



*Draft PC Minutes were reviewed and approved as corrected at the November 16, 2022 PC Meeting. Corrections are in bold and underlined.*

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

September 14, 2022 at 6:00 PM

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, September 14, 2022. Chair Heberlein called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., followed by roll call. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ron Heberlein, Jennifer Willard, Aaron Woods, Andrew Karr, Breanne Tusinski, and Olive Gallagher. Kamran Mesbah arrived after Roll Call.

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Daniel Pauly, 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 July 13, 2022 and August 10, 2022 Planning Commission Minutes

This item was addressed after Informational items.

Commissioner Mesbah noted the following corrections to the July 13, 2022, minutes:

*(Note: additional language shown in bold, italicized text)*

- Page 2 of 10, second bullet, fourth sentence, "The Dewatering Performance Optimization project did **not** yet have a dollar amount..."
- Page 3 of 10, eight bullet, last sentence, "...assuming people would **not** be as wasteful as they were today?"

**Commissioner Gallagher moved to approve the July 13, 2022, minutes as corrected. Commissioner Karr seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

The August 10, 2022, Planning Commission Minutes were accepted as corrected.

### WORK SESSION

## 2. Airport Good-Neighbor Policies (Bateschell)

**Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director**, reminded that the purpose of the project was that the City of Wilsonville has interest in airport resource, the French Prairie District south of the Willamette River, and potential growth that may happen at the airport and adjacent to it. In order for the City to have a voice at the table as an affected jurisdiction in any planning, or discussions around growth that may happen there, the City needed adopted policies to help provide City Staff and other leaders with guidance on how to give direction about Wilsonville's interests and position when at the table. The project involved developing those policies, but also aligning them with the role of the Comprehensive Plan. The project team was challenged in working with larger encompassing discussions with many community members and knowing how to dial the feedback from citizens into the City's role, particularly since the airport was not within the city; knowing how to align the policies with the role of the Comprehensive Plan, and that the policies being put in place were both relevant to the City's interests and concerns, but also written in a manner that aligned with the scope consistent with Wilsonville's role as a neighboring city and the role of the Comprehensive Plan. The draft policies presented to the Commission were developed as an Area of Special Concern in the Comprehensive Plan. After a lot of discussion with the Planning Commission, City Council and amongst the project team, they landed on maintaining it as an Area of Special Concern for a couple of reasons since that component of the Comprehensive Plan was to outline areas with special considerations when development occurred in that area. While there might be broader impacts in the city coming from activity at the airport or potential growth, the impact area might be different than the Area of Special Concern because the area map depicted the development area where the policies would guide the City's review and participation, which was why the policy objectives were presented as an Area of Special Concern as opposed to distributed across the Comprehensive Plan. The Commission's task was to advise on any missing components within the draft policies and whether the draft policy objectives captured the City's scope of influence and aligned with the Comprehensive Plan. The next step was a public hearing in November.

**Chris Green, Senior Planner, HHPR**, presented the Airport Good-Neighbor Policies via PowerPoint, highlighting interests, concerns, and feedback received while engaging the community, stakeholders Planning Commission and City Council. He also reviewed the draft policy objectives and the proposed boundary for the Area of Special Concern.

Discussion and feedback from the Planning Commission regarding these questions posed from the project team was as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

*Are there any key policy objectives or special considerations missing?*

*Do the policy objectives reflect the City's scope of influence?*

- How would the City enforce the Good-Neighbor Policies, seeing that the subject area was in the Comprehensive Plan but not in the city? How would the policies work in actuality?
  - **Mr. Green** explained that as an affected jurisdiction, the adopted policies would give the City something to point to as a starting point in regional conversations around issues and objectives that have been identified. The policies did not enforce things outside the city boundary.
  - **Ms. Bateschell** added that as part of the City's Urban Growth Management Area Plan agreement with the County many years ago, a shared area of interest was established, and that

boundary included the airport and this area of the county, which actually expanded beyond Area O, and anytime a development application came forth in that area, the City was required to be notified per that agreement. The City did have an opportunity to review development applications proposed adjacent to or in the surrounding area of the airport, whether it was airport-related or not. In reviewing the development proposals in Area O, the City would look to the policy objectives in that area to help guide Wilsonville's concerns and interests as a City and its standing in reviewing those applications. Reviewing for things like rural development, consistency with regional and state policies, how development should occur in EFU land, and provide public comment consistent with the Comprehensive Plan policies for things like adequate services. Staff had done that on a number of applications to date in the county. Having the adopted policies in the Comprehensive Plan gave the City a bit more standing when the comments were being reviewed by the deciding body and/or any appeals body. The City did not necessarily have control over that land, and could not control exactly what happened there, but it provided us with that the information in terms of how the City should review and comment, and how those comments might be treated.

