



**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JULY 11, 2012
6:00 P.M.**

**Wilsonville City Hall
29799 SW Town Center Loop East
Wilsonville, Oregon**

Approved
August 8, 2012

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Altman called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ben Altman, Ray Phelps, Eric Postma, Al Levit, and Peter Hurley. Marta McGuire arrived after Item VII.B Commissioner Comments. Amy Dvorak was absent.

City Staff: Barbara Jacobson, Daniel Pauly, Eric Mende and Steve Munsterman

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

III. CITIZEN'S INPUT - This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Planning Commission on items not on the agenda. There was none.

IV. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT

Chair Altman announced a joint work session was scheduled with City Council for August 6, 2012, to discuss the economic development strategy.

The Planning Commission consented to a 5 p.m. meeting time.

V. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

The May 9, 2012 Planning Commission minutes were approved 4 to 0 to 1 as presented with Commissioner Levit abstaining.

Due to the expected late arrival of Commissioner McGuire, there was agreement to delay the public hearing and discuss agenda items out of order.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2010 Planning Commission Work Program

Daniel Pauly, Associate Planner, invited comments from the Commission regarding the work plan, especially in light of the prior CCI discussion.

Chair Altman noted the joint work session with Council to discuss economic strategy and TSP updates was scheduled for August.

B. Commissioners' Comments

There were none.

Commissioner McGuire arrived at this time.

The Commission took a brief recess at this time. The meeting was reconvened at 6:10 p.m. and the Commission returned to Agenda Item VI. Public Hearing.

VI. PUBLIC HEARING

- A. **LP12-0002 - Water System Master Plan update.** The Plan documents current water demand, evaluates current system deficiencies, estimates future water demands over a 20-year growth horizon, and estimates the capital and operation costs needed to meet these future demands. **The Planning Commission action is in the form of a recommendation to the City Council.**
(Mende)

Chair Altman read the Legislative Hearing procedures into the record.

Barbara Jacobson, Assistant City Attorney, noted that the land use notice sent to numerous property owners pursuant to ORS.227.186, notifying people of the public hearing, was properly dated with today's date, but the date in the body of the notice incorrectly stated that this public hearing had taken place on June 13, 2012, which should have been corrected. The only applicable date is July 11, 2012.

Chair Altman called for the Staff report.

Daniel Pauly, Associate Planner, stated the last update to the Water Systems Master Plan was in 2002 and Staff has gathered a large amount of utility data and data from the Public Works crews to gain a comprehensive look at the existing water systems in the community. Forecasting data was also gathered from Metro and past efforts by the City, which included urban reserve areas, to determine the future development needs in each area. The Master Plan update considered maintenance and capital improvements to the current system in light of that forecasted growth, so the Plan would guide water system projects in the community for many years.

Eric Mende, Deputy City Engineer, introduced the Water System Master Plan, noting the extensive community and public involvement prior to the hearing, which included two briefings to the Planning Commission, a public open house held at the Water Treatment Plant and one City Council briefing. Another briefing was scheduled for City Council on July 16, 2012. Staff had taken the required steps to notify the public and obtain significant input on the Master Plan.

- He reviewed the changes made following direction received from the Planning Commission at the last work session as follows:
 - The Executive Summary had been revised to be more friendly and readable for the general public and included a list of acronyms and abbreviations. The Executive Summary also included more focus on the positive aspects of the existing distribution system.
 - Additional text and stronger recommendations for addressing unaccounted for water is included in Chapter 2.3 and Chapter 7 under proposed Policy 3.1.6.
 - Revisions were made to the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to breakout repair and replacement projects from growth-related capital improvement projects. The capital improvement priority list was also revised to include a category that matches the general 5-year CIP process. This information was included in the Executive Summary as well as in Chapter 5.
 - Additional text was added to Section ES 2.4 of the Executive Summary and Section 3.6 in the main document to reflect the Commission's strong recommendation not to abandon any water rights associated with any wells.
 - Figure 3.1 Localized Fire Flow Deficiencies was corrected to show the short falls as a percentage with the red dots replaced by smaller yellow, orange and purple dots.

Jeff Bledsoe, Keller & Associates, presented the Water System Master Plan via PowerPoint with the following key additional comments and addressed questions from the Commission as noted:

- Overall, Wilsonville's current water system is in very good condition, and probably one of the best systems he has seen, which was a testament to City Staff as well as those involved in previous water system planning efforts for the City.
- A Master Plan update was required because the existing Plan is outdated and the new Water Treatment Plant created major changes to the demands in the system. Residents no longer have to deal with moratorium conditions, declining aquifers, or water use restrictions. Updating the Master Plan also met the Comprehensive Plan Goal 3.1 to assure good quality facilities and services are available.
- Full development of all the City's build out areas were considered, using both population and commercial growth projections, to predict corresponding water flows and demands.
- The City currently has more than 100 miles of distribution piping, most of which is relatively new in the last 30 years. Three main pressure zones provide water to the citizens: a small pressure zone in the north, the main pressure zone, referred to as Level B and the third zone is in the Charbonneau District.
- He confirmed that even with the water treatment plant, the four storage reservoirs are still needed for emergency storage and handling peaks that occur throughout the day.
- Substantial data was used in the water usage analysis, which considered how water usage varies throughout the seasons, times of the day, and according to land use.
 - Wilsonville has a lot of commercial water usage, which reflected the type of land use in the community. Compared to other cities similar in size, Wilsonville had a disproportionate amount of commercial water usage.
 - The difference between the water sold and the water produced, shown on Slide 5, indicated the unaccounted for water, which has been between 15% and 17% over the last couple of years. Typically, unaccounted for water should be below 10%.
 - The consultants have worked with the City in trying to identify the sources for the unaccounted for water. One potential source was the large meter that meters the water leaving the water treatment plant, which may account for as much as 3% of the unaccounted for water. Addressing other identified sources could bring the amount of unaccounted for water down to about 13.5%. The Master Plan identifies specific steps the City should take to reduce unaccounted for water further.
- He agreed irrigation might be related to a large portion of the unaccounted for water. The study found a large account with a meter that was not working and had not been recording the water usage for some time. That account also had a lot of irrigation water usage. With increased water usage in the summer, there is a larger potential for more unaccounted for water in the summer.
- Mr. Mende added that most of the system is metered, including most of the irrigation usage. Larger commercial and industrial properties have both a domestic meter and an irrigation meter, which was why meters were looked at specifically as a potential large source of the errors being seen. As far as irrigation usage, both single- and multi-family properties, except large apartment complexes, do not have individual irrigation meters.

