

**Development Review Board – Panel B
Minutes–November 25, 2019 6:30 PM**

I. Call to Order

Chair **Richard Martens** called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. Chair’s Remarks

The Conduct of Hearing and Statement of Public Notice were read into the record.

III. Roll Call

Present for roll call were: Richard Martens, Samy Nada, and Ellie Schroeder

Staff present: Kimberly Rybold, Barbara Jacobson, Cindy Luxhoj, Kerry Rappold, Miranda Bateschell, and Khoi Le

IV. Citizens’ Input This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Development Review Board on items not on the agenda. There were no comments.

V. Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of minutes of October 28, 2019 DRB Panel B meeting

Ellie Schroeder moved to approve the October 28, 2019 DRB Panel B meeting minutes with the Roll Call corrected to state, “~~Elizabeth~~ Ellie Schroeder.” Samy Nada seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

VI. Public Hearing:

A. Resolution No. 371. Willamette Water Supply System Raw Water Facilities: Tualatin Valley Water District and City of Wilsonville – Owners, Willamette Water Supply Program – Applicant. The applicant is requesting approval of a Conditional Use Permit, Site Design Review, Type C Tree Removal Plan, Willamette River Greenway Conditional Use Permit, Abbreviated SROZ Map Refinement and Abbreviated SRIR Review for development of water intake and transmission facilities and associated improvements at the Willamette River Water Treatment Plant. The site is located at 10350 SW Arrowhead Creek Lane on Tax Lots 1800 and 1900 and on temporary and permanent easements on Tax Lot 1700 of Section 23B, Township 3 South Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Cindy Luxhoj

Case Files: DB19-0019 Conditional Use Permit
DB19-0020 Site Design Review
DB19-0021 Type C Tree Removal Plan
DB19-0022 Willamette River Greenway Conditional Use Permit

Chair Martens called the public hearing to order at 6:35 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. Chair Martens and Ellie Schroeder declared for the record that they had visited the site. No board member, however, declared a conflict of interest, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

Cindy Luxhoj, Associate Planner, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on Pages 2 and 3 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

Ms. Luxhoj presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly reviewing the site's history and describing its location, surrounding features and land uses, as well as the requested applications, with these key comments:

- The project site was located at the Willamette River Water Treatment Plant (WRWTP) and Park. The WRWTP was developed in 2002 in a partnership between the City of Wilsonville and the Tualatin Valley Water District (TVWD). The site was jointly owned by the City and TVWD, 51% and 49% respectively. The Applicant was the Willamette Water Supply Program (WWSP), a partnership between TVWD and the cities of Hillsboro and Beaverton, on behalf of the Willamette Water Supply System (WWSS) Commission, with Angelo Planning Group acting as the authorized representative.
- The proposed project would provide a resilient and redundant water supply to several communities on the west side of the metro area, including Hillsboro, Beaverton, and others, via a 66-in water pipeline that would draw water from the Willamette River. The proposed facilities and improvements were collectively referred to as the Raw Water Facilities.
 - She reviewed the overall extent of the project. (Slide 6) From the WRWTP site, raw water would be pumped through the pipeline to a new water filtration plant in Sherwood's Tonquin Employment Area where multiple treatment processes would produce high quality drinking water. The drinking water would then be pumped to reservoir facilities on Cooper Mountain and then gravity-fed to the existing distribution system.
- The WWSP was seeking land use approvals to develop water intake and transmission facilities at the WRWTP site. Construction at the site was planned to start mid next year and expected to be completed in 2024, with the entire WWSS project slated for completion in 2026.
- Proper noticing was followed for the application and no comments were received. Beginning in November 2017, the Applicant conducted outreach activities with neighbors and others in the city to create awareness and provide opportunities for input. There had also been ongoing coordination with City departments, particularly Public Works, Engineering, Natural Resources, Parks, and Planning.
 - Earlier this month, a presentation focused on the proposed park and trail improvements was made to the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, and the Board approved a

recommendation that the parks improvements associated with the project be presented to the DRB with no changes to the design.