- **Amanda Guile-Hinman, City Attorney**, confirmed the City would have comment with standing, legally speaking. Another component was that the State had agency coordination programs, which included the Oregon Department of Aviation. As an affected jurisdiction, requirements had to be met, not only in providing notice, but coordinating if there were conflicts the affected jurisdiction noted, which pointed to what the Comprehensive Plan stated. Right now, that was silent for Wilsonville, and so this was a way for the City to be clear about its objectives and where it might point to identify where there might be conflict.
- Would there be a special area of concern between the airport and the city boundary? What happened if growth was proposed, not as part of the airport, but as a peripheral to the airport, such as a convention center?
  - **Ms. Bateschell** believed that would be outside the scope of this project. The Airport Good-Nighbor Policies came about due to concerns about ensuring the City had a potential role in the airport master planning process and that Wilsonville was an affected jurisdiction, someone who's a part of that conversation. Any concerns about rural development in general would spark a conversation about illegal urbanization of rural land. At that point, multiple other enforcement layers would be at play, it may not be needed at the City necessarily, because it would be private development at an urbanized level that would not be allowed by the County or State. If other bodies were not enforcing it to the degree that Wilsonville had concern over, the City could address and discuss at a later point in time or under a different project: would the City want to have another area that addressed private development in French Prairie as a whole.
  - A high functioning airport like this begs for an adjacent convention center, which was big bucks and not far-fetched in terms of long-range, regional development. Dealing with development as it came was a good approach.
- Was this a document that would be shared with the airport commission and Marion County, or was this an internal document for the City to use in the event it was notified? It seemed that notification would be required to those impacted by any adopted policy.
  - **Ms. Bateschell** clarified this language would be adopted into the Comprehensive Plan. She was uncertain about legal notice requirements but will follow up with legal counsel and confirm whether the airport commission and Marion County would be on the notification list. If

providing public comment on a development or through the planning process, the City would likely share its position, which would be founded in the Comprehensive Plan.

- She clarified the City's position had not yet been formulated in the City's policies and Comprehensive Plan.
- Were flight patterns and safety part of the conversation? Were they an issue?
  - **Mr. Green** responded Cities were limited in what they could do directly. One objective was to coordinate with agencies that enforce some of the rules about noise and safety. The federal regulations have a Part 150 that federally addresses what could happen around airports in terms of noise. A type of study, done once in Oregon for PDX, was mentioned in the objective to the extent that it made sense for the City and Comprehensive Plan to discuss it. A lot of the regulation occurs at the federal and state levels.
    - Noise abatement studies were funded by federal grants through the FAA, so it would be a matter of convincing state, but likely federal government to fund that type of study. The grant cycles came up from time to time, so it would be a matter of advocating for that type of study to be done for the Aurora State Airport. The programs and criteria for awarding the funds changed with each cycle. The objective was written to be flexible about any potential funding opportunities, but not because money was currently available.
- **Ms. Bateschell** clarified this was the final draft document, which could change based on feedback from the Commission. The intent was to have a public hearing at the Commission's November meeting.
- The potential negative impacts to the development of industrial land in Wilsonville was not clear. What connection existed between potential development around the airport and that harming Wilsonville's development of industrial land? Were there companies that the airport would be poaching from the City's industrial land?
  - **Mr. Green** explained that within Wilsonville and Metro, the adopted industrial development standards require certain levels of infrastructure, zoning that has design standards, etc., and the project team was uncertain how that would necessarily play out in a hypothetical, industrial area next to the airport. As far as companies being poached, developing within an already urbanized area that was providing the necessary services versus something that was close to an airport but did not have that infrastructure in place could be a lower cost option, but then the cost would be in those impacts to the environment around it, including Wilsonville.
  - Development in Aurora, Butteville, or any other areas around Wilsonville would also be a concern, so it was not just an airport specific concern.
    - **Mr. Green** noted that being a city, Aurora already had municipal services and zoning specific to that type of development, but area around the airport was not municipality.
- With regard to the resiliency, how would an increase in runway length or any other practical change in the configuration of the airport, impact its function in emergency response?
  - **Mr. Green** replied it might not, but the idea was given its close access to Wilsonville, the emphasis was on providing those general aviation services versus becoming a different type of airport, essentially prioritizing different types of air traffic.
  - Was the assumption that the airport would become a regional or international airport? A longer runway would allow for a potentially larger airplane to land, which would aid in disaster response, not make it worse.