Commissioner Hurley asked if the City would consider physically looking at smaller commercial accounts by hand to see if their water usage made sense. Comparing usage to five or ten years ago might reveal some obvious discrepancies. The city was small enough that a hand tally should only take a week to complete.

- Mr. Bledsoe stated the larger meters are being checked and calibrated. Often, problems are tied to larger meters, such as the meters being oversized. These ideas have been discussed with the City, which had a good vision about how to move forward.
- Mr. Mende said discussions would return to the issue of unaccounted for water when finances, capital improvements and operating costs are discussed. Steve Munsterman from Public Works could address any specific technical questions.

Commissioner Levit noted the apparent spike in the summer with irrigation was proportionally no different from water usage in April or May. Water usage was consistent through the year in terms of a percentage.

- Mr. Bledsoe explained another recommendation was that the City track usage as a volume, not necessarily just as a percentage, and to do a 12-month moving average. Water usage in April and May is almost identical to water usage in October. Sometimes billing cycles do not match the demand. Therefore, a 12-month moving average provides a better picture of actual water loss.

Commissioner Phelps:

- Asked how unaccounted for water compared to other metered services like gas and electricity. Having unaccounted for water at 15 to 17 percent was surprising and seemed high. He questioned if there could be a quality issue related to meter maintenance.
 - Mr. Bledsoe replied he did not know about the losses related to gas and electric, but 10 percent was the standard for unaccounted for water established by State. Some formulas establish the lower limit that a city could really attain. Considering the City's system pressures, the miles of pipe and the number of service lines some leaks have to be anticipated; even pinhole leaks on 107 miles of pipe add up. The analysis for Wilsonville showed a lower limit of about 5 percent, so getting below 10 percent is the target, but getting below 5 percent was not very realistic. Some communities are much worse than Wilsonville, such as Stayton, which was at 35 percent; Amity at 40 percent and Gates at 20 percent.
- Noted the rate payers were paying for that 17 percent loss, so the City should probably be more aggressive to reduce the loss to 10 percent or less.

Mr. Bledsoe continued his presentation, discussing the methodology used to project water system demands for the future and noting the average daily demand could potentially grow from 2.2 million gallons per day (mgd) to 28 mgd, which also included Sherwood. Excluding Sherwood's use, Wilsonville's demand would be about 8 mgd for build out.

- He confirmed that the 2.9 and 3.5 percent reflected the compound annual residential and nonresidential growth rates, respectively. Sherwood was factored in because of the demand placed on Wilsonville's water system in terms of the main transmission pipeline from the plant and the plant itself.
- Mr. Mende explained that the City of Sherwood currently owns only 5 mgd, but the City projects Sherwood would purchase additional water rights, which are available for purchase through the Tualatin Valley Water District. The City of Wilsonville owns 20 mgd of water rights. The source of water would still be the Willamette River at the Treatment Plant, where the water would still be treated and then transmitted through the 48- or 63-inch transmission line to Sherwood's pipeline, which does have the capacity. He confirmed that Tualatin Valley Water District was not currently drawing any water.

Commissioner Levit confirmed that a linear growth model was used because nothing better was available and noted the report said that things had changed below what the previous expectations were possibly due to conservation measures. He asked if a substantial amount would be gained by future conservation measures, notwithstanding the unaccounted for water.

- Mr. Mende explained the study did assume a linear growth rate by averaging or taking the data from 2000 to 2010 and turning it into a linear growth rate. The growth rate that was estimated in the 2002 master plan was significantly higher and showed water usage in 2010 at an average of 8 to 9 mgd; however, the city was currently using about 3.1 mgd. The previous growth assumptions were very aggressive and did not hold true, so the methodology was changed to use actual growth rate numbers. While the last few years have been a bit of an economic downturn for growth of Wilsonville, those years were preceded by boom growths. Based on averages, Staff was comfortable with the growth assumptions.
- Mr. Bledsoe added the projected population for 2030 was consistent with other planning documents adopted by the City. He explained that some reduction in demands per capita could be achieved through conservation. However, the study did not assume any reductions moving forward to be conservative. It is common for communities to achieve 5 percent to 15 percent reduction based on education, improved

irrigation practices, etc. Conservation is encouraged and is one of the recommended Comprehensive Master Plan policies.

- Mr. Mende explained the previous per capita usage estimates were changed based on what has occurred over the last ten years. The significant amount of conservation due to water saving measures, conservation and low water usage toilets and showerheads, was taken into account, but no additional conservation measures were assumed.
- Mr. Bledsoe noted increased water rates are the most effective means of reducing water consumption; however, a rate analysis was not part of this study. Many communities have inclining blocks of rates that encourage conservation.

Mr. Bledsoe explained that as the distribution system was evaluated, a model was created using GIS that linked demands to parcels throughout the system, resulting in a highly accurate distribution of those demands and a very good calibration of the system, meaning field conditions were matched very well to the model conditions.

- The system had no pressure deficiencies, even in peak hour conditions.
- Less than 5 percent of the pipelines, node or junctions had fire flow deficiencies. The desired amounts were 1,500 gallons per minute (gpm) for residential areas and 3,000 gpm for commercial and industrial areas.
 - The deficient areas with a greater than 50 percent shortfall were shown in magenta on Figure 3.1 Localized Fire Flow Deficiencies (Slide 7). Many of these areas were close to other areas that meet fire criteria. Localized improvements could be completed to bring the entire system up to standard.
- In terms of water storage, the water treatment plant should be designed to handle only a high average or daily peak demand. Any extra demand that might occur, like when everyone turns their sprinklers on or when people get home in the evenings, should be handled by peaking storage.
- Operating storage is the difference between the on and offset points in the tank, and 10 percent is good to encourage circulation in the tanks. Fire storage is governed by the fire authority for the City of Wilsonville, which is 3,000 gpm for four hours, in addition to the emergency storage. For Wilsonville, emergency storage was calculated using two days of average day demand instead of three, because Wilsonville has backup wells that provide an alternative source of water. Wilsonville also has a state of the art treatment plant with a lot of redundancy and backup built within it. Sherwood and Tigard also have comparable emergency storage requirements.
- Using the capacity of the backup wells was recommended as a lower cost alternative to building additional storage to reduce the projected future storage requirements. Maintaining and keeping the wells in service would lower the demand for new storage from about 9 million gallons to a little more than 2 million gallons.
 - With the planned construction of 3 million gallons of additional storage, the City would be in position to meet the 20-year projected need.
 - Mr. Mende noted Table 3.1 of the Master Plan showed the planning criteria that drove the entire evaluation of the water system. Every community had the same general pressure requirements, as well as a 1,500-gpm fire flow requirement for residential areas. All the communities were in the same general ballpark as far as the gpm required for fire flow in commercial areas, the differences could be due to engineering preferences.
- Following the wells' evaluation, the team recommended that the City continue to maintain the wells currently in service, however, a couple wells were questionable in terms of future production. It was recommended that the City repurpose some of those wells instead of abandoning them. Water rights would need to be considered regarding any changes to ensure that those rights were retained.