- The City and the WWSS Commission entered into an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) for the proposed project that was fully executed on October 30, 2019. (Exhibit B4) Project goals, as outlined in the IGA, included coordinating the design and construction of the proposed work; acknowledging that the proposed work could not interfere in any way with the ability of the WRWTP to produce safe, reliable, and uninterrupted drinking water; and specifically for the City to review and approve the work to ensure it would not unreasonably disturb the WRWTP and park property, operation of the treatment plant, or other City work in those areas; and for the WWSS Commission to design and construct portions of the water transmission facilities and pipeline to further the objectives of the Commission to increase water supply, reliability, redundancy, and resiliency to its member service areas.
- The Conditional Use Permit application was required because the proposal included improvements to the WRWTP and raw water facilities that were regulated as conditional uses in all zones.
 - Some of the improvements included modification to the Willamette River Intake Facilities, the seismic upgrades to the riverbank, pump station upgrades, an electrical duct bank or buried conduit for electrical wiring, a new electrical building, and other public utility structures. In addition, although the proposed underground pipes that were a part of the Raw Water Facility improvements, including the 66-in water main, were permitted in all zones, they were reviewed pursuant to the Conditional Use criteria because they were a part of the set of improvements containing conditional uses.
- Site Design Review applied to the new electrical building and landscaping on the Upper Site. The new building was designed to be simple, attractive, and complementary of other buildings on the WRWTP property. Materials were brick and cast-in-place concrete with a modern look that matched the overall aesthetics of the existing buildings. Design elements included a metal roof, panels and trim, door canopies, window frames, and doors and louvers in a range of neutral colors from medium bronze to light gray and Portland stone. The building and ancillary facilities would be buffered and screened from the adjacent trail, residential area, and road by a high berm and a variety of landscaping.
 - Site Design Review also applied to the minor architectural changes on the pump station building on the Lower Site. The exterior modifications were designed to be consistent with other existing treatment plant buildings, mainly by replacing the brick faces with cast-in-place concrete, which was required as a part of the seismic upgrades.
 - Additionally, Site Design Review also applied to improvements to areas of the park outside the Willamette River Greenway, including landscaping, the park pathway, improvements to the upper overlook, and upper parts of the new west and lower trails.
- The Type C Tree Removal Plan was required due to the 413 trees on the project site, 92 of which were proposed for removal, including 75 inside and 17 outside the SROZ. Tree removal was needed to accomplish the proposed improvements.
 - In Area A, seven trees needed to be removed to locate the receiving shaft near Arrowhead Creek. In Area B1, seven trees needed to be removed, as well as 36 trees in Areas B2 and B3, to locate the pipeline and the fiber optic conduit bench. In Area

- B4, which was closest to the river, 40 trees needed to be removed for the seismic stabilization measures to the pump house and riverbank. (Slide 14)
- Throughout the project site, tree removal was limited to only trees necessary for construction of the proposed improvements, and removal had been minimized to the extent possible while still allowing the work to occur.
 - Tree removal on the Willamette riverbank and in the SROZ would be mitigated in several ways, including: restoring native shrubs over locations of the footprint of the seismic stabilization measures; planting over the location of the informal trail on the riverbank that was being abandoned for safety reasons; plantings associated with the overlooks and the new trails on the riverbank; and planting in a large mitigation area on the Upper Site to create a diverse native upland habitat connected with Arrowhead creeks.
 - To mitigate the removal of the 17 trees outside the SROZ, trees would be planted in landscape areas associated with the new electrical building on the Upper Site, and park improvements on the Lower Site, well in excess of the number of trees removed. For instance, 13 trees would be planted at the main overlook on the Lower Site. (Slide 15) On the Upper Site, 23 trees would be planted on the west berm shown as Area A. In Area C, 34 trees would be planted on the south and east berms, as well as 21 trees along SW Arrowhead Creek Lane for a total of 91 trees, which did not include the additional trees proposed for planting in the stormwater swales surrounding the new electrical building. (Slide 16)
 - Willamette River Greenway Conditional Use Permit. The proposed project also involved several improvements within the Willamette River Greenway which included modifications to the water intake facilities, seismic stability measures, including stability along the riverbank, and landscape improvements and new trails along the riverbank.
 - The applicant had requested approval of an Abbreviated SROZ Map Refinement and SRIR review for exempt development located within the SROZ and its 25-ft impact area. The proposed exempt development included the pipeline bored under Arrowhead Creek Lane at the Upper Site; a pipeline construction corridor along the western side of the treatment plant between it and the ravine along the west side of the Lower Site; staging areas grading and seismic stability improvements along the south side of the Lower Site; and a new path and pedestrian overlook in the Willamette River riparian area.
 - The request was reviewed pursuant to the SROZ ordinance, and the impact to the SROZ was found to be necessary to accommodate public improvements associated with the project. The Applicant provided sufficient information to demonstrate that compliance was correct with the review criteria.
 - The Applicant requested modifications to Conditions of Approval PDB 5, PDB 6, PDC 2, and PDC 4, but because the conditions were based directly on the standards of the Wilsonville Code, Staff did not recommend the requested changes be made, except for one clarification to Condition PDB 5, which applied to Site Design Review and specified requirements for the planting of shrubs and ground cover in landscaped areas of the project site.
 - She entered into the record Exhibit A3, Staff's memorandum dated November 25, 2019 which responded to the Applicant's requests to modify the four conditions of approval.