- **Mr. Green** responded the objective was not in response to a longer runway specifically, but anything that could come up in the airport planning process that would impact general airport operations.
- **Brad Kilby, HHPR**, clarified the project team was not putting this objective necessarily forward to stop them from building a longer runway, but trying to highlight considerations that Wilsonville would like the airport to consider in any discussions about how it continues to grow. This specific objective recognizes that the airport provides a benefit to the community, and probably the region at large, for having a runway that was available, though helicopter pads were probably more relevant currently. There was talk about reclassifying the Hillsboro Airport as a new type of airport due to its activity and size, but he did not foresee that at the Aurora Airport at any specific time in the near future given the high cost to bring in the urban services for water/sewer that would be needed before considering altering it. The objective just noted the City's concern and reason for the concern, not specifically to stop the airport from building a longer runway.
- **Chair Heberlein** stated he was struggling with finding a conceivable scenario that would result in a negative impact to emergency operations, and the extended runway was the most prominent example available. Even a change in designation would not impact the airport's ability to serve as a disaster relief airport, so why should that be put in the Comprehensive Plan as an actual concern?
  - **Mr. Green** said he did not believe it was meant to anticipate a specific change, as much as it was a benefit the City wanted to retain. It was probably not one where they could draw a direct line that extending the runway would be bad for emergency services, because it would not; but if something happened in the future, this at least, records the community's interest in having those things based there.
- **Chair Heberlein** replied, without a plausible scenario, how could the City have a concern?
- **Commissioner Karr** noted this Area of Special Concern extended beyond the airport. Any development in that area that impacts the airport's ability to deliver those emergency services was a concern to the City. The roadway and infrastructure were rural, so if development continues around the airport to a point where they were straining that infrastructure, making it less likely that the airport could provide those emergency services, that was the City's concern.
- **Chair Heberlein** suggested rewording of the draft language to reflect the concept that it was a concern more about the infrastructure around the airport than the airport itself.
  - **Ms. Bateschell** asked whether the rewriting should be to the final bullet on Page 2, which would be the issues or potential impacts, or Policy Objective 6, which was an interrelated policy objective that seemed to address the matter.
  - **Chair Heberlein** stated his concern was about the verbiage regarding the potential impacts in the preamble. He clarified he was okay with Policy Objective 6.
- **Commissioner Mesbah** noted that limiting the concern to development around the airport itself was too limiting. The objective was a heads-up that this airport was a resource for emergency delivery and that function must be maintained. It did not need to be a specific scenario. It was just one of the issues of interest to the City. While development around and clogging the roadways, etc. would be one scenario, if that was the only focus, other stuff might be **missed**. The whole idea was that this was open-ended, so whatever happened, this was one thing on the checklist to watch for and ensure it was covered. That seemed to be the intent of

the objective, not as an impediment for the airport to function as an airport and a resource, which would continue.

- **Chair Heberlein** stated if the City had specific concerns, they needed to be stated along with the potential impacts. If the City could not come up with a conceivable potential impact that made sense, then what were the merits of including the concerns?
- **Mr. Green** read the proposed change of the second sentence in the last bullet on Page 2 of Attachment 1 as follows: “Changes to the configuration of the Airport, type of operations housed there, or development-related impacts to surface transportation connections between Wilsonville and Area O, ~~would~~ **could** diminish the overall benefits provided by the Airport.”
- **Commissioner Willard** noted the language should state, “changes to the configuration of the ~~Airport~~ **Area of Concern**,” because it was not exclusive to the Airport.
  - **Mr. Green** agreed, adding it said surface transportation, but if there were other development related impacts to air navigation from that development, it would already be covered by FAA.
- **Commissioner Karr** questioned the need for the second sentence as the first addressed Commissioner Mesbah's point of making sure the City was protecting the integrity of the emergency services. There could be unexpected uncertainties, but did the Commission want to hamstring the City by putting in that second sentence?
- **Mr. Kilby** reminded the draft polices would be in the Comprehensive Plan. It was not a regulatory document, but a framework document that acts as a foundation that the City's regulations were built on. The intent of this whole process was to show both the impacts and benefits to the citizens of Wilsonville from activities at the airport. The document would help remind future City Staff and Commissioners about this discussion.
- **Commissioner Mesbah** noted that looking at the benefits of the airport, if he were the airport, he would approach the City about collaborating, which was why he liked the checkboxes.
- Objective 3 should be updated to reference, ~~FAR Part 150~~ **14 CFR Part 150**, because it was Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations Part 150, and other Part 150's were throughout the Code of Federal Regulations.
- Objective 4, if the airport was in Marion County, why would Clackamas County policies be referenced?
  - **Mr. Green** replied that would potentially be part of the area that would be impacted. The City would be looking to review the Area of Special Concern, but those impacts were related to the rural reserves that Clackamas County designated in between Wilsonville and the airport. He understood that was outside of Area of Concern O.
  - **Ms. Bateschell** clarified this was a technical reference to the rural reserves, which did not exist in Marion County. The reference reflected the City's desire to protect rural reserves, which were agreed upon by the region and Clackamas County. The policy could be made clearer to apply to EFU in Marion County and rural reserves in Clackamas County to capture both.
- Why would the Area of Special Concern be larger than the airport perimeter and the through the fence area? That was the area of development that would occur at the airport, anything else outside of that was something that could happen regardless of whether the airport was there. What was the likelihood of an airport-related development across the highway? And, if that was not likely, why include it within the Area of Special Concern?

