



PREPARED FOR:

WILLAMETTE WATER SUPPLY PROGRAM

July 2014

PREPARED BY:

DHM RESEARCH

(503) 220-0575 • 239 NW 13th Ave., #205, Portland, OR 97209 • www.dhmresearch.com

1. INTRODUCTION & METHODOLOGY

DHM Research conducted two focus groups, in partnership with Barney & Worth, Inc., with residents of Wilsonville. The primary objectives of the research were to assess Wilsonville residents' understanding of and attitudes about the expansion of the Willamette River Water Treatment Plant and construction of a new water pipeline to serve other communities. The results of the focus groups will inform public information and engagement efforts.

Research Design: The groups were held on Saturday, May 31. A total of 18 Wilsonville residents participated. They represented a range of ages, genders, occupations, and political affiliations. See Appendix A for complete study demographics.

The focus groups were led by a professional moderator and consisted of both written exercises and group discussions. Although research of this type is not designed to measure, with statistical reliability, the attitudes of a particular group, it is valuable for giving a sense of the attitudes and opinions of the population from which the sample was drawn.

This memo highlights key findings from the discussions. Each section reviews a major topic from the group discussions and includes representative quotations, as well as evaluative commentary. The quotes and commentary are drawn from both written exercises and group discussions.¹ The referenced Appendices provide the complete responses to all written exercises.

DHM Research: Davis, Hibbitts & Midghall, Inc. has been providing opinion research and consultation throughout Oregon, the Pacific Northwest, and the nation for over three decades. The firm is non-partisan and independent and specializes in research projects to support community planning and public policy-making. www.dhmresearch.com

¹ Quotations were selected to represent the range of opinions regarding a topic, and not to quantitatively represent the expressed attitudes.

2. SUMMARY & OBSERVATIONS

Participants were pleased with most aspects of their current water system.

- People in general thought their water tasted good, and that their current water was better than the city water prior to construction of the water treatment facility.
- Although troubled over pollution in the Willamette River, people expressed confidence in the water treatment facility.
- Participants were concerned about the cost of their water. They observed that they pay a premium for a good service. Current water prices were described as high, and rising.

Participants were generally unaware of the water partnership with Tualatin Valley Water District and had almost no knowledge of what the partnership entails.

- While several participants were aware that Sherwood has partnered with Wilsonville, few knew of the link with Tualatin Valley Water District.
- Participants did not have a clear understanding of when agreements were made, what contributions others had already made to the partnership, and what responsibilities Wilsonville had undertaken as a result.
- Although a few participants indicated that they had read about this issue, there seems to be a need to provide city residents with more information about the water partnership.

Participants recognized that water partnerships could bring benefits, but had reservations about whether those benefits would be realized.

- Most participants held positive views toward water partnerships in general.
- In both open-ended questioning and a ranking exercise, cost savings was the most important benefit participants hoped to see with a water partnership. They were concerned about who would bear the costs of additional infrastructure, and clearly did not want to see their rates go up any more.
- Participants hoped new partners would bring an expanded knowledge base and wisdom, but were concerned about how the differing needs and priorities of additional communities would weigh against those of Wilsonville.

Participants requested that the city actively protect residents' interests.

- Participants cited construction and traffic as their biggest concerns for a water pipeline project. They wanted to minimize disruption to business and residents, while balancing cost.
- Ideally, any construction projects would improve the city.
- Participants expressed concern over the ability to meet increased demand on the water, and wanted to ensure that Wilsonville residents are given first priority.

3. KEY FINDINGS

3.1 | Community Improvements

"Our community is growing, and as you know, the traffic and everything else is growing."

"Also the swimming pool. I feel strongly about that."

"I put a police force that is friendlier with the community."

The focus groups started with a written exercise asking the participants to list improvements that they would like for the local community. The improvements mentioned most frequently involved transportation, community amenities, and public safety (Appendix B).

Transportation. The most commonly-elicited improvements involved transportation. Participants listed multiple issues related to transportation in Wilsonville. Traffic problems or traffic flow was mentioned by five participants, and this issue resounded with others in the open discussion. Suggested improvements included improved traffic light timing, additional east-west access, and more work to ease congestion on Wilsonville Road. Four participants brought up issues concerning bike transportation. People were interested in seeing more bike lanes and improved connectivity of lanes.

Community Amenities. A few participants listed a community pool as the top desired improvement. A specific attraction of a pool was that it could be used by all ages. A few other participants would like to see more library services, either through increased hours or expanded class offerings to engage more of the community.