Commissioner Phelps asked if the City could afford this much redundancy or backup.

- Mr. Bledsoe explained that in this case, the 20-year projected cost would be about \$100,000 per year to maintain the wells, which is a lower cost alternative compared to constructing a six million gallon storage tank. The City would have the benefit of having backup in more than one location. Wells are indefinite; if something happened that resulted in no service for up to five days, as long as power could be provided to the

wells, which would have backup generators, the City could provide some level of service. He confirmed the needed capital improvements were reflected in the \$100,000 average cost per year.

Commissioner Postma asked if rights to the wells included an element to maintain the wells for the sake of maintaining the water rights. The \$100,000 cost could be considered as maintenance of water rights that the City might lose if the wells were abandoned.

- Mr. Bledsoe agreed, adding the City had to do certain things to retain the water rights, which might not ever be perfected unless the wells were put into full production. One purpose of the Water Management and Conservation Plan was to retain the water rights.

Mr. Bledsoe returned to his presentation, stating that the water treatment plant evaluation identified a couple item that require more exploration as the City moved forward later with a Water Treatment Plant Master Plan.

- Some policy decisions could affect the capacity of the clearwell storage facility. A tracer study was recommended that might influence the rate of capacity of clearwell storage. Minor modifications could address the concern to provide a full 15 mgd capacity at the plant.
- Providing a surge tank would avoid a water hammer when pumps are turned off, which could create negative pressure that is hazardous for large pipes. As demands in the system increase, this improvement would need to be implemented.
- The Charbonneau District was evaluated more closely in light of some specific concerns seen within the district.
 - A disproportionate amount of pipeline problems were associated with the cast iron pipe and some lines need to be replaced, particularly those constructed in the early 1970s.
 - The District is isolated from the rest of the city with one supply line and a backup system that consists of a couple of wells, a booster station and a tank. A seismic evaluation revealed that the tank was at risk and had the potential to settle up to eight inches in an earthquake. While settling would not cause a catastrophic failure, it would make the tank useless. An earthquake could result in the loss of the pipeline supply across the bridge.
 - The two recommended options to provide backup included rehabilitate or replace the tank or constructing a secondary pipeline under the Willamette River to supply to the Charbonneau District, which was the more cost-effective option based on a 20-year lifecycle analysis.
 - He confirmed that burrowing a pipeline beneath the river would be more reliable than hanging the pipeline from the I-5 Bridge, since the pipeline would not be subject to issues regarding the bridge itself. A new pipeline would be conducted with HDP (high density polyethylene) material. HDP is black plastic that is very resilient and highly flexible, making it much more reliable in an earthquake.

Commissioner Postma asked if the eventual abandonment of the current storage facility was being recommended, adding the pipeline and then a new storage facility for Charbonneau at some point in time.

- Mr. Bledsoe explained that 2 million gallons was still needed within the 20-year planning period. Constructing 3 million gallons, as is currently planned, and abandoning the tank would still meet projected future needs. If a line broke, no storage would exist under this scenario on that side of the river. The wells would always be retained as backup, which provide about 350 gpm, which is enough water to meet minimal in-house demand, not irrigation.

Chair Altman confirmed the intention would be to keep the line on the bridge and disconnect the reservoir, which would create a loop system to Charbonneau that did not currently exist.

- Mr. Mende added that in addition to Option 1 and Option 2, there were Options 1A and 1B. Replacing the tank and rehabilitating the existing tank were both considered. Both of those options were more expensive than drilling a new pipeline under the river. The pipeline would eventually replace the tank over time. The wells would stay. There would be no reason to disconnect the tank until it was no longer usable. The line

over the bridge would stay as well. The analysis assumed that if a large enough earthquake did occur, it would break the existing pipe across the Boone Bridge.

Commissioner Postma:

- Asked how long the district would have storage if a large earthquake did occur.
 - Mr. Mende explained that a 6.7 earthquake would damage the tank beyond repair. The seismic analysis showed Wilsonville could get a 7.1 earthquake, so the City was relying on the wells regardless. The City can either rely on the wells completely with no pipeline under the river, or the replace tank to make it seismically safe, or put a pipeline under the river. He noted this was a technical evaluation, the large earthquake might never happen but the policy or financial decision still needed discussion.
- Understood if a catastrophic event occurred prior to building a new pipeline under the river, the City would be relying on the wells in Charbonneau, which would keep a minimal amount of water flowing.
 - Mr. Bledsoe agreed the recommendation was a risk reduction. If the tank were up to current seismic code or if the pipeline were in place, the City would have the additional redundancy as well as fire protection. The purpose of the tank improvement was to provide the same level of service being provided everywhere else in the community for that type of event.
 - Mr. Mende explained if there were a major fire, the wells could not put out enough water to satisfy fire flow demands in Charbonneau and also supply limited day-to-day usage of the residents without a tank in place.
- Stated it seemed odd that those larger events in Charbonneau were lower on the capital improvement priority list than other concerns.
 - Mr. Bledsoe explained that after seismic report was completed, the issue was moved up to a Priority 1B, which was within the first ten years. It would take time to get permits, designs, and get it built. Even if started today, the entire process, including construction, might take five years.

Mr. Bledsoe continued the PowerPoint presentation, noting the minor revision made to Comprehensive Plan Policy 3.1.5.b regarding the City's authority to request offsite improvements, and reviewing the three additional policies that were recommended. These policies addressed conservation, tracking water usage throughout the season, and coordinating with other infrastructure improvements. He agreed coordinating the storm water and water infrastructure improvements in Charbonneau made sense.

