers from the collection system master plan, which was an aggressive growth rate that was trending with what the City has been seeing over the last 10 years on average. It was hard to know what was going to happen. Was it going to slow down? Was Metro going to put limits on the City to meet certain housing projections? Staff believed the aggressive growth rate was the right measure to use for this Master Plan.
 - Mr. Nacrelli noted the Master Plan numbers were compared with Metro's Transportation Analysis projections, and they were very close.
 - Mr. Weigel confirmed there was really no way to avoid MBR. There were ways to avoid additional chambers of MBR that Staff would be tracking over time, but that was typical with a master plan; the needs were identified, population growth, flow, and needs were tracked over time, and the projects were implemented when they were needed. And then, every 10 years or so, the Master Plan is updated when a deeper dive is taken into the data to make sure the City was following those projections and then updating the Master Plan as needed.

Chair Heberlein called for a brief recess and reconvened the meeting at 8:45 pm.

INFORMATIONAL

5. 2023 Transportation Performance Monitoring Report (Pepper)

Amy Pepper, Development Engineering Manager, presented a report card on the City's performance of the City's Transportation System Plan (TSP), its policies, programs, and projects, and how the City's projects had measured up to Goals 1 through 7 of the TSP, along with recommended actions to lead to desired outcomes. A full update of the report was included in the packet.

Ms. Pepper responded to questions from the Commission as follows:

- The feedback received from public was skewed because of the Boone Bridge failure, so it was hard to say how people were feeling about how transportation was functioning in the city as they were out and about. (Goal 3, Slide 6) Additionally, there had been a lot of active construction projects and some related traffic control issues, so it was hard to say if people were feeling that transportation function was reliable.
- Additionally, the Boeckman Bridge was about to go under construction, which would be a major reroute of traffic, so there may be a decline in how people perceived the system working due to the major projects the City had under construction.
- As far as the impacts, it was good to look at the big picture; overall, there would be improvements. Restoration activities were being done on 95th Ave, and each section would open back up before another section was closed for that project, so Staff was monitoring the construction activities around the city to minimize some of the impacts to the citizens.

6. City Council Action Minutes (September 18, 2023) (No staff presentation)

7. 2023 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, stated the November meeting will be primarily virtual, but people could also attend in person and join virtually as a group from Council Chambers. More details would be provided by Kim Rybold, who was leading the effort. November's meeting would serve two purposes. First, the meeting was required by statute because Wilsonville has met a threshold of being rent burdened at a certain percentage, which it had not previously. Jurisdictions meeting a certain threshold were required to hold a rent-burdened meeting annually. Second, it allows for input into the City's future Frog Pond housing project for future housing need and what strategies the City could use to produce housing into the future.

Ms. Bateschell added the expectation was that all Commissioners could attend like a Planning Commission meeting. The meeting was being hosted by the Commission as the Committee for Citizen Involvement, so each Commissioner's participation was definitely wanted. The Commission was making a lot of different policy decisions right now about housing, so having an opportunity to engage with and get input from those attending this meeting would be very helpful when considering the City's future policy decisions around housing. To avoid any awkwardness in engaging the public, the Commission would essentially host the meeting as an online virtual open forum for anyone to attend, so anybody with limitations could participate virtually for a more seamless experience. Ms. Simmons would send out all the information with the appropriate links for the Commissioners to participate.

ADJOURN

Commissioner Willard moved to adjourn the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:59 p.m. Commissioner Neil seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

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