Public Safety. Various issues related to public safety were also a common theme. A few people brought up the need for more police officers, in particular for police officers engaged with the community. For example, one participant noted the need for Wilsonville to have its own police department rather than sharing some facilities and coverage with Clackamas County. Some of the public safety concerns concerned traffic, overlapping with the general transportation theme, but crime and break-ins were brought up as an issue as well. There seemed to be a sense that with growth, it would be helpful to move forward now with a community-based plan to forestall problems.

3.2 | General Evaluation of Drinking Water

"You are not going to get really much better water than you are getting through the city."

"I just know the filtration process that they use down at the water treatment plant by the river, and it is amazing."

No participants listed improvements to drinking water as a top concern for the community. When asked specifically to evaluate the quality of drinking water, most participants viewed their drinking water positively. Nearly all (seventeen) participants rated the water as very good or good (Appendix C). Participants reported that the water tastes good and they are generally happy with the water. Long-term residents definitely preferred the Willamette River water to the well-water that the city used formerly. The river water was seen as better-tasting and having fewer mineral (calcium) issues.

Participants who rated the water lower mentioned a chemical or "odd" taste. Other negative aspects of the water included a fish smell, lack of fluoridation, and some remaining mineral issues. Even if people had a generally positive view of the water, some concerns over the source remained. That is, participants were concerned about pollution in the river water. As one participant noted, *"Although the Willamette starts way up in the Cascades, it passes through a lot of pastureland and a lot of agricultural land, so it does get the opportunity to be exposed to livestock. It gets exposed to pesticides and other things."*

Several participants expressed confidence in the water treatment facility. A few people had toured the facility or attended hearing about the treatment facility. These participants were very comfortable about the quality of water treatment. One person said, *"It is such a state-of-the-art facility, and everything that I read and educated myself about makes me believe and feel very, very comfortable thinking we probably have some of the better quality water in the whole state of Oregon."*

3.3 | Description of Drinking Water

Participants were given a list of adjectives and asked to circle the top three or four that describe their drinking water (Appendix D). Eleven of the participants chose *good tasting*, echoing the general satisfaction observed in the previous discussion. *Clean* or *clear* and *safe* were also frequently chosen words.

3.4 | Source of Drinking Water

"I think Oregon has done an admiral job of cleaning up the river, but there is always more that can be done to keep it clean."

"And again, I put my trust in the treatment plant, and hopefully it's not misplaced."

Participants identified the source of their drinking water and provided their opinions about the source (Appendix E). Two-thirds of the participants were aware that the water comes from the Willamette River; one person did have a private well. Opinions about the source were split. Many participants were concerned about the cleanliness of the river water, but nonetheless several felt that the treatment facility was capable of providing safe water to their houses. People's tangible experience with the river was often negative. That is, participants found the brown river water unpleasant visually or had negative experiences when using the river for recreational purposes. Those experiences shaped how they viewed their water source.

"We spend a lot of time out on the river boating and stuff like that, and there have been times it is like, 'We're not going to go swimming.'"

"You go to the beach, you can't go in the beach, and then the river is one of the most polluted rivers. You can't even see through it. A friend of mine went in there and cut their foot open on glass."

3.5 | Drinking Water Supplier

Participants next indicated which agency supplies their drinking water and noted their opinions about the supplier (Appendix F). Close to two-thirds of the participants named Wilsonville Water, or City of Wilsonville, as their supplier. Around one-quarter of the respondents, five people, felt their supplier was doing well or "ok." An equal number of participants noted concerns with the cost of their water. In the discussion, people noted that rates have gone up and seem very expensive. For example,

"I have just seen the water bill go up, up, up, up, up. I bought it in 2006, and the difference between then and now, it is a lot, and it is not because of watering irrigation. It has just gone up a lot, and I don't really know why."

Participants expressed concerns about the fairness of rates and how they are set. In addition, condo residents in both focus groups complained that the city changed from individual meters to a building-wide meter. This was seen as particularly unfair to single occupancy units.

3.6 | Evaluation of Water Partnerships in General

The participants provided their opinions on partnerships for water systems in general. The majority (eleven) thought partnerships were a good idea (Appendix G). Positive outcomes listed by participants primarily revolved around cost effectiveness and cost sharing as well as a broader base of knowledge. On the other hand, concerns most frequently revolved around potential disagreements and concerns about water shortage.