Mr. Pauly noted Implementation Measure 3.1.5.b had been revised and was different from the measures noted in the PowerPoint and on Page 2 of 11 in the Executive Summary. He read the revised Implementation Measure 3.1.5.b into the record as follows, "All major lines shall be extended in conformance to the lines sizes indicated in the Master Plan and, at a minimum, provisions for future system looping shall be made. If the type, scale, and/or location of a proposed development negatively impacts operating pressures or available fire flows to other *existing* properties or warrants off-site improvements to achieve or maintain minimum pressures or fire flows *as determined by the City Engineer*, the Development Review Board may require completion of looped water lines, off-site facilities, pipelines, and/or facility/pipelines ~~upgrades in conjunction with the development~~ *to achieve or maintain minimum pressures or fire flows as a condition of development approval.*"

Chair Altman said that was consistent with the concurrency policy structure. He inquired if requiring that adequate fire flows be available prior to issuance of construction permits could also be an option. This would enable the applicant to either add adequate fire flow themselves or coordinate with the City. Identifying a system deficiency and doing offsite improvements that might be beyond the demand created by the applicant was a concern. A secondary edit would allow the Development Review Board (DRB) to add a condition to require the fire flow, and then work out whether the applicant fronts the cost with a payback or uses the other options available in the process. Such an edit would avoid simply attaching a condition to a specific development to do offsite improvements.

- Ms. Jacobson stated the newly revised language of Policy 3.1.5.b provided that the DRB “may” consider the requirement. At the time of application, the proportionality and Dolan findings would have to be reviewed, but the DRB would have the flexibility to do it or suggest something else.

Commissioner Levit confirmed these policies were automatically adopted into the Comprehensive Plan and no further action would be required.

Mr. Bledsoe and Mr. Mende continued with the presentation and displayed the Water Facilities Master Plan map indicating the future improvements for the City of Wilsonville, which were color coded by priority.

Improvement projects shown in blue would be completed in coordination with development. Projects shown in orange were Priority 1 projects and those indicated by small purple dots primarily regarded fire protection.

- Capital improvements recommended for the first ten years were organized into Priority 1A and Priority 1B categories. Many minor distribution piping improvements were in Priority 1B with the pipeline to the Charbonneau District being the big ticket item. Priority 1A’s big ticket items included the 48-in transmission line and the new 3 million gallon reservoir, which would provide for the City’s 20-year need. The 48-in transmission line was in the design stage, and both items had been carried forward as part of the previous master plan. Land for the reservoir would be purchased within the next couple of months and the design would start in the next couple of years. The vast majority of the Priority 1A capital improvements were already planned and budgeted, and built into the rate structure and system development charges (SDCs) equations. Once the Priority 1A items were completed, very few big ticket items remained Capital improvements moving forward were very nominal compared to many other communities.
- Priority 2 Improvements slated for 2020 to 2030 were mostly pipeline projects with a few other minor improvements at some of the pumping facilities.
- Recurring maintenance costs included maintaining wells, replacing pipes and meters, and inspection programs to ensure the facilities continue the same level of service. The City would need to consider the identified costs and the current budget when doing the rate analysis. Currently, very little was being allocated for some of the well maintenance, so keeping those facilities going would be an added cost. Very little was also being allocated toward pipeline replacement. Being proactive and replacing the pipelines on an ongoing basis would save the City money in the long run.
- Mr. Mende clarified that the recommended \$365,000 maintenance replacement budget in the Master Plan reflected the total budget, not the increase in the maintenance budget. Many maintenance and replacement items were already being implemented. The annual increase would be between \$65,000 and \$80,000 per year, which was about an 8 percent annual increase in the water distribution budget.

Commissioner McGuire believed it was important to identify the two major CIP projects carried forward and being implemented from the previous master plan with a different color and a footnote to clarify that they were not new projects. Some people would look at the updated Master Plan without any prior knowledge of all of the planning and efforts that occurred before.

Chair Altman believed clarifying that the \$365,000 was not new costs was important for Council, the Budget Committee as well as citizens.

Commissioner Hurley suggested revising page 13 of the Executive Summary to add a section under Water Supply to show the costs if the City did and did not abandon the Canyon Creek Well. The potential cost for abandonment was \$26,000, so adding a section that identifies the cost if the well is not abandoned might be a good idea. This information would be good for Council and the Budget Committee.

- Mr. Bledsoe noted that making the well usable would cost more than \$300,000.

Commissioner Postma noted some things were not in the CIP. He was glad to see the revisions made to the fire flow deficiencies chart, but some neighborhoods had a large percentage of needed improvements to address fire flow issues. He asked where correcting fire flow issues fit into the CIP and what the plan was for those issues.

- Mr. Bledsoe explained that with each dot on the chart, the consultants, Mr. Mende, and Interim City Engineer Steve Adams looked at the land use; the proximity to another hydrant with adequate flow; the potential for some type of redevelopment and then gave a higher priority to commercial over residential because commercial demands are higher. Based on those criteria, the decisions regarding when the improvements should be made was determined for each individual area. Most of the fire-related improvements were not health hazard concerns, so they did not usually make the Priority 1A list. The Oregon Department of Water Resources and Drinking Water Division would not require the City to provide a certain level of fire protection, so the more urgent fire protection improvements were included in Priority 1B, and the rest were in Priority 2. All the improvements were included on the CIP charts. The items identified in purple on Figure 4 (Slide 13) addressed the dots on the fire flow deficiencies chart.

Commissioner Levit noted the designation of radius for each hydrant was fine in an open field, but asked how that translated into a street network.

- Mr. Bledsoe explained that circles were used to evaluate proximities and then each dot was reviewed with City Staff to determine what areas were not covered. For example, if a structure was not being covered, they considered the structure's proximity to a hydrant when determining if a new hydrant was needed. In light of the street network, the structure could be within the 300-foot radius, but it might take 400 feet of hose to go around structures. That level of detail was not considered in the Master Plan.
- Mr. Mende believed the fire department standard was a 300-foot hose lay. Some locations were considered where hydrants were 500 feet apart, but they were on either side of a major building, so the fire standard was met and those dots were removed from the deficiency chart.

Commissioner Hurley asked if the City had some kind of constrictive rate structure for higher water use.

- Mr. Mende replied that an inverted block structure on water rates was included in the Master Plan that differed for both commercial and residential customers. As residential customers use more water, residents would still pay less than commercial water consumers. The base rate for commercial was also higher. The esoteric nature of the rate structure was one reason the rate study was not included within this technical document.