She noted there had been additional clarifications to the wording of the modifications since the Board members received their copies earlier that afternoon, and the memo presented at the dais was the most recent version of that text.

- Staff recommended that Condition PDB 5 be modified to clarify that the requirements of the condition only applied to plantings in the landscaped areas that were reviewed by Planning Staff. It did not apply to mitigation sites for the SROZ or plantings in stormwater facilities, which were reviewed for compliance by Natural Resource Staff. Staff proposed adding, *"Except for mitigation sites and storm water facilities to be reviewed and approved in writing by Natural Resources Staff pursuant to the conditions and findings outlined in the Staff report,* to the beginning of Condition PDB 5. (Slide 20)
- Staff recommended approval of the Willamette Water Supply System Raw Water Facilities with conditions, including the recommended clarifying edit to Condition PDB 5.

Ellie Schroeder confirmed the bold, italic, underlined language shown in Exhibit A3 were Staff's addition, and that everything else was the same as the initial exhibit provided to the Board.

Chair Martens requested a summary of what work would be done within the SROZ.

Kerry Rappold, Natural Resources Manager, said he had reviewed the proposal based on the Abbreviated SRIR because all of the proposed impacts were exempt within the Code because they complied with the existing Master Plan developed for the site. All of the City's capital projects fell within exemptions within the SROZ, because they were considered in a broader perspective as far as the environmental impacts and sometimes other types of permitting were required, similar to the proposed project.

- The most significant impact would be to the riparian area along the Willamette River, which would undergo seismic improvements. While most of that work to stabilize the area would be done underground, the bulk of the disturbance would occur when gaining access to the area, impacting both the trees and understory.
- The fiber and duct work along the western edge would result in some impact to a riparian area associated with that intermittent drainage way. The pipeline would be to the east of the SROZ.
- There would also be impacts on Arrowhead Creek due to the boring underneath the creek for the 66-in pipe; however, there would not be any disturbance in the creek. The boring required creating a shaft to gain access, which would be in the receiving area on the eastern side of Arrowhead Creek where the seven trees would be removed.
- Some of the trees being removed were non-native species, but the impact to the canopy would be mitigated by the introduction of native tree and understory species.

Chair Martens confirmed that the cable tree would not be removed.

Mr. Rappold elaborated that although the trail connection would not be improved, the tree would still be accessible. The tree was a large Cottonwood with an old logging cable around it

located in the far southwest corner of the riparian area. There were also one or two other trees with logging cables adjacent to the river that would not be impacted. Staff and the consulting team had worked closely to preserve some of the more significant trees, such as a Grand Fir, and minimize the impact while also enabling the work needing to be done.

Ms. Schroeder noted that on Page 14, Condition PDC 3 stated that any tree that died or became diseased during the two years after planting would be replaced, but the language did not include a time limit for replacing the tree(s).

Kimberly Rybold, Senior Planner, replied she did not believe the Tree Code requirement included a specific time period for replacing a diseased or dead tree; however, at that point, it would become a Code compliance issue where part of that approval relied upon the presence of those mitigation trees and would be enforceable by the City.

Samy Nada asked if the City had Code regarding acceptable noise range levels during construction and operation of the facility.

