



**PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
July 13, 2022 at 6:00 PM**

City Hall Council Chambers & Remote Video Conferencing

Draft PC Minutes were reviewed and approved as corrected at the September 14, 2022 PC Meeting. Corrections are bold and underlined. Commissioner Gallagher moved to approve the July 13, 2022 minutes as corrected. Commissioner Karr seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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, July 13, 2022. Chair Heberlein called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m., followed by roll call. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ron Heberlein, Jennifer Willard, Aaron Woods, Andrew Karr, and Kamran Mesbah. Olive Gallagher arrived after roll call. Breanne Tusinski was absent.

City Staff: Daniel Pauly, Ryan Adams, Mike Nacrelli, and Mandi Simmons.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

CITIZEN'S 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 June 8, 2022 Planning Commission Minutes

The June 8, 2022 Planning Commission Minutes were accepted as presented.

WORK SESSION

2. Wastewater Treatment Plant Master Plan (Nacrelli)

Mike Nacrelli, Senior Civil Engineer, noted the Wastewater Treatment Plant Master Plan was the first since the last major upgrade to the Master Plan in 2012 and would look at the plant capacity, condition of the equipment, the regulatory landscape, and any issues that needed to be incorporated into a capital plan.

Dave Price, Project Manager & Vice President, Carollo Engineers, briefly highlighted his professional background. He presented the Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Master Plan via PowerPoint, noting Carollo based its planning around the City's Comprehensive Plan and the growth expected in the community through 2045 to ensure the treatment plant had capacity to treat in compliance with the NPDS permit to discharge to the Willamette River. Also reviewed were potential regulatory drivers, the WWTP condition and process capacity assessments, alternatives evaluation for addressing capacity deficiencies, as well as the recommended plan for new projects and infrastructure to provide additional capacity, the proposed phasing schedule, projected yearly cashflow, and next steps, which included the Master Plan's adoption anticipated in mid-October.

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

- Had the upcoming projects in 2023 and 2024 been estimated in the City's budget to provide the needed funding? (Slides 15 and 16)
 - Mr. Nacrelli replied the larger dollar amount projects, the UV System Improvement and Secondary Clarifier Mechanisms, were both in the Five-Year Plan of the recently adopted budget. The Seismic Improvements project could be accommodated in the City's Wastewater Capital Budget, and Staff would look into adding it to the Five-Year Plan in the next budget cycle. The Fiber Optic Cable Addition, at less than \$60,000, was a relatively small project. The Dewatering Performance Optimization project did **not** yet have a dollar amount and Staff would work with Jacobs Engineering Group Inc., the City's contract operator, to get that figure. The City might provide some funding through that operations contract, but the project would not have a major impact on the City's cash flow.
 - He confirmed a good amount of the near term proposed projects were in the Five-Year Plan, though a few things still needed to be addressed.
- What was the financing plan for 2031? Would funds come from CIP and is there adequate annual Capital Improvement Project (CIP) funding for the 2031 projects? (Slide 16)
 - Mr. Nacrelli noted the 2031 Solids Dryer Improvements project was the next big project. As mentioned in the Staff report, the current fiscal year budget identified a wastewater rate study and SDC analysis would be done in. The final Master Plan document would be used to see what the numbers and schedule meant for the monthly rates and the system development charges (SDCs) and how they might need to be adjusted. After the public hearings, over the next year, figuring out the finance plan would be the next step in implementation.
- Mr. Price clarified that grouting any soil voids around the existing piping was not part of the Seismic Improvements project but recommended in the geotechnical report and Northwest Geotech's study. When Northwest Geotech did its site work, no active erosion or piping was occurring; however, the City would need to pay attention to those requirements when doing the new improvements for the aeration basin, or if something was identified that appeared could be an issue, such as a hole showing up suddenly after some rain events. He did not know of anything to be worried about regarding the soils currently.
- Were there many complaints over odor and should the City do any projects to address odor?
 - Mr. Nacrelli responded he had not heard much about odor complaints from the operators at the site or from Delora Kerber, Public Works Director, who manages the contract.
 - Mr. Price added odor-control facilities were tied to the dryer and the solids building. He was not a solids processing expert, but there were risks when the process was interrupted and solids were not making it through the dewatering process to the dryer on a continual basis, which would occur because something broke or something else interrupted the normal flow. Under normal operations, the assumption was that the existing units were functioning as they were intended to control odor.
 - Mr. Nacrelli added he had not noticed any odor during his many times visiting the site.
- Mr. Nacrelli clarified the process for solids did not include a digester with gas harvesting, noting the digesters were eliminated with the last upgrade.
 - Mr. Price added there was no digestion, dewatered raw solids went from the centrifuge units right into the dryer unit, and that process was intended to function on a continual basis.
- Regarding plans for generating gas in the future, which was typical when dealing with solids, Mr. Nacrelli noted producing heat and electricity from harvested methane had been a big part of his previous job at