Commissioner Levit:

- Noted at the top of Page ES.5 the draft talked about replacing the cast iron pipe and some of the steel pipe. Approximately 32,800 feet of pipeline was in the second line; however, the draft stated 34,500 feet needed to be replaced.
 - Mr. Bledsoe confirmed 1,700 feet of steel pipe was included in the 34,500 feet.
- Noted that the third line on Page ES.6 under ES.2.5 should state (TVWD); the V was missing.
- Recognized that two different priorities were being addressed in Priority 1 on Page ES.8, which regarded increasing fire flows currently less than 1,000 gpm, and later discussion about improving to between 1,000 gpm and 1,500 gpm.
- Noted Items 300 & 301 in Table ES.4 used MCC and asked what that meant.
 - Mr. Bledsoe replied MCC meant Motor Control Center, which would be added to table of acronyms.
- Asked if the first paragraph in Table 2.6 on Page 2-9, which stated the water bottling plant gets its water at an irrigation rate, was correct.
 - Mr. Bledsoe did not know if the plant was billed at an irrigation rate, but the plant has an irrigation account because it did not contribute to the sewer. The City did not have a separate billing structure for customers that fully consume water. The estimated irrigation usage was not assumed in Table 2.6 for those four months. Irrigation usage was not based on the irrigation accounts, but on the total system

- demand as opposed to the winter demand because a huge number of residents have irrigation demands but no separate irrigation meter.
- Noted someone on his street was taking small tanker loads of water from the hydrant for dust control at a horse farm. Tanker after tanker of water had been being taken for weeks and weeks. He was not sure how that usage was accounted for by City. The City said it was aware of this when it was happening a couple years ago.
 - Mr. Mende explained anyone taking water out of City hydrants is supposed to have a bulk water permit issued from Public Works, which allows for payment of the water. A meter is issued to the permit holder as part of the bulk water permit.
 - Noted that Table 3.1 on Page 3-2 discussed velocities and the maximum for pipes under 12 inches as 10+ feet per second; however, Charbonneau's 4-inch pipe flow was 12½ feet per second.
 - Mr. Bledsoe agreed Charbonneau's pipe did exceed the maximum, which was something the consultants recommended the City monitor. The pressure regulating valve needed higher flows to maintain pressures. The valve was in a pipe segment located inside a building, making it easy to monitor. He noted the 10 feet per second was a guide, but 20+ feet per second was needed for fire conditions. The goal was to avoid having a pipeline in the distribution system that regularly exceeds 10 feet per second, which indicates that a parallel line or larger pipeline was needed. Water flow became more turbulent, velocities increase, and there was potential for surge and water hammer problems. It was also a flag for a lot of head loss or efficiencies in the system. High velocities would let indicate the need for more transmission, but Wilsonville had a lot of transmission capacity.
 - Asked if laminar flow, not turbulent flow, was used to measure flow, and was that a factor when trying to calibrate some of the pumps.
 - Mr. Bledsoe stated every meter was a bit different. A guideline was used for upstream and downstream pipe segments. Turbulence might be less critical for certain types of meters. Usually, laminar flow was recommended, but it would not be a factor in measurement problems. Turbulence is usually introduced when going through fittings and turns.
 - Inquired about the City maintaining lines at more than 80 psi. Most homes operate better at less than 80 psi, so are residents advised to install pressure regulating valves?
 - Mr. Bledsoe replied the City requires pressure regulators when the pressures are higher; much of the system has pressure regulators. He was not sure if the pressure regulators are located in the meter vault or in residents' homes. It is not uncommon for cities to have large areas with pressures above 80 psi and every resident has a pressure regulator on their system. Some communities make pressure regulators a policy, regardless of the system pressure, to transfer risk to the homeowner.
 - Steve Munsterman, Public Works Supervisor - Water, clarified that the pressure regulating valves used by homeowners and business owners could be placed anywhere from a garage to right outside the meter vault. People are encouraged and builders know that pressure regulators need to be installed. Residents do not always know they have them, which can create problems when the pressure drops or increases and they realize the regulators have to be replaced. Pressure regulators are also used in the system to control pressure differences due to elevation changes. The City owns and maintains these pressure regulators. Older homes should all have pressure regulators. Homeowners could tell a regulator is needed if they have singing pipes, surging water pressure or other issues.

Mr. Pauly entered the following exhibits into the record:

Exhibit E: Email from Eldon R. Johansen dated July 8 2012 regarding concerns about how the Water System Master Plan ties into the City planning process and to any pending water rate and SDC study update.

Exhibit F: Letter from Wallulis & Associates dated July 9, 2012, along with six pages of review notes responding to the Water System Master Plan, and his resume.

Chair Altman opened public testimony regarding the Water System Master Plan Update at 7:35 p.m.

Stanley Wallulis, 7725 SW Village Green Circle, Charbonneau, reviewed the comments and concerns presented in his letter to Mr. Mende dated July 9, 2012 (Exhibit F) and discussed his work experiences in other jurisdictions and how other communities resolved water issues. He noted the availability of water in Charbonneau that could be used to fill fire trucks should there be a major fire, as well as meeting water demands.

Chair Altman:

- Understood Mr. Wallulis' written testimony and oral presentation primary focused on the proposals for Charbonneau and that he believed the City could provide water to Charbonneau through less expensive means than what was proposed.
 - Mr. Wallulis agreed. He cited Item 4 in Appendix H on Page 24 and noted the City would not only have the river crossing, but would also have to build another reservoir.
- Clarified the Master Plan already included providing an additional reservoir on the west side of town, not in Charbonneau, that would provide the needed replacement storage. If the Charbonneau tank ultimately went away, the new reservoir that was already planned would replace it.
 - Mr. Wallulis stated additional testing was needed and should be budgeted to determine the subsurface conditions under the reservoir in case the City considered doing repairs and improving the tank. This should be done before deciding to abandon the tank. Charbonneau would not grow; it was maxed out, so he did not believe a lot of expense was necessary to service the Charbonneau District.

Commissioner Phelps asked if Mr. Wallulis was suggesting the second pipe not be built and that the wells were sufficient regardless of the level of catastrophic events.

- Mr. Wallulis confirmed that was his opinion. He explained that the present tank and booster pumps were adequate if minor adjustments were made to bring them up to Code. There were two additional wells by the tank. If it was really a question of getting more supply, he suggested building wells in Charbonneau, which would be a lot less expensive.

Chair Altman confirmed Mr. Wallulis was suggesting that the ponds on the golf course, which are fed by river water, could be tapped to provide an adequate emergency supply that was not considered in the Master Plan.

- Mr. Wallulis noted that other areas build ponds to serve as fire protection and many ponds already exist in Charbonneau.

Clifford Engel, 8180 SW Fairway Dr. Wilsonville, noted the Water Usage Analysis chart showing the difference between what was being metered and what was being used. Charbonneau had many 35- and 40-year old irrigation systems used for the residences as well as the common areas. The common area between his condominium and the one next door uses much more water than it takes to put an inch of water on the lawn because the area is a swamp in the middle of summer.

- He suspected that while the residences in Charbonneau were metered, the District itself might not be metered. He suggested the City try to find these unmetered irrigation systems. There could be many broken pipes, which would be less expensive to fix than continuing to pump water that was not needed. Because the common areas are not metered, the wasted water was not being accounted for and the residents pay for this with higher rates.
- He noted how high his water bill was when he incorrectly installed a watering system in his backyard. A lot of water can be wasted in a very short time.