Ms. Luxhoj confirmed the City did have a noise code that included certain hours of operation. She deferred to the Applicant regarding construction noise, but noted operational noise after construction was complete would be similar to the existing buildings on the site, which was minimal.

Chair Martens called for the Applicant's testimony.

Joe Dills, Planner, Angelo Planning Group, stated the Applicant was appreciative and supportive of the findings and recommended conditions in the Staff report, including the modification of Condition PDB 5 as presented. The Applicant collaborated with Staff last week and learned how standard conditions were applied. He explained that representatives for engineering, landscape design, permit coordination, and natural resources were also present to answer any questions.

David Kraska, Director, Willamette Water Supply Program, explained that he and Mike Rich would be presenting the Willamette Water Supply Project via PowerPoint. He provided an overview of the project with these key comments:

- For the program owners, the Willamette Water Supply Project was preparing for the future. Metro predicted 200,000 additional people living in Washington County by 2040. The supply also represented resilience against various threats to the water supply, including earthquakes, drought, pollution, and more severe storms.
- From 2011 to 2013, both TVWD and the City of Hillsboro independently conducted their own studies regarding long-term water supply options, and both considered four options, which included new ground water supply developed in Sauvie Island; additional purchased water from the City of Portland; the mid-Willamette River supply in Wilsonville; and increasing storage in Hagg Lake.

- Hagg Lake was also known as the Joint Water Commission Supply in Forest Grove, another jointly-owned partnership project by the cities of Hillsboro, Beaverton, Forest Grove, and TVWD, which was also one of the original owners and investors of the original WRWTP, and partially owned the land and facilities there. Both Hillsboro, TVWD, and the City of Beaverton own water rights to the Willamette River.
- Following the studies, both TVWD and the City of Hillsboro independently selected the Willamette River for a number of reasons. The water quality was excellent as proven by the City of Wilsonville through its operation of its WRWTP since 2002. Having ownership of the Willamette Water Supply was very important to the City of Hillsboro and TVWD, and the supply was reliable. The site offered fewer environmental impacts than the alternatives, and was the lowest cost option to develop.
- This was a partnership project with the TVWD and the Cities of Hillsboro and Beaverton with all three being part owners of the operation.
- Project Overview. (Slide 7) One benefit of the project was the existing intake on the Willamette River could be modified, so no new intake needed to be built. Six to seven miles of pipeline would run from Wilsonville to just outside Sherwood at the intersection of the new 124th Ave extension and Tualatin Sherwood Rd, where the new water treatment plant would be built. From there, the finished water pipelines would go up Tualatin Sherwood Rd and Roy Rogers Rd, extending up to Sunset Hwy with another extension to the east that would connect up to Beaverton Hillsdale Hwy. The total transmission system included about 30 miles of large-diameter pipeline. On the top of Cooper Mountain would be 30 million gallons of water storage for handling emergency supplies and peak demands.

Mike Rich, Engineering and Construction Manager, Willamette Water Supply Program,

continued the PowerPoint presentation, noting he would address some of the questions raised by the Board. His comments were as follows:

- He reviewed the features of the existing WRWTP site, noting the pump station currently included a 50-ft diameter caisson that was 80-ft deep with 4-ft thick, reinforced, concrete walls. The existing pumps that served the water treatment plant, as well as new pumps being added, would be inside the caisson with a structure on the top. From the caisson, there was a pipe out to the river with screens at the end. During the WRWTP's construction, the Upper Site had served as a convenient location to stockpile all of the spoils from the building phase.
- The Applicant would be doing work throughout the park, connecting the Lower Site to the Upper Site with pipelines and the duct bank that would contain the electrical facilities.
- It was important to consider seismic hazards, which were one of the greatest risks to water systems in the Northwest Region. The fault of the Cascadia Subduction Zone was approximately 140 miles due west of Wilsonville where the Pacific Plate was subducting below the North American Plate. When such faults ruptured, they created subduction zone earthquakes, the largest type of earthquakes. The 1964 earthquake in Alaska and the 2011 earthquake in Tohoku, Japan were examples of such earthquakes. After a trip to the Tohoku region, he had brought back lessons learned that could be applied to future construction projects.