the City of Gresham, but it would be prohibitive for the City of Wilsonville to ~~try and~~ go back to using anaerobic digestion after eliminating the digesters.

- Mr. Price clarified that the percentage increases on Slide 4 were 2045 projections for an increase in the potential need for capacity based upon Staff's analysis using Metro numbers.
 - On how the percentage projections compared to the population increase percentage, Mr. Price replied the projected population of 30,000 in 2045 (Slide 3) was less than those represented in the table. (Slide 4) Often, conservative numbers were used when evaluating specific elements, like the loads or flows, for future growth and what would be produced. To ensure, Carollo was being conservative for planning purposes, the best-case scenario was not used. Every home built would not necessarily have the number of residents assumed by the Comprehensive Plan.
- The project assumed the same per capita load and flow generation seen today for 2045. The population increase would be around 18 percent, but the analysis showed increases of more than twice that in all categories. What infiltration inflow analysis information was available?
 - Mr. Price replied evaluations for treatment facilities looked at the actual flows received at the plant. Depending on the circumstance, the client's desires, and the needs of the community, the analysis might look at the collection system model to see the maximum amount of flow it could deliver. Typically, the flow numbers were generated based upon an evaluation using rolling averages, often a maximum month flow based upon a rolling 30-day average was used; not what the average was in one month compared to some time period, often it was the previous five years. The analysis did not necessarily utilize the same kinds of assumptions used in a collection system plan in part because with a treatment plant, no matter how tight the site was, the assumption was that more capacity could be built, expanded, or intensified. However, once pipe was put in the ground, it was difficult to make it any larger so often the collection system plan made very conservative assumptions, especially for peak flows it needed to convey to the plant to prevent wastewater protrusion from manholes.
- Did the City have a handle on clear water intrusion in the system?
 - Mr. Nacrelli replied the Wastewater Collection System Master Plan would have definitely looked at water intrusion and the Master Plan had a CIP to replace a lot of older pipes. He had been involved in several projects in Charbonneau, an older area where the age of the infrastructure had been a particular issue. The City was definitely addressing intrusion and the best way to do it was to either line or replace old pipes.
 - Commissioner Mesbah responded he had hoped to hear the City had a handle on any potential large inflow areas; not old pipes, but broken lines, especially in low areas with shallow ground water and he assumed some gravity lines were located where such water intrusion could occur, letting in water that was not efficient to treat. Was a conservation plan to reduce the loads in the future part of the WWTP Master Plan, assuming people would **not** be as wasteful as they were today?
 - Mr. Nacrelli noted the increases in BOD and TSS were a bit higher than the flows, which probably reflected that the influent was often trending stronger because less clean water, or rainwater, was coming into the system. The City was treating the same amount of solids, but the hydraulic impact was not as severe as it would have been in past years. (Slide 4) He agreed more efficient pipe materials, fixtures, and plumbing contributed to less water being treated.
 - A program to encourage more conservation would be more to do with the water distribution and plumbing side of things and was not part of this project's scope. However, the City was interested in conservation and pursuing it.
 - Mr. Price added one thing that came up with many of the planning studies he had done over the last 18 to 20 years was the idea that flows were very important, and they are however, as Mr.