- **Mr. Green** replied some probability or possibility of growth happening was anticipated if there was an expansion of the airport area, resulting in the development area potentially expanding outward as well.
  - He clarified these were not necessarily trying to anticipate specific events happening that would lead to development in those areas. It was saying development in the area around the airport, such as an industrial development located one parcel away from the through the fence, might occur due to its proximity to the airport.

**Ms. Bateschell** clarified the project team had a work session with the City Council on Monday to review the draft policies and get Council's input. The collective input received would refine what came before the Commission in November.

### 3. Wastewater Treatment Plant Master Plan (Nacrelli)

**Mike Nacrelli, Senior Civil Engineer** updated on the progress of the Wastewater Treatment Master Plan (WWTP) process via PowerPoint noting the growth projections presented to the Commission in July were based on lower growth projections from Metro. Following discussions with the Planning Commission and internal with management, the project team [we] went back and looked at the higher growth curve, which was just under 3 percent annually, and reran the numbers for the modeling of the flows and loads at the plant, as well as the impact on plant capacity and the capital investment required to handle that level of growth, which resulted in substantial changes. (Slide 3) An updated project phasing schedule and cost estimates were created for the projects and all the other portions of the Master Plan document impacted by these changes were being updated as well. An online public open house would begin September 28<sup>th</sup> for any members of the general public who wanted to provide input.

**Dave Price, Carollo Engineers**, continued the PowerPoint presentation on the WWTP Master Plan process, reviewing the updates made to the Facility Capacity Assessment and Unit Process Capacity Summary, given the higher growth projections from Metro; the Alternatives Evaluation and Recommended Plan for the required improvement projects, including new capacity upgrades, as well as the now more accelerated Project Phasing Schedule. With the higher growth scenario, the Project Costs had increased to more than three times the approximately \$31 million reported in July. The Draft Cash Flow chart provided a visual representation of the Project Costs along the timeline. (Slide 10)

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

- Looking at the Draft Cash Flow, the membrane bioreactor (MBR) was the biggest outlay of cash in years. Was the City doing any pro-planning of the funds that would be needed for that?
  - **Mr. Nacrelli** replied that upon completion of this plan and part of next steps, the City planned to do a rate and SDC study within this current budget year to look at the details of how to fund the improvements through a combination of rate adjustments and SDCs, and maybe other mechanisms available.
- Assuming some monies were already in reserve, at what point would the rate and SDC changes need to happen for the monies to be there for the 2028, 2029, 2030 MBR expenditures?