- Another characteristic was that subduction earthquakes typically had several minutes of ground shaking, which was important as it could significantly impact the site, given the kinds of soils present.
- Referencing the chart on Slide 10, he explained the vertical axis represented the amount of movement expected and the horizontal axis represented the duration of ground shaking. During a short-duration earthquake, there would be virtually no soil movement until approximately 60 to 80 seconds of ground shaking when the soils would weaken such that there would be about a foot of displacement. Once the ground would start moving toward the riverbank, the caisson was predicted fail and be rendered useless. It was important to understand what long duration ground shaking would do to the soils as the soils lost strength through all of that shaking, and then developing appropriate mitigation to arrest that expected movement.
- The improvements the Applicant expected to use included methods that would strengthen the ground in place. To achieve that, a cementitious material known as jet grout would be installed or cement would be mixed in with the soil in a method known as deep soil mixing.
 - In between the caisson and riverbank, the Applicant would use a top-down method of construction with different kinds of equipment to improve the ground and improve their importance. Based on various analyses and input from structural and geotechnical engineers, the mix of soil improvements and the geometry required to stabilize the structure had been identified.
 - However, limiting the amount of tilt in the caisson was also important. The caisson would move a little bit, but the design solution would limit the amount of tilt, which would enable the pumps to continue running. The really long pumps could only get out of vertical a tiny bit. The design criteria for the ground improvements would limit the movement of the caisson such that the pumps continued to run, which was less than what the actual structure required.
- The Applicant had collaborated with City Staff and their own design team to understand what was needed to install the top down approach and minimize the impact to the riverbank, particularly along the top of the bank.
 - After construction was completed, the Applicant planned to go back and improve the entire riverbank area. Those improvements included a set of new trails to the lower overlook, a new trail loop at the top of the park area with a west overlook, and broader improvements to the existing overlook. He also indicated the existing informal trail that preserved access to the cable trees at a couple locations.
 - An improved view of the riparian forested riverbank was another benefit of the improvements to the upper overlook and overall mitigation. Currently, it was very overgrown and offered limited access.
 - He also described the views depicted in the renderings of the Upper Site on Slide 16, noting the top image showed the view from Arrowhead Creek Ln looking north. The lower image showed the view facing west. He noted berms and landscaping would be installed around the perimeter of the site where public access existed, resulting in an improvement over present conditions. (Slide 16)
- The Applicant was intentional in having the proposed building match the existing architecture of the lower plant. (Slide 17)

- Park closures would be necessary in certain degrees.
- Access to the site was very limited and all the pipes and infrastructure would go through one narrow corridor on Arrowhead Creek Ln. In support of that activity, the Applicant anticipated a five-month closure to facilitate construction in that location, which would prevent public access by road to the park, but the Applicant would work closely with City Staff to ensure access was maintained for operations of the WRWTP. Aside from the five-month closure, it was anticipated that much of the park would remain open.
- Construction of the pipeline and duct bank on the west side would not go into the ravine, but would stay on the Upper Site, although some closures would be needed to support that work.
- With regard to noise, he explained that once built, the operational noise levels would be similar to the existing WRWTP. During the construction phase, the Applicant would comply with all City requirements regarding construction noise.
- No metal piles were being driven in, so there would not be any loud, striking noises. He was unsure how the contractor would install the metal piles in the river to protect the screens, so there might be some loud striking noises for a short duration. Otherwise, the Applicant intended to work closely with the neighborhood and be sensitive to any comments received from the neighbors.

Mr. Nada asked if the Applicant had received any feedback from neighbors about the construction.

Marliss Mock, Lead Communications, Willamette Water Supply Program, stated the Applicant had been conducting outreach for a couple of years, as mentioned, and had coordinated their outreach activities with City Staff since 2014. The Applicant had met with the Morey's Landing Association twice, and people just had a lot of questions about the project and the benefits the city would receive. There were some questions about a possible park closure, but no strong sentiments either positive or negative regarding the project; people appreciated the Applicant asking questions and working with them and City Staff as much as possible. No specific comments had been received from residents, and the Applicant had knocked on doors, left flyers, attended meetings, and had done quite a bit of outreach over the last few years.