Nacrelli had indicated, wastewater management tried to control the flow as well as ensure a process that could handle and treat the organic loads coming in, all of which included contaminants. In his experience, water conservation efforts did not always benefit wastewater treatment plants. For example, efforts in northern California, where constituents were regulated to a much lower level than DEQ, had resulted in the unintended consequence of water coming into the plants with a much higher concentration of pollutants. Water conservation was important, but it needed to be looked at carefully and watched at the wastewater plant, which was why the loads were looked at closely in the analysis which was often more important in some ways.

- Mr. Nacrelli noted the flows and loads increase was greater than the population increase and asked if that was because non-residential sources were also included.
 - Mr. Price confirmed the numbers did reflect non-residential sources, which included the prison and other industrial/commercial users within the service area, which were not reflected in the population numbers. Following Commissioner Mesbah's comments, he did want to take a hard look at the flows and loads analysis along with evolving land uses to make sure everything was in line.
- Industrial uses, like a brewery with higher loads to the treatment plant might exist in the city that the Commission was unaware of. Was the growth projection lowballed or would the City experience higher growth?
 - Mr. Nacrelli replied Metro's numbers were definitely on the low end, which was why they looked more closely at the medium projections indicated by the green line. (Slide 3, Green line)
- Historically, Metro numbers had been low, but the other aspect was that the City did have some say in how fast it grew. Some of the costs shown in the Draft Cash Flow chart were the costs of growth. (Slide 16) Perhaps those things should be thought about in addition to the expansion of load systems, etc. There were costs associated with choosing to grow which the City needed to be strategic about. The plan was conservative and seemed to have room to cover more than Metro's projections. Layering conservatism in the planning process should be avoided. Conservatism in facilities planning sometimes resulted in over-building unnecessarily that went unused long term.
 - Mr. Price replied that was a concern of his as well. Process engineers were conservative because no one wanted to under plan. The community should pay close attention to who was responsible for paying for which element of the need. Unfortunately, some elements might not be driven by capacity, but performance. There was an element of capacity embedded even in that large dryer unit that somebody would benefit from other than the existing users.
 - Mr. Nacrelli added because the City did not appear to have a capacity issue in the near-term, it could track what growth actually looks like over the next five years and then adjust accordingly, as the Master Plan would be adaptive. The City had not updated the Plan in 10 years, but he expected the City would not go longer than five years before assessing growth and making adjustments to the Master Plan as necessary.
- It would be helpful for the report to include a full built-out analysis. As the City built out areas it was adding, would it have adequate capacity, or would capacity go unused by the time the equipment needed to be replaced because it was not useful anymore; without having really used it? That would be a waste of taxpayer or ratepayer money. A full build-out analysis with timelines would provide some idea of whether the growth of the facility was being tracked in lockstep with the expected built-out of the areas added to the urban area.
 - Mr. Price noted the flows and loads had been projected out to the projection curves. Early in the analysis of the plant, Carollo Engineering, in conjunction with City Staff, decided not to necessarily

plan around the built-out numbers for the reasons pointed out. Including the build-out numbers would result in a more intense treatment plant site at the facility to account for the population nearly doubling, as shown by the projection on the higher rate curve. (Slide 3)

- Mr. Nacrelli clarified build-out was unrelated to the rate of growth. The current city boundaries and reserve areas would max out and fill up at some point according to how the areas were zoned. There was a number associated with build-out, though it was not necessarily tied to a time frame but to land use.
- Build-out could be tied to a time frame because the Planning Department had some idea of how fast the neighborhoods would develop. For example, 1680 units were planned for Town Center, 1750 units were planned in Frog Pond East and South. At 2.5 people per unit, 8500 residents would be living in developments the City knew were likely to be built between 2022 and 2035. Coffee Creek and Basalt Creek would likely be built out within a 20-year time period. While those were industrial uses, the City knew it would happen during the subject growth period.
- The expected growth chart should reflect the planning the City knew was already in progress. The city's population would increase from 27,000 to 37,000 just with the known development in Frog Pond East and South and Town Center, and that did not include Frog Pond West. The standard curve should include known development and another curve should address potential additional growth.
 - Additionally, the City should be explicit in its conservatism. Right now, the plan showed a 12 percent population growth from 2021 to 2045, but a 30 percent increase in load. The discrepancy between those two numbers should be explicit, especially as it the Master Plan progressed toward Council. The plan needed to be explicit in why the load increase was twice as much as the population growth, which was a big deal.
 - Mr. Nacrelli clarified Jacobs Engineering had taken over CH2MHill, the company that had the design/build/operate contract for the treatment plant, so Jacobs was now the City's contract operator for the treatment plant.
- As different population projections were done, Staff and the consultants were asked to use the same time frame for gathering historical data and for the future projection. For example, show 30 years' worth of previous data and then project 30 years into the future. A projection using 5 years of data to project 25 years in the future was not statistically defensible. The prior five years of growth could have been a growth spurt that was being extended 30 years into the future, which was not accurate. Growth, especially in a small city like Wilsonville, was choppy, so it should be averaged out to determine the long-term trends.