Cost Effectiveness: Participants thought that a partnership among multiple municipalities could be more cost effective if overhead and administrative charges were shared. They noted either volume discounts or economies of scale might help lower water costs. Participants also hoped that partners would contribute toward improving the water and provide access to a bigger area from which to gather the water. On the flip side, people with negative views about partnerships worried that it could increase costs, perhaps through the expense of building and maintaining a larger infrastructure.

Knowledge base: Several participants believed that a partnership would bring together people with more areas of expertise or knowledge. Better ideas could help the overall system.

Differing priorities: Participants worried about some communities having greater or more expensive needs than others, leading to inequities. Lack of consensus among partners was a clear concern. The participants questioned how disagreements would be resolved: *"I think that our own city council has a hard enough time making a decision...Nothing is ever going to get solved, because who is going to be the deciding factor?"*

Limited resource: A few people worried about Wilsonville's capacity to supply water to other areas. Seasonal fluctuations in water availability and usage, or growth in Wilsonville, were given as concerns for the sustainability of partnerships.

3.7 | Knowledge about Current Partnership

Participants were asked to list communities that have water system partnerships with Wilsonville (Appendix H). Just about one half of the participants, eight, did not know of any partnerships. The most commonly listed partner community was Sherwood, identified by six people. Three people named Tualatin as a partner.

It was clear from the focus group discussion that people were uncertain about many facets of the partnership. While a substantial number indicated that they knew there was some partnership, the specifics on which communities were partners and when the partnerships were formed were hazy. For example, in trying to understand the history, one person remarked, *"When we were building this, we wanted these other communities to come in and help share the expense, and my hope is that these people are finally coming on board at a*

later date, that hopefully they will be absorbing some of those initial costs.” Some people thought Sherwood was already connected to the water system, others were not sure.

People were concerned about the capacity of the current facility and the need for future expansion if partners come on board. The primary concerns, however, had to do with effects on the residents of Wilsonville. Specifically, people wanted water costs go down for Wilsonville and to see, at the minimum, a slowing of rate increases. In addition, they wanted reassurance that the water needs of Wilsonville residents would be prioritized.

People who reported some awareness of the partnership identified *The Messenger* newsletter as a source of information.

3.8 | Concerns about Partnership

Participants were asked to provide their concerns or reactions after learning that the Willamette River Water Treatment Plan is jointly owned with one partner organization. In general, people were too uncertain of the details to provide an opinion (Appendix I). One person wrote, *“I don’t know who they are partnered with to make an opinion about it.”* Participants had questions about how the partnership was structured and what it meant for their community. One person asked, *“When we invite other communities to join in our program, what is their buy-in? What is their stake?”* They wanted to know if the water treatment plant would have enough capacity to meet increased demands, who would pay any expansion costs, and who would pay for infrastructure costs.

3.9 | Concerns about New Water Pipeline

Participants listed their concerns about a new water pipeline through Wilsonville. Echoing the general community concerns elicited at the beginning of the group, construction and traffic were the biggest concerns (Appendix J). Additional notable concerns included cost and location of the pipeline.

3.10 | Water Pipeline Routes

Participants read several different scenarios concerning the placement of future water pipelines. Overall, placing a pipe under a pedestrian trail received the broadest support. Participants were also amenable to placing a pipeline along an unimproved two-lane road or placing a pipe in the ground at the same time a new road is built (Appendix K). In the discussion, it became clear that participants had difficulties making concrete decisions about balancing cost and disruption without more information about the specific routes involved.

Route A—The pipe is placed under a wide boulevard. Participants were opposed to this scenario. A few in the first focus group vehemently described this as a “*disaster*” and “*horrible idea*.” The second focus group had more mixed reactions; nonetheless, the majority viewed this option negatively.

Route B—The pipe is placed along an unimproved two-lane road. The majority of participants approved of this idea. Some descriptors included “*a better idea*” and “*best idea*.” One person explained, “*If they are tearing up a road that needs to be improved anyways, two things are done at once.*”

Route C—The pipe is placed under a street in a neighborhood. Participants opposed routing the pipe through a neighborhood.

Route D—The pipe is placed under a frontage road bordered by a mix of businesses. Reaction was rather mixed to the idea of disrupting businesses on a frontage road. People were concerned about effects on business revenue. Some of the positive responses were accompanied by qualifiers, such as only if a bike lane was also put in or construction was done early in the morning. On the other hand, one participant noted that placing a water pipeline along a frontage road seemed more fitting than placing it under farms or undeveloped land.