Mr. Dills added the Applicant tried to anticipate the needs of the community that lived adjacent to the site. It was clear that the trail on the west side of the upper side was well-used, which was taken into consideration for the design and the reason behind the total retention of the ravine's screening and trees enjoyed today.

Mr. Nada asked if it was well-communicated to the neighbors that the project's construction would last four years.

Ms. Mock replied that at the meeting with the neighbors last winter, the duration and clarity around how long the park would be closed during any particular phase of the project was uncertain; however, the Applicant was committed to providing access as much as possible. She believed the residents understood the important seismic benefits to the facility and reiterated

that there were no strong objections to the project. Overall, they were happy to hear information about what was coming and that the Applicant was committed to keeping everyone updated to avoid surprises and so everyone knew what to expect.

Mr. Rich explained that construction would take place in two phases. The first phase, anticipated to begin approximately June 2020, would consist of all the ground improvements, pipe and duct bank installation, and other elements impactful to the site. That phase would take a couple of years to complete. The balance of time would consist of building the structure at the Upper Site, installing the big pumps, motors, and large pieces of equipment. The Applicant had tried to be deliberate in how the work was set up, focusing the more impactful elements in a concentrated timeframe for the first phase with the second phase being less impactful and focused more on trade activities.

Chair Martens confirmed with Mr. Rich that the pipe itself would be in an open trench and the pipe installation work would start next summer.

Mr. Nada asked about the size of the water supply system compared to other sites in Oregon.

Mr. Rich replied at \$1.3 billion, it was currently the largest infrastructure program in the state. As a comparison, the TVWD was the second largest behind the City of Portland, but when coupled with Hillsboro and Beaverton, which represented a large group of water users in the region, the program represented a pretty large infrastructure system for a portion of Oregon.

Mr. Nada asked if the facility was the same size as or larger than Portland's, for example.

Mr. Rich replied it was different, but noted the intake facilities were roughly the same size as the Lake Oswego/Tigard intake facilities.

Ms. Schroeder stated she had visited the plant and was happy to see the seismic changes, as she had lived in Seattle, Wilsonville, California, Japan, and Taiwan, and as such, knew the importance of the proposed changes and their significance.

Chair Martens called for public testimony in favor of, opposed and neutral to the application.

Ashley Threlfall, 10501 SW Brockway Dr, Wilsonville, OR, 97070, stated she had just learned about tonight's meeting recently through a mailing. She said she had questions about the tree removal in Area B1 and asked if the seven trees right on her property line along her fence would be removed permanently or if they would be replaced. (Staff's Slide 14) She also asked if a pipe would be put into the ground right up next to her fence, adding she did not understand the details around that part of the project. She indicated that her home was along the narrow section of road that connected to the park.

Mr. Nada asked if Ms. Threlfall knew about the project before the mailing.

Ms. Threlfall replied she did not know about the electrical building, but was aware pipeline would be installed. She did not know anything else about the project, such as tree removal, until she received the mailing. She had not attended HOA meetings, but also had not heard anything from the HOA about the meetings with the Applicant regarding the project. She clarified her property was located in Area B1 right on the corner of Brockway Dr. She reiterated she wanted to know if the trees along the fence line would be permanently removed. (Slide 14)

Sarah Betz, Project Manager, Associate, David Evans and Associates, stated her firm was doing all of the environmental permitting for the project. She explained that part of Area B1 with the trees lined up with the pinch point area where the water pipeline, fiber conduit, and duct bank would all converge, and the seven trees in question would be permanently removed. Mitigation for those trees would be at the Upper Site mitigation area. The tree removal in Area B1 was driven by the need to thread the needle through a really congested area with three different lines.

Ms. Schroeder asked if any other landscaping would be installed to replace the seven removed trees, which she believed was Ms. Threlfall's concern, adding she would lose the shade.

Ms. Betz replied the Applicant's team was looking that up.

Ms. Threlfall responded the trees acted as a buffer between the road and concrete plant and her home, so it was a significant impact. She confirmed the trees provided a visual barrier. She also asked how long the construction near her fence would take place and what type of noise impact there would be, noting 2024 was a long time.

Mr. Dills clarified that all parts of the site would be revegetated, but the Applicant would need to do more research on whether new trees would be planted in the area. Construction would take place on and off during the first phase that was more earthwork related, followed by building the facility on the Upper Site, and then finishing up with the bank work which would be done at a much later date.