3. Frog Pond East and South Master Plan (Pauly)

Dan Pauly, Planning Manager, noted this was the Commission's sixth work session on the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan. He presented the Master Plan, including updates in response to the Commission's feedback via PowerPoint, reviewing the housing related design concepts and describing the similarities and differences between the three housing design types, displaying examples of each type using photographs from Villebois and Frog Pond West. He noted three housing design types were not set in stone, but the presentation addressed questions from Council and would be helpful for the Commission. Understanding the three housing types would be important in developing policy.

Joe Dills, MIG|APG continued the PowerPoint presentation, summarizing the feedback and preferences discussed by the Planning Commission last month, noting the aspiration to create and connect special destinations within the neighborhoods was still part of the physical planning. (Slide 29) He described the

updates made to create the Draft Plan Preferred Alternative (Slide 30), including changes to traffic circulation, street classifications, and the placement of housing types which helped enhance connectivity throughout the Master Plan area. Additional comments from Saumya Kini from Walker Macy addressed the equitable distribution of housing and multiple types of affordable products throughout the neighborhood and Andrew Paris from MIG|APG overviewed the housing capacity estimates and mix assumptions used to determine the impacts to transportation and infrastructure planning.

Mr. Dills noted the Planning Commission's policy discussion would determine how to achieve the best variety within the housing types. Unlike Villebois, which had a master developer, replicating the best of Villebois would need to be done through public standards and zoning ordinance techniques.

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

- Initially there did not seem to be enough Type I in South, but since three-unit town houses could fit into both Type I and Type II. The mix within the type allowed some flexibility with the minimums and maximums. The map was fine.
- Ms. Kini clarified the arrows pointing toward the BPA easement indicated there would be some kind of public connection, whether it was an alley or a pocket park.
 - Mr. Pauly added Staff was still exploring a potential connection across the easement on the north end near the Grange. Otherwise, Staff did not expect any vehicular access across the easement.
- Mr. Dills clarified the arrow down the middle of BPA easement was a proposed trail and as it connected to and crossed Stafford Rd, the trail would be in the proximity of the northern extension of the Boeckman Creek Trail, which Metro was ultimately showing as a trail that would go up into the Stafford Basin. The proposed trail would connect the area to the larger, regional trail network. (Slide 30)
 - Having openings into that open space between houses on the long block paralleling the BPA easement was suggested.
- Ms. Kini noted previous discussions suggested a portion of school property south of the Future Community Park could provide an opportunity for Type 1 housing; however, since the previous meeting, it had been determined that property should be considered part of the school district and was shown as such on the map. The team also had good communication with the City's traffic engineers and the School District about the trail connections and felt confident about showing a trail connection going south toward Boeckman Creek Primary School.
 - Did the land use change result in fewer dwelling units in Alternative C? At the last meeting, Alternative C had a total of 1,803 dwelling units and now it showed approximately 1,600 units. The focus of the new alternative was to do a little mixing and matching within Alternative C. Was the reduction in the overall buildable area driving the reduction in the number of units?
 - Mr. Dills confirmed the school parcel was part of the reduction, but the larger cumulative effect was from going from fuzzy lines to hard lines with block thinking. The amount of Type I decreased as it was fit into areas with the actual conceptual block formation.

Mr. Pauly continued the PowerPoint presentation with a review of housing variety policy options, key points to consider, and a summary of four draft policy options to facilitate housing variety. Staff recommended combining Policy Options 2 and 3 to adopt a minimum of target housing types and a maximum of individual housing types.