- **Mr. Nacrelli** replied the timing was one of the question the study would have to be able to answer. He suspected rate and SDC increases would be phased in over time, but that would have to be fleshed out in that study, accommodating the growth expected and how those rates would have to be adjusted as growth occurs in order to provide the necessary funding. Once the study and public involvement process were completed, and the fee increases adopted, the new rates would probably have to start right away to make those adjustments.
- How would rate changes for future expansion be explained to existing customers?
  - **Mr. Nacrelli** stated that was ultimately a Council decision. He agreed the majority of the investment was driven by capacity needs; however, some components involved replacing old equipment, so it was not entirely growth driven. He anticipated the impact on SDCs would be far greater than the impact on rates.
- **Mr. Nacrelli** confirmed the improvements would be triggered by threshold population growth; as growth reached a certain place, a new unit gets triggered which provides some flexibility, so the project costs/schedule were not cast in concrete
- Regarding the cost of growth, this was an interesting exercise because in simulating a doubling of the size and the cost tripled, which slows growth because some of the growth occurs because it was competitive price wise. People come to Wilsonville because it was cheaper than Tualatin, for example, and the city has a growth spurt. Growth slows as costs catch up. The schedule was not cast in concrete, growth triggers the decisions for these units to come in.
  - **Mr. Nacrelli** displayed the Capital Planning and Expected Growth – 2045, explaining the numbers in the table on the left were for the orange curve, but the numbers presented in the PowerPoint were based on the purple curve, which was the same growth rate Mr. Price mentioned was used in the 2014 Collection System Master Plan, as well as the Water Treatment Plant Master Plan, and possibly several other planning documents. (Slide 14)
- **Commissioner Mesbah** noted in a previous life, he would be reviewing the Master Plan. A community's Comprehensive Plan was a wish that did not necessarily come true. A cost-effective analysis was needed of some of this projection, growth, and units, especially since by taking this population growth curve, the City had managed to say the only option was the MBR treatment, which was a more expensive treatment, which he understood was to meet higher water quality standards. It was taking away a lot of choices that the City may do well to consider. Maybe the City decides it does not want to double in size—ever—to avoid dealing with higher water quality impacts on city water. These were necessary to explain to rate payers in a comprehensive and understandable way why the City was planning what it was planning. Questions like, “Am I paying for someone else’s growth?” were divisive and not helpful to a sense of community. This was a community service, and it should be approached as a benefit for all and the environment that was receiving the City’s treated waste.
- In terms of the current analysis for flow rates and the details in some of the earlier slides, what baseline population numbers were used as the starting point, 2021 or 2015?
  - **Mr. Price** explained typically 5 to 6 years' worth of data were used, adding this could be considered a 2021 number. When looking at existing data, they often analyzed the flow meter and data being collected from operators at the plant, then they projected out using unit factors and numbers that were conservative to a certain extent, making sure it provided for some flexibility in terms of how the facility was being planned. If the numbers being used were too conservative, and growth did not occur as that particular projection envisioned, then the Plan needed to adjust to that.



- The projected flows made sense, but did the City really expect to be at that 2045 population level to drive all the necessary infrastructure requirements that had been defined. (Slide 14) In July, the projection seemed low and now, was it too high? Was there a middle ground that was a more realistic growth scenario or, if that were to come to pass, would the system's design be done differently from a planning perspective if 45,000 people were expected rather than 52,000.
  - **Mr. Price** responded not necessarily, given the space available at the existing treatment plant site. The City would likely wind up with the same recommendation.
  - **Mr. Nacrelli** noted it might push the timeline further into the future, but to serve the ultimate build out, whether that happened in 2045 or later, there was no more space to do something different.
  - **Mr. Price** agreed, adding they had looked at other options to provide capacity and other processes to intensify secondary treatment, and the conclusion was that the MBR was the direction the City should go no matter the timeline. This was a plan the team believed would provide a very robust facility that the City could feel confident would meet its requirements on the water quality side, while also being flexible to the degree to which it could be made flexible; some additional variations could be added should different criteria or scenarios apply over the next 23 years. At this time, the July and this current proposal bracketed the range of options.
  - **Mr. Nacrelli** stated the Rate and SDC Study would certainly look at how the funding would be impacted by changes in growth. If growth slowed way down for some reason and the projected flows were not achieved, then the City would likely push some of these projects out. To serve the ultimate population within the UGB around Wilsonville with the limited existing site, what would be built would not change, just possibly when things were built.
  - **Mr. Price** noted none of the scenarios accounted for any significant changes on the regulatory side. There were processes in place, underway, or pending to potentially look at other pollutants that might be regulated. This particular plan provided a very firm basis upon which to build, which was why the aeration basin was proposed first as opposed to going right to the membranes. Having that additional volume and capacity in the plant would provide flexibility for the City in the future in being able to address potential future regulatory concerns.
    - He noted that when the membrane facility was in place, the filters and the two secondary clarifiers that are not demolished would effectively become redundant facilities because the MBR would produce **effluent that** would not be necessary to run through clarifiers and filters because of the process of the liquid separation that occurs with the membrane.
    - The membrane facility was chosen due to the site constraints at the treatment plant, but when the facilities are in place, some space would be freed up providing the City with some flexibility in the future should additional regulatory issues arise in addition to the growth.
- **Commissioner Mesbah** said he wanted to clarify his earlier comments. The proposed plan was based on population that was currently baked into the City's plans and would eventually happen, so the projects would be necessary. As long as this plan was based on need and the projects were pushed out if the population growth did not happen, it was a sound plan. The City still needed to explain it very clearly, so it did not create an impression that this was cost for newcomers versus cost for what was not done before, etc. He was unsure whether the fiscal impacts of growth were looked at ahead of planning. Since it was a separate process, it did not get considered when the City adopted new areas to grow into. He suggested doing this kind of thinking before adding areas would be helpful in the overall process.