There was no further public testimony.

Chair Altman inquired about Exhibit E. He understood Mr. Johansen wanted to make sure the City was still covering development requirements, and Chair Altman believed the policy structure being added might address his concerns.

Mr. Mende stated he would address Exhibits E and F. He thanked Mr. Engel for pointing out the issue with the common areas in Charbonneau and confirmed it was another potential source for unaccounted for water. The irrigation system in Charbonneau was not considered and would definitely be researched further. Most of the irrigation in Charbonneau was on a private district, but it was still an issue worth considering.

Mr. Bledsoe added one recommendation in the Master Plan was to partition the City up and use meters to see if certain areas were more subject to water loss than other areas. One recommendation was to meter the water going to Charbonneau, so the City could compare the amount of water sent to the district to the sum of all of the individual meters in Charbonneau to determine what water loss might be occurring.

Commissioner McGuire asked if Villebois was set up the same way. Like Charbonneau, Villebois has a number of privately-owned common spaces, some of which would transition to the City. She asked if Villebois had a general meter for entire development and noted common areas in Villebois were overwatered as well.

- Mr. Bledsoe explained that it was not uncommon for a homeowners association (HOA) to have their own account. The City would bill a HOA with its own meter and homeowners' HOA dues typically include water.
- Mr. Munsterman stated that to the best of his knowledge, every water service in the city was metered. Villebois was an area the City had the best handle on because it was all new. The City has had Staff members on the water crew for 16 and 25 years who have a good idea about the metering system. If there is a green spot in an area with no meter, it is pretty simple to figure it out. All City accounts are metered as well, in fact, the City bills the City for water.
 - Charbonneau's irrigation district previously only provided water to the golf course, but that changed to cover the cost of replacement so the burden was not totally on the golf course members and the HOA is being charged. While areas inside one's private courtyard might be watered off the home system, the area outside the courtyard is watered off a common system. The golf course is watered off another section, but any use of City water is metered.

Mr. Engle explained if a condition caused by a gradual leak had been occurring for sometime, the City might not see much difference because the measurements are based on prior leaks during the heavy watering season.

- Mr. Munsterman stated it was not always possible to know what is leaking when there was no separate irrigation account. The City is happy to help people figure what might be causing a leak if their bill doubles.

Mr. Engle suggested the City send a notice to Charbonneau stating the City would begin assessing individual homes to pay for leaks if they could not be found; he assured the City would get many reports in just one week.

- Mr. Munsterman noted leak detection was covered in the main document. The City contracts with a leak detection company that surveys a one quarter to one third of the City's system every year and not a lot of leaks are found. The City was fairly good at finding and repairing leaks and no active leaks exist at this time. The City surveys all new construction and everything still under warranty so leaks can be repaired by the builder.
- Mr. Bledsoe added that of the 30 water studies he has done, Wilsonville was the most proactive with regard to leak detection and elimination.

Mr. Mende addressed the comments and concerns discussed in Exhibits E and F as follows:

- Exhibit E regarded Mr. Johansen's concerns, which included how to meet demands, how the DRB evaluates demands, and the requirements the City places on a development to ensure specific capacities. He cited Mr. Johansen's email stating, "In general, the statements on water and sewer were casual until we approached

capacity. Then, we provided specific capacities and previously approved water requirements.” This was a true statement and the City would like to keep it that way.

- In the analysis, the City looked at current conditions, and the water needed to accommodate the growth rate over a 5- to 20-year period, which provided a macro view of the water demand over the long term without looking at each individual development. If the City had enough water for the forecasted growth of 2.9% residential and 3.5% commercial, the water supply would be accurate.
- A hydraulic model has been prepared to study individual developments, such as a large industrial user like Coca-Cola. Specific nodes within that distribution system could be taken into account to ensure the City did have the capacity, flow and pressure.
- Mr. Johansen’s second concern regarded the water SDCs; however, a rate study component was not included in this Master Plan for a couple of reasons.
 - First, this Master Plan was primarily intended to be a technical document that did not get into the economics of different alternatives but recommend, from an engineering and technical standpoint, what was the best and most economical way to move forward and maintain the current system.
 - The second reason was that this distribution system was only half of the equation; to fully develop a rate study, the Water Treatment Plant improvements would need to be built into the rate study. The Master Plan for the Water Treatment Plant was last updated in 2004. A long-term look was needed to determine improvements for the Water Treatment Plant. Short-term improvements were addressed on an interim basis to achieve 15 mgd for both Wilsonville and Sherwood. The Water Treatment Plant Master Plan update would involve multiple entities, including the Tualatin Valley Water District and the City of Sherwood.
 - He clarified that an 18-in line was installed across the wetlands along the Montebello alignment. An additional 18-in line was planned to follow the Barber St alignment that would hang from the bottom of the bridge and connect directly to the 18-in Barber Street line, which goes out to Graham’s Ferry and then north. The parallel 18-in line was needed after the reorganization of Villebois for the new school to ensure that section of town is looped.
- With regard to Mr. Wallulis’ letter (Exhibit F), he had addressed comments about SDCs and the rate study, which paralleled Mr. Johansen’s.
 - Most comments on the first couple of pages regarded the Executive Summary, and Mr. Wallulis did find a couple typos, such as Item 2 having to do with annual demand, which should be daily.
 - He clarified that Proposed Policy 3.1.7, in Item 19, was the tracking system and metering data for all the billing data, which was discussed as part of the unaccounted for water, as well as the City’s approach for addressing the issue and maintaining an accurate profile of water usage.
 - Item 16 are in regards to system development charges.
- Mr. Wallulis’ comments on the Executive Summary requested quite a bit of significant technical detail, but the Planning Commission had asked that the technical detail be removed from the Executive Summary to make it more readable for the public. Most all the detail requested by Mr. Wallulis was located in the main text of the document, but would not be included in the Executive Summary.
- Mr. Wallulis’ comments noted in red regarded the 16-in water line crossing to Charbonneau and his suggestion that additional economic analysis be considered. Mr. Mende believed the basis of the economic analysis had been covered as a comparison to repairs or replacements of the tank and well system. Mr. Wallulis’ evaluation of the upgrade costs did not consider the cost of seismic retrofit, which was a late addition that was not incorporated into the earlier Master Plan draft.
- Mr. Bledsoe noted that rehabilitating the tank would cost \$1.8 million and when added to the \$265,000, it became quite a bit more costly to keep the status quo and meet current Code.