- He clarified that including Frog Pond West, the entire area was similar to Villebois, which was developed mainly by four developers. While some small developers would come into play, Frog Pond would ultimately have a maximum of four or five developers. Frog Pond East would not have as many as North

where the large tracts of land would likely be controlled by one or two developers. There was potential for some smaller scale projects in the southern portion.

Planning Commissioner comments and responses to Staff's questions (Slide 37) continued as follows with Staff addressing further questions as noted.

Commissioner Willard expressed support for Policy Option 4.

Commissioner Karr:

- Liked Policy Option 4 but asked if specifying a minimum and maximum would require a minimum and maximum for each housing category within the type or could a maximum just be attached to detached single-family, for example.
 - Mr. Pauly replied the number would be adjustable; each bucket did not have to be in each block. The minimums and maximums could vary based on the size of the subdistrict or the context.
- Noted detached single-family would push things out of the affordable range, so developers would get the idea if a maximum was placed on at least detached single-family. He believed minimum and maximum requirements were needed on housing types in order to meet the City's affordable and equitable housing initiatives. If not required, developers would build detached single-family houses as they were the most profitable.

Commissioner Woods also liked Staff's recommendation, which provided a good balance between the City complying with HB 2001 and providing a limit range on housing types. However, in addition to single-family detached homes, there should be options for tiny homes, perhaps even a tiny home requirement, if builders were available, to offer more affordability for first-time homebuyers. He clarified tiny homes were typically 499 sq ft to a maximum of 899 sq ft and had all the amenities of a larger home but were just smaller in size and cost.

Commissioner Gallagher believed the City needed to be very clear about the minimum standards regarding what the City wanted to achieve. If the City just made suggestions, profit would overrule standards. She confirmed this was captured in Policy Option 4.

Commissioner Mesbah:

- Also liked Policy Option 4. In looking at the different housing types presented, it was clear that articulation of the façade made a big difference in how the space looked and felt. He was not sure the project team was talking about that level of design at this point or if they ever would.
 - Mr. Pauly replied the City could build off some of the articulation standards adopted for Middle Housing as well as the articulation standards in Frog Pond.
- Commented he had to remind himself that details, like bump outs and coves, which make an attractive façade add to the cost of construction, but he would hate to see blank walls for the affordable housing. There was an approach to affordable housing that said real affordable housing needed to be really well designed because otherwise there were additional costs in maintenance and other things. He hoped it would all fall into place to be a harmonious and coherent look for the neighborhood.

Commissioner Karr asked that Staff include a breakdown of the housing types in Villebois at a future work session. Villebois was a good representation of what the Planning Commission would like to see; though the streets were narrow, it was a nice housing development. He noted discussion had begun about urban renewal and using tax incremental funding to help with some of the HB 2001 affordability requirements in Frog Pond.

Commissioner Heberlein:

- Agreed requiring a certain mix of housing was the only way to go realistically and liked the idea of focusing on a maximum number of single-family homes, which should be investigated further. However, would placing a maximum number on any product type penalize later developers as those in earlier could take up certain housing units? Was there some mechanism to help ensure that would not happen?
 - Mr. Pauly replied the geography the standards were based on would assume each geography was done by one single developer.
- Supported Policy Option 4 as a blend was good.
- Requested that Staff bring examples of housing variety policies that had been successful elsewhere to future work sessions to be used as a template.
 - Mr. Dills replied research had shown that Wilsonville was a trailblazer regarding such policy.

INFORMATIONAL

4. Outreach Framework (Pauly)

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, noted Consultants Bill de la Cruz and Pat Noyes had concluded their contract work resulting in draft Outreach Framework. He presented the Wilsonville Framework for Inclusive Engagement via PowerPoint, noting the updates made since the Commission's May work session and.... providing an overview of the framework, how the process was designed, examples of barriers and potential actions, as well as a menu of outreach activity, and next steps.

Commissioner Karr believed the City had done a good job of engaging with the community in the past, but the framework elevated its game, adding a focus on underrepresented stakeholders would help to better serve the entire community, not just the few who attended all the meetings. He applauded the City's efforts, noting in the long run, the framework would make the City/Wilsonville that much better.