- **Commissioner Karr** believed the original concern with following the orange line was the fact that the Commission knew of future developments that were going to exceed the orange line. If those developments come to fruition, the orange line was not usable, and that becomes the problem of, "It's an essential service and it has to be in place". Even though there was a timeline, it sounded like the project list would not change, only the timing of the project list and representative costs. He proposed amending the chart on Page 3 to state, "**potential** timeframe based on expected growth" to provide a clearer picture. Since the expenditures for these projects depended upon seeing the anticipated growth, the timeframe should be a little more 'squishy'. (Slide 9)
  - **Mr. Nacrelli** confirmed that whether build out was reached around 2045 or 10 years later, the facilities would still be needed, but perhaps not as soon. (Slide 9)
  - **Chair Heberlein** suggested adding "estimated timeframe" as well as "estimated costs" to clarify there was no hard date.
  - **Mr. Nacrelli** stated that even with the orange population curve, the aeration basin would be done fairly soon.
  - He clarified the first few projects before the aeration basin were not substantial and that the funding for those first few was available, adding the projects were not necessarily even growth projects. (Slide 9)
- The new aeration basin was more growth driven than current population, replace secondary clarifier mechanisms was maintenance, but all the "new" projects were growth-driven. The majority of the estimated cost was growth related and if the timeline was not certain, it would be better to state an estimated timeframe instead of a timeframe which leads people to think a project was certain to happen at that point.
  - **Mr. Nacrelli** agreed that could be presented better and they would make it clear in the document.
- Rather than 'squishy' the project team was encouraged to use 'commensurate to population threshold numbers' and hopefully, the team could show at least a range population levels that would trigger an action, so that it gave some guidance to decision makers.
  - **Mr. Price** agreed including an assumed population column would be helpful.
  - **Mr. Nacrelli** reminded there was a significant element of industrial use in the projections, so population could be a guide, but it was not 100 percent.
- **Commissioner Gallagher** said she fully supported taking care of infrastructure, but she reacted to the projection of growth. Did the City really plan on doubling the population of Wilsonville? Is that what was wanted? Was that what this was all about or was that what the City was concerned about?
  - **Mr. Nacrelli** displayed the City Land use Designations Map, noting most of the service area was mostly already within the city limits. If the available land developed as planned, the projects in the Master Plan was what would be needed, unless there were Zoning or Comprehensive Plan changes.
- The Commissioners discussed where 50,000 people would come from, noting Frog Pond would be 6,000 people. If the study area was based on this Land Use Map boundary, then the population estimates should be based on that boundary as well. Either the boundary or the population estimate was off, as well as what the density would permit.
  - **Mr. Nacrelli** clarified these numbers were consistent with the planning done for the sewer system, as well as the water treatment plant currently under expansion. The numbers were not really a departure from other projections the City had been using to plan for infrastructure.

- As long as it was timebound, or population or use based, then it was okay. This was the plan for infrastructure when Wilsonville needed it, regardless of what the boundary said.
- If the team low balled it and blew the water quality standards because the City was now discharging raw sewage or polluted wastewater, it would penalize the City, and potentially put a total stop to any new growth, etc. until it was addressed. The City did not want to be in that position, which was why planning was done ahead of time.

The Planning Commission took a brief recess, reconvening at 7:48 pm

#### 4. Frog Pond East and South Master Plan (Pauly)

**Dan Pauly, Planning Manager**, stated this was the Commission's eighth work session on the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan. He introduced the project team and began the PowerPoint presentation, noting tonight's discussion would be around infrastructure, continued discussion on Housing Variety Policy, next steps, and what the finish line looked like at this point.