Chair Martens asked how long construction activity was expected to last near Ms. Threlfall's home.

Ms. Threlfall asked if it would be a couple feet from the fence line as it was a narrow area.

Mr. Rich replied it was difficult to give specifics, noting a contractor was currently working with the Applicant to develop the sequence in the plan. During the 5-month closure, there would be a lot of activity right there that involved not only their infrastructure, but also the City of Wilsonville's and other utilities. That area would also serve as the vehicle access through the park as the pipeline and duct bank were being constructed and would also support the movement of equipment down to the riverbank as part of a construction loop that would enter through the park and exit via the existing WRWTP. During that Phase 1 period, there would likely be ongoing construction on and off over a roughly two-year period.

Ms. Schroeder stated she was not sure that could be mitigated due to the pinch point.

Mr. Rich explained the pinch point was created by the Wilsonville Concrete property on the east side, and then the neighborhood on the west side. It was an unfortunate limit based on how the properties came together at that location.

Ms. Rybold clarified that it appeared that the trees being removed were not the ones that were westernmost against the property line. She noted the road, a line of trees, and then a path shown on Slide 14 of Staff's presentation and said the trees being removed were between the path and road itself with a small handful of trees remaining in between the path and Ms. Threlfall's property line.

Mr. Dills stated Ms. Rybold was correct. At that location, the trees west of the path, closest to the adjacent property, were all being retained, and the trees bordering the east, inside edge, where the path was at pinch point, were being removed, so, the screening function of the existing trees on the west side would still be in place.

Ms. Luxhoj confirmed she was looking at Sheet 27 in the 11x17 plans.

Mr. Dills added that not only would the trees on the west side of the path be retained, but trees would be a part of the planting plan on the east side, at the inside turn of the path as well.

Chair Martens understood that some of the trees closest to Ms. Threlfall's property would be retained.

Ms. Threlfall agreed, adding that according to the sheet before her, [Sheet 27] it appeared that the trees she had been concerned about would all be retained, which was comforting. She asked if there would be more communication regarding the project and how she could receive emails updates, etc.

Mr. Dills replied there was a communications process that would occur during the project that Ms. Mock could explain.

Ms. Rybold noted that by signing the sign-up sheet at the side of the room, she would receive an update on the decision and the documentation. Ms. Luxhoj could give her some additional contact information, if she still had questions.

Ms. Mock stated an outreach plan was developed for all of the Applicant's projects that helped guide the outreach process. She planned to be onsite often over the next four years to help neighbors cope and to work with the contractors to ensure the park locations were kept open as much as possible. She would also be attending all construction and neighbor meetings, and even visiting with neighbors, if needed. The Applicant wanted to ensure that all plans were communicated to neighbors before they happened, so there were no surprises. She confirmed

there was a hotline number for neighbors to call if they needed to and that she would deal with any issues with construction workers.

Mr. Nada noted that not all HOAs communicated information to people. He suggested the Applicant try to communicate/reach out to all the neighbors abutting the construction project.

Chair Martens confirmed there was no further testimony or questions and closed the public hearing at 7:45 pm.

Ellie Schroeder moved to accept the Staff report as amended with the modification to Condition PDB 5 as noted in new Exhibit A3. Samy Nada seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Samy Nada moved to adopt Resolution No. 371. The motion was seconded by Ellie Schroeder and passed unanimously.

Chair Martens read the rules of appeal into the record.

VII. Board Member Communications:

A. Recent City Council Action Minutes

Kimberly Rybold, Senior Planner, noted the three City Council Action Minutes summaries and that the right-of-way vacation for Cherbourg Lane was approved on second reading at the first October meeting, so that the ordinance was now in effect.

- She stated DRB Panel A did not meet this month, but a meeting was anticipated in December. She confirmed Panel A only had three members due to a member relocating outside the city and Councilor Linville's appointment. Staff expected the open positions to be filled in the New Year.
- She did not anticipate a December meeting for Panel B. There were some agenda items, but they would be pushed to a possible January meeting.

VIII. Staff Communications

IX. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Pinyerd, ABC Transcription Services, Inc. for
Shelley White, Planning Administrative Assistant