Commissioner Woods said he had participated in the framework from the very beginning and found the outcome to be very comprehensive, detailed, and specific. Some key items would be very difficult to overcome, the first being the general interest from the community itself and looking at what the community wants and needs. Hopefully, there were community ambassadors to help to pool groups together and find out exactly what the City was missing. 'Build it and they will come' would not work in this scenario. There were multiple attack points the City would have to approach and it would take some time. Engaging unrepresented stakeholders would be extremely important. The framework was an excellent document, but the City had to do a deep dive and look at how to tie together some of the needs while trying to understand what the community and underserved communities need as well as finding ways to bring them out. Some people would not be able to travel to meetings or access Zoom meetings. It was a good document, but there were key points to concentrate on to make the City's objectives work.

Commissioner Mesbah seconded Commissioner Woods' statements. He was pleased with the framework document, adding the City was dealing with a general citizenry that is disinterested until something is proposed that catches their attention. Throughout the country, communities were finding out that they needed to build that kind of engagement and community spirit into a functioning democracy at a small scale. Part of the impetus for having the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Committee was to have a committee focused on building that kind of rapport with the community and that kind of outreach, especially with underrepresented communities. Perhaps, if the City built engagement with the underrepresented, the rest of the community would also get interested because the effort necessary to do that kind of work would have spillover effects throughout the community. The Planning Commission needed to think about building that level of engagement as part of its job description. The Planning Commission was the outreach committee. As the document noted, just holding public hearings was not outreach. The Commission needed to come up with

ideas to engage portions of neighborhoods and the community on different issues; perhaps even going out to the community instead of expecting the community to come to the Planning Commission. He wanted to underscore Commissioner Woods' statement that this work was heavy lifting, and the City needed to start brainstorming about how to do it.

Commissioner Gallagher agreed it was a heavy lift and added that, as an ethicist, she wanted to point out that the City could have the best of intentions, but it was trying to overcome something that was based on a sense of trust and respect, which was not something that could be overcome by forming a committee with good intentions; it had to be built over time through action, and it was a very challenging process, especially in the country right now. She did not want all the good intentions of trying to bring people together to overlook the reason why those populations felt not included to begin with, which would just put a Band-aid on a problem that was not going to heal.

Commissioner Heberlein believed the Outreach Framework was a great step towards helping to ensure the City was consistent in how it reached out and solicited input. A key would be to focus on Steps 1 and 2, making sure the citizenry was involved in defining the problem and identifying the desired outcome and making sure the City was focused on listening to the entirety of the citizenry in those early steps. The City tended to jump to brainstorming solutions, but it needed to make sure it had a general consensus on defining the problem. There was a significant amount of disagreement over whether a bridge was needed on the Boeckman Dip and the City's money being better spent elsewhere. This was an example of where the City may have been able to do a better job of defining the problem, the desired outcome, and getting the citizens' involvement up front to mitigate some of that, even though it may have resulted in the same solution. He was hopeful the document could help the City make more informed decisions moving forward.

Commissioner Gallagher noted earlier comments about setting a minimum standard for developers in terms of the types of housing the City wanted and added that in a way, the Commission was really asking the citizens of Wilsonville, 'What kind of town are we? What kind of a place do we want to be? What kind of values and what kind of behavior do we want to reflect that will make people feel welcome here and included?' How could this be quantified [put your arms around it] unless certain behavioral standards were set in order to achieve the vision for the type of community the citizens wanted and tried to live it every day.

Commissioner Willard asked to see the long-term data over the engagement through the six steps outlined in the Framework. Was there a particular step in which the community was more engaged? Those numbers could be used as a baseline to measure progress from. In terms of diversity, equity, and inclusion, it would be helpful to understand what parity was. What did the City know about the mix in the community and the engagement it got now, and when would that be at parity? Those two data figures would be meaningful to understand if the City was making progress.

5. City Council Action Minutes (June 6 & 20, 2022) (No staff presentation)

There were no comments.

6. 2022 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

There were no comments.

ADJOURNMENT

The regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission adjourned at 8:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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