- He explained the preliminary work done during the 2015 Frog Pond Area Plan provided a foundation for the list of needed infrastructure projects as well as the cost estimates to develop a program for funding them.
- A sensitivity test for a hypothetical higher residential unit count was included in the water and sewer memorandum, and not in the current draft of the transportation memo. During the State administrative rule making for implementation of House Bill 2001, a variety of options was provided that jurisdictions could take, one of which was to plan for 20 units per net acre. How much more expensive would infrastructure be if 20 units per acre were planned versus what the City anticipated would be built during the initial buildout.

**Jenna Bogert, Transportation Engineer Consultant, DKS Associates**, continued the PowerPoint, highlighting the transportation analysis process and the housing unit and job counts used in the traffic model to identify failing intersections and needed improvements, including for bike and pedestrian facilities. She noted the traffic operations, identified deficiencies, and proposed improvements within the subject area, and described four main intersection improvements, which included roundabouts. (Slide 7) She reviewed the pros and cons of single lane roundabouts, as well as proposed pedestrian and bicycle treatments to address gaps and deficiencies, and the proposed street cross sections on Stafford and Advance Rds.

- **Mr. Pauly** noted the Stafford Rd/65th Avenue intersection was a high-priority project for the County to fix. The team's scenario assumed that those improvements were built within the 2040 baseline being considered. (Slide 6)
- **Ms. Bogert** added City Staff had been informing the County of the changes and plans for the Frog Pond Area throughout the master planning process.

Commissioner comments regarding the transportation infrastructure was as follows with responses to questions by the project team as noted:

- With the Advance Road and 60<sup>th</sup> roundabout so close to the school and park, what advanced safety precautions beyond the crosswalks would be taken because school children would be crossing there?
  - **Mr. Pauly** replied the project team talked directly with the School District this week on how to plan it. The District likes the roundabout for bus and traffic circulation, having buses go out that

way rather than being queued at a stop-controlled intersection. It could certainly be a place where extra flashers were installed, spaced out to increase visibility. He believed such improvements were on the designer's radar.

- The crosswalks on Roundabouts 1, 3, and 6 seemed pretty close to the turning portions of the roundabout and concern was expressed about the potential for an accident.
  - **Ms. Bogert** explained typically crosswalks were placed far enough back from the circulating traffic such that a vehicle could be completely out of the roundabout and on the road that they were traveling on without being in the crosswalk. The crosswalk was usually about a car's length or more away from the actual circulating lane of the roundabout, so that drivers feel comfortable stopping for a pedestrian without feeling they would get rear-ended by someone else in the circulating part of the roundabout. Design standards exist for the distances where the crosswalks are placed with safety in mind.
- As shown, the crosswalks looked very close to the roundabout. It was important to make sure cars coming out of the roundabout have enough time and space to stop for pedestrians and also for vehicles behind a car that has stopped for pedestrians to also come to a stop safely.
  - **Ms. Bogert** clarified the concept figures shown were not to scale but were very much concept icons and not great indications of what would necessarily be seen. (Slide 9)
    - She confirmed the roundabout design would be similar to the Boeckman/Kinsman roundabout from a crosswalk perspective with a 1 to 2 car gap after exiting the roundabout and before the crosswalk, which was a standard design.
- Roundabouts were a good traffic calming feature for the higher urban speeds when entering a neighborhood. The roundabout at the far west side of town on Wilsonville Rd could help slow people down who come flying in from that country road.
- What was the difference between Table 4 and Table 5? The volume through the Stafford/Kahle Rd roundabout increased after improvements were made. (Pages 15 and 17, Traffic Analysis)
  - **Ms. Bogert** clarified the volume differences between those two sets were because of the turn restrictions at Frog Pond Lane, which prevented traffic from turning left or going across. The volumes at Brisband and Kahle increased because that traffic had to be rerouted. It was assumed most of that traffic would go north to Kahle or with some down to Brisband.
    - She confirmed vehicles wanting to turn left on Frog Pond Lane were anticipated to go north on Kahle using the local streets and continue north from there.
    - Traffic was expected to come south as people came in from the country. A lot of the growth was in the south bound direction on Stafford Rd.
- The roundabouts were a great entry feature, however, the roundabout at Advance Rd and 60<sup>th</sup> Ave was not an interface between the rural and urban, because two to three intersections were east of that. What would be done from a traffic calming perspective to address the high speeds on those streets before people get to that roundabout?
  - **Mr. Pauly** replied there would be a median and lane markings, potentially on street parking, so some of those urban things would start to signal a more urban environment; however, there would not be any pedestrian/bicycle conflicts yet. He confirmed there were no crossings on Advanced Rd east of 60<sup>th</sup> Ave, noting a bicycle and pedestrian crossing would be a consideration at that safe intersection at 60<sup>th</sup> Ave in the future since there was no real traffic slowing elements before that.