Commissioner Phelps:

- Stated the recommended, most cost effective way to serve Charbonneau did not add up. There were concerns about putting the pipeline through the river because the City might lose the bridge, yet the bridge supposedly has been retrofitted for earthquakes. Then, the Commission has heard that plenty of standby

water exists on the golf course. He did not oppose the current recommendation, but wanted to know if service in Charbonneau could be maintained by taking advantage of what already exists in Charbonneau, or putting the water line across the river and reducing the reliance on wells.

- Mr. Bledsoe explained there were two scenarios. The first scenario was to provide the same level of service in Charbonneau that the City targets for the rest of the community, which included fire protection and demand in an emergency event, and the second was to have secondary supply sources. To provide the same level of service, the following options were considered: replace the tank at Charbonneau, rehabilitate the tank at Charbonneau or put in the pipeline.
 - The lifecycle analysis in Appendix E showed that building the pipeline and some extra storage would cost the same as rehabilitating the tank at 20 years. With a 40-year lifecycle cost, the tank would cost even more; therefore, the pipeline was more cost effective over a 40-year span. The pipeline was longer-term investment than 20 years. The breakeven point of fixing the tank versus installing the pipeline was about 20 years out, when the annual cost savings would pay for the investment.
- Understood the investment now would benefit the community for more than 20 years, but the City would breakeven at 20 years. The tank might last 20 years, then the pipeline would take over and become more cost efficient after that 20th year. Doing nothing for 20 years would only delay installment of the pipeline, which could cost more money in 20 years.
 - Mr. Bledsoe noted there would be some cost because doing nothing for 20 years would require more investment in the booster station to keep it going, etc. The cost breakdown was added to Appendix E.
 - Mr. Mende added the main premise of the analysis was to treat Charbonneau the same as other parts of the city. If the decision was made that Charbonneau was to have a less secure system than the rest of the city, then the City could save money.
- Responded less secure was in the eye of the beholder and becomes art rather than science at some point. He wanted to know where this recommendation is cost beneficial. The cost benefit question would be raised at future conversation levels and he wanted to know how that question would be addressed. He was not able to get at the information he needed to address his question.

Commissioner Levit confirmed the ponds would be not be used for potable water, only for fire protection, so if the tank was not usable, the wells would not be adequate.

Commissioner Hurley understood the other part of the question was what if the tank was not rehabilitated and the pipe was not built, but more was invested to recharge the wells only in Charbonneau.

- Mr. Bledsoe responded it would be hard to get adequate production if any new wells were like the existing wells, one well put out 80 gpm and another, 300 gpm. Residential fire protection requires 1,500 gpm and larger facilities require 2,500 gpm, which would require a lot of big wells. The study did not consider using the ponds anywhere in the system.
- Mr. Mende noted the ponds were privately owned and an agreement would be required between the City and private owners with the water rights, which was possible.

Commissioner McGuire commented that the logistics of getting water from a pond versus a direct source would affect fire protection.

- Mr. Bledsoe explained commercial entities that use ponds as their source must maintain the ponds and make sure water was in the pond year round. In addition, there was usually a direct connection to a hydrant that puts the pond water within proximity of the structure as directed by the fire department, such as that a 300-ft radius. Water in a pond a quarter mile away could still be hauled, but it would not meet the same level of service provided to other areas of the community.

Commissioner Levit believed there might be an impact on fire insurance rates for homeowners dependent on a pond rather than a full hydrant system.

- Commissioner Postma replied that insurance companies did not do that type of independent analysis.
- Mr. Bledsoe added the ISO ratings for a neighborhood were not that specific.

Mr. Mende concluded his responses to items in Exhibit F with these comments:

- Many comments regarded terminology, like turnouts, and the acronyms and abbreviations would be modified accordingly.
- He clarified that the footages associated with various improvements were included in the estimates in the appendices and that the summary tables in Chapters 5 and 6 only looked at projects and costs, so adding that level of detail would not be included in those chapters.
- He believed the remaining Mr. Wallulis' comments were addressed during the Staff report and questions.

Chair Altman closed the public hearing at 8:27 p.m. and called for Commission discussion.

Ms. Jacobson advised the Commission about procedural process given the discussion regarding the recommended changes. She noted Commissioners McGuire and Hurley each made changes that could easily be incorporated, as well as the language revision by Mr. Pauly. Some of the responses to issues raised in the letter would not necessarily result in changes to the Staff report, but were just explanations. She suggested the Commissioners indicate which comments they would like addressed tonight, adding the Commission had the option to request another version of the Staff report.

Commissioner Postma understood Mr. Mende intended to incorporate some typographical/correction items raised by Mr. Wallulis and asked how best to differentiate those for the sake of clarification based on the laundry list of suggested changes.

- Mr. Mende stated Ms. Jacobson addressed two or three specific changes requested by the Planning Commission. While Staff had presented the analysis, Commissioner Phelps also wanted clarification about the least cost option for Charbonneau.

Commissioner Postma:

- Suggested addressing Commissioner Phelps concern by stating that additional discussion of a cost benefit analysis of multiple options for Charbonneau be included in the recommendation for approval. The technical corrections made by Commissioner Levit were easy to include because of specific indications already on the record; however, Mr. Mende did not confirm which specific changes should be made from Mr. Wallulis' notes and which were questions; the discussion became a bit confusing.
 - Mr. Mende clarified the typographical errors and other fixes did not need to be stated as a condition.
- Recommended stating, "Mr. Willulis' comments based upon typographical errors or corrections that need to be made" as opposed to comments.

Commissioner Phelps stated he would like to see the cost benefit analysis as characterized by Commissioner Postma.

Commissioner Postma agreed it was not easily digestible. There should be a pros discussion of the different options that were considered and that the recommended option was the best cost benefit analysis because of X, Y, and Z.

- Mr. Bledsoe reiterated the cost benefit analysis was already included, but information was spread throughout the document.

Chair Altman understood the need was to consolidate that cost benefit analysis information into the Staff report that would go forward to Council.

Mr. Mende understood that the Staff report would then include a cost benefit analysis for providing fire flow service to the Charbonneau District using both public and private water ownership and both underground and surface sources.

Commissioner Phelps:

- Explained that he wanted the cost benefit of no new water line versus a new water line. He would like all of that information in one place where it was easy to see.
 - Mr. Mende explained that with his suggested language, any source of water could be used and wells and ponds could be built in to do a new cost benefit analysis that would go beyond the one already done for the pipeline versus –
 - Mr. Bledsoe interjected, asking if the analysis should involve just the pipe versus the tank.
 - Ms. Jacobson believed Commissioner Phelps wanted a cost benefit analysis to determine if it was more cost beneficial to have a pipe or use what exists and not have a pipe.
- Agreed Ms. Jacobson's summary was correct; all he wanted to know was whether the City needed a pipe.