- From a report perspective, it was confusing to have Figures 1 and 2 before Figures 4 and 5. Reordering the report to have Figures 4 and 5 first showing the analysis based on this situation, and then the figures afterward seemed to make more sense.
  - **Ms. Bogert** explained she usually placed the figures at the front because she assumed most people would not read past the first few pages.

**Mike Carr, Principal Engineer, Murraysmith**, introduced his professional background and presented the proposed water and wastewater systems for East and South Frog Pond via PowerPoint, reviewing the scope of each system analysis, previous studies that provided context and set the criteria for the proposed infrastructure improvements, which he highlighted. The improvements included water distribution and storage projects and wastewater projects within the Master Plan area, as well as offsite wastewater Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects for conveyance to the Wastewater Treatment Plant. Stormwater projects would be presented at a future date

Commissioner comments regarding the water and wastewater infrastructure was as follows with responses to Commissioner questions by the project team as noted:

- Of the four lift stations proposed, why was Station 4 the only one with an alternate lift station.
  - **Mr. Carr** explained in working through the plan with City Staff, discussion included about phasing and how the projects would get implemented. The entire Frog Pond South Area would drain south, and it all needed to be pumped. Station 4 and its associated force main and gravity sewers need to be built at the very beginning, before almost any development in Frog Pond South. The first choice for the primary station location would be at the very south end of 60<sup>th</sup> Ave, but it was not clear that development would occur down there to start with due to extensive costs to bring infrastructure there. Typically, these things happen incrementally. Elevation wise, another location was on the school property. This plan gives planners, designers, and developers opportunities to have other discussions, and those were not the only two locations.
  - **Mr. Pauly** added the entire drainage basin to the north was currently under one ownership, so there was no question that when that developer brings in that chunk of land, they could put in that lift station. In Frog Pond South, the parcels were much smaller for the most part, so if some smaller parcels to the north wanted to develop sooner, then some alternatives were needed if the property to the south was a long-term holdout because there was nowhere else for the sewer to go.
- **Mr. Pauly** confirmed the City was coordinating to combine as many infrastructure projects as possible from the Frog Pond improvements, Boeckman Dip project, Boeckman Rd sewer improvements and the school.
- **Mr. Carr** agreed 8-inch water lines could be installed to match the existing lines at Canyon Creek and the Wilsonville Rd neighborhoods, but the City engineer concluded 12-inch lines would provide robust continuity and the cost was almost the same as installing an 8-inch line.

**Mr. Pauly** continued the PowerPoint addressing questions related to Housing Variety from the last work session about the high income need and ADU costs, all of which was included in the Staff report. The high costs of ADUs reiterated the challenge of market rate affordable home ownership. He then highlighted next steps, noting the upcoming October 12th work session and November public hearing. Certain items, such as infrastructure financing and the details of the Development Code, would be addressed going into 2023. He reviewed what remained to be addressed in the Master Plan by the

Planning Commission in 2022, noting not a lot of discussion or controversy was anticipated because the items were based on prior work or prior precedent. (Slide 23)

- He asked how comfortable the Commission was with where the project was at and its ability to review the entire Master Plan given Metro's December deadline. Feedback was requested about holding a special work session probably in late October or in the next month or so to work through the details and get to a comfort level where the Commission was ready to have a public hearing.
- He explained that Metro's deadline was written as a condition of approval to the ordinance explaining the UGB; however, he was unclear about any enforcement actions. There was also the thought that Metro might be okay with it, but could other organizations sue Metro and the City for not following it. A public hearing to make a Council recommendation would be needed in November for Council to take action by the December deadline.

Following a brief discussion on the time needed to review the remaining Master Plan items and available dates, the Commission consented to hold an additional 3-hour, special work session on October 19<sup>th</sup>.

#### **INFORMATIONAL**

5. City Council Action Minutes (August 1 & 15, 2022) (No staff presentation)
6. 2022 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

**Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director**, highlighted upcoming items, including the agenda items for the October 12<sup>th</sup> meeting, which included a public hearing on the WWTP Master Plan.

The Commission returned to the consideration of the July 13, 2022, meeting minutes at this time.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

**Commissioner Willard moved to adjourn the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 9:09 p.m. Commissioner Gallagher seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

Respectfully submitted,

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