Commissioner Postma thanked the team, City Staff and Consultants, for making the Master Plan more readable. The City had an obligation to its citizens to make sure the Master Plan could be read and understood by anyone. The changes made for a better document, which was incredibly useful.

- He agreed with Commissioner Phelps on the issue of Charbonneau. More discussion about the cost benefit analysis was important because it would show which items the Commission believes the Council should consider.
- The lost water issue had been discussed ad nauseum. Discussion at a previous work session included the idea that the cost of unaccounted for water was not necessarily passed on to certain residents or businesses and he disagreed. Lost water had to be accounted for and there would be an increase for everyone because the system as a whole must pick up the slack in order to cover that production. Sherwood would now have to share in the lost water expense, despite the fact that Sherwood has a brand new facility. Eventually, Sherwood would speak up about having to pay for the City's water loss. Even though the City is aggressive in preventing and repairing leaks, the lost water issue still needed to be resolved because that loss was paid for by everyone. It was hard to hear that the City was doing great with leaks and meters, so Staff did not think it was a problem. It was important to track down where the lost water was going. He did not know where those costs fit into the equation, but he believed the City should continue to be sensitive the issue.

Commissioner Levit believed the team did a pretty thorough job of trying to evaluate the water system, which was not an easy task because the system is underground. It was important to understand what would be checked. However, City Council would have to follow up on those things if the Commission approved the changes tonight.

- His one concern was focusing on just one cost benefit analysis when a case could be made for doing or not doing every item on the list, though that level of justification was unwarranted, not that it should not be done, but the Commission was not focusing on each and every item.

Chair Altman noted that specific testimony was given raising the issue and proposing alternatives that were never addressed. The Commission had heard the comments and Staff was looking at the issue, which seemed to be the cost benefit of making those improvements to Charbonneau and the best way to do so. He was comfortable with that approach. The only reason the analysis was being done was that specific testimony raised the issue; no other testimony was given about other areas in town.

Commissioner Phelps confirmed he was concerned about the cost benefit analysis before, but the public testimony solidified his concerns. He noted the biggest cost elements in the Master Plan revolved around Charbonneau. The City needed to make sure that much money must be spent in order to do the job right.

Chair Altman echoed his appreciation for the revised and simplified Executive Summary, and particularly the fire flow exhibit.

Commissioner Postma moved to adopt the Staff Report, with the amended Implementation Measure 3.1.5.b, as stated by Mr. Dan Pauly, and to recommend approval of the Water Master Plan, with modifications of multiple items as follows:

- **Consolidate and simplify the cost benefit analysis for available options to address Charbonneau’s short- and long-term supply and flow issues as discussed and addressed by Commissioner Phelps.**
- **Include the note with regard to the chart on Page 17 of the draft Water System Master Plan (Exhibit A) for large capital items listed in Priority Items 1A that were previously included in the prior Master Plan as indicated by Commissioner McGuire.**
- **Include the suggested revisions or corrections as addressed by Commissioner Levit.**
- **Correct the third line under ES.2.5 on Page ES.6 to state “(TVWD)”.**
- **Include Motor Control Center (MCC), used in Table ES.4 for Items 300 & 301, in the table of acronyms.**
- **Include the cost benefit of abandoning versus maintaining wells as noted by Commissioner Hurley.**
- **Include the correction of typographical errors addressed by Mr. Wallulis in Exhibit F.**

Commissioner Hurley seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Commissioner Postma moved to adopt Resolution LP12-0002 with the adopted Staff report as amended. Commissioner Hurley seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Mende stated that he expected someone to ask why Technical Memos 1, 3 and 5 were included in Appendix B, but not Technical Memos 2 and 4, and explained that they were rolled into Technical Memos 1, 3 and 5.

Commissioner Levit noted that the Commission just approved changes with a cost benefit analysis, but no recommendation was made about how the cost benefit analysis was to be utilized.

- Mr. Bledsoe reiterated that the cost benefit analysis had already been completed, but only needed to be summarized in a way that was easy to follow. He confirmed that the Master Plan recommended the pipeline versus the reservoir.
- Mr. Mende added that the Master Plan now goes to Council where other considerations, in addition to the technical basis behind the improvements, were being recommended, such as a future rate study. The timing for the recommended improvements might be changed.

VIII. ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY COMMENTS

Barbara Jacobson, Assistant City Attorney had no comments.

IX. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

A. Community Survey Results

Daniel Pauly noted the inclusion of the results in the meeting packet, adding he enjoyed watching the community survey. He welcomed comments and questions from Commission.

Commissioner Levit:

- Confirmed that renters were included in the survey.

- Questioned the validity of some of the responses. For example, Ease of Bus Travel, 77 percent responded that it was good to excellent; Ease of Bicycle Travel, 70 percent responded that it also good to excellent. He wished there were that many people using public transit and bikes. He believed a lot of the responses were observational, i.e., “there’s a bike lane so it must be good.”
 - Mr. Pauly agreed, adding it was difficult to understand what people were thinking when comments made on the surveys were so general.
- Noted on Safety Services; 71 percent of respondents believed the municipal courts and traffic enforcement were good. He did not know the courts were that busy.
 - Mr. Pauly confirmed Court, held every other Tuesday night, was busy.
- Confirmed that 600 completed surveys were received from the 3000 sent out which was a good return.

Commissioner McGuire added she was surprised walking scored so high.

Commissioner Phelps noted the Chamber of Commerce did a survey a couple years ago and no comments were received regarding public safety, indicating citizens were so satisfied with public safety that no comments were necessary. Now, two years later, the community survey confirmed this to be true. He was very pleased that the police department was doing a good job.

Chair Altman stated comments were made when the survey results were presented that some of the responses were perceptions. The number of people using transit was low compared to the 70 percent that thought it was great. The City Manager commented that the real value was to monitor responses over time to see how the City was doing with regard to services provided.

B. E-version of Planning Commissioner’s Journal

Mr. Pauly noted the journal would be converted to a web-based version. Any questions should be directed to Administrative Assistant Linda Straessle via email or phone call.

C. 2012 Select New Partner’s for Smart Growth Presentations

This item was misprinted on the Planning Commission Agenda and was to be addressed during the Committee for Citizen Involvement meeting.

X. ADJOURNMENT TO THE COMMITTEE FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT MEETING

Chair Altman adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

By Paula Pinyerd of ABC Transcription Services, Inc. for
Linda Straessle, Planning Administrative Assistant