Route E—The pipe is placed in the ground at the same time a new road is built. The majority of participants supported placing the pipe while building a new road. Generally, this was seen as a “*good idea*” and a sensible solution. “*I think if they’re going to make a road, it would be perfect.*”

Route F—The pipe is placed under a pedestrian trail. Participants overwhelmingly approved of this option. Four people described this as the “*best idea*.” No one voiced concerns. As one person noted, “*I think you’d have less impact in general over the major portion of the population while the construction was going on.*”

Route G—The pipe is placed under a two-lane road fronted by warehouses. The two focus groups received this option quite differently. Three-quarters of the first focus group opposed this option; everyone in the second group approved. As a whole, then, residents were split on whether they support this scenario. One participant summed up this option nicely: “*It is a medium solution.*”

Route H—The pipe is tunneled under a busy intersection. While a few people supported tunneling under a busy intersection, negative responses were strongly opposed. For example, people wrote, “*Absolutely no way*,” “*Super bad idea*,” or “*disaster*.” Information about the total level of disruption might be helpful in considering this option. One participant noted, “*The tunnel aspect of it was intriguing to me. I thought maybe the surface wouldn’t get disrupted at all.*”

Route I—The pipe is placed under private property, not a public street. People in the second focus group only were asked to evaluate placing the pipe under public property rather than a street. They were fairly evenly split in their reactions. They seemed a bit skeptical that it would be viable, but it would be acceptable.

3.11 | Potential Benefits of a New Water Pipeline

Participants were asked how the construction of a new water pipeline to serve other communities could benefit Wilsonville. Most participants listed potential financial benefits (Appendix L). The most frequent financial benefit given was increased revenue. People also hoped cost sharing or lowered water rates would be a benefit. A few noted that it was “neighborly.”

3.12 | Benefit Rankings

Participants were given a list of potential benefits associated with a water pipeline and asked to rank the top three benefits for Wilsonville. Cost savings for Wilsonville ratepayers received the highest ranking (Appendix M). In both written exercises and discussion during the focus group, cost was a top concern for residents. Other top-ranked benefits included new bicycle and pedestrian paths, upgrades to Wilsonville’s water, sewer and stormwater lines, restoration of wildlife habitat, and opening of new areas for business expansion and jobs. Benefits with moderate rankings included repaving existing streets, building new parks or open spaces, reconstructing and widening streets, and moving utility lines underground.

3.13 | Final Messages

At the end of the focus groups, the participants were asked to write their final advice about expanding the water system to serve other communities (Appendix N). Participants wanted to see thoughtful planning, with a goal of minimizing impact on current residents. They wanted to see prudent planning that protects Wilsonville’s resources and puts the expense on those looking to partner with the city. They also wanted to see planning for future improvements and needs done concurrently with any proposed project.

Limit Effects on Wilsonville Residents

Use the route that disrupts the least, costs the least, and try to get the other cities to pay for it.

Considering the expense—find the least disruptive route that will return the affected neighborhoods and roads back to the original condition or better. Have alternate routes available. Include as much as possible all communities in the decision making process.

Protect Wilsonville’s Interests

Be thoughtful of our own community first.

My advice is we must make sure that this additional partnership is in the best interest of all Wilsonville residents.

Long-Range Planning

Plan for the future. Locate the waterline where it will work for long-range growth, access, and repair. Be prudent with future agreements. Keep Wilsonville protected with our resource.

Cost effectiveness isn't just the cost of putting it in. You have to look out 20 or 100 years and the cost effectiveness over the life of the project.

**Wilsonville Water Focus Groups
May 31, 2014**

**APPENDIX A
PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS/BACKGROUND**

Occupation	
Group 1	Group 2
Administrative Assistant	Retired management
Civil engineer	Assistant portfolio manager
Medical transcriptionist	Retired speech pathologist
Job coach	Retired educator
McDonald's manager	Retired from electric utility
Accountant and property manager	Homemaker/former legal secretary
Truck driver	Sales/customer support
Manufacturer's sales representative	Pilot
	Real estate appraiser
	Steel worker

Education Level		
	Group 1	Group 2
Less than high school grad (1-11)	0	0
HS graduate	0	1
Some college/2 year degree	3	4
College degree/4 year degree	5	2
Post college	0	3

Household Income		
	Group 1	Group 2
\$0 - \$15,000	0	0
\$15,000-\$29,999	1	2
\$30,000-\$49,999	1	2
\$50,000-\$74,999	3	0
\$75,000-\$99,999	1	6
\$100,000 +	2	0

Age		
	Group 1	Group 2
18-24	0	0
25-34	1	0
35-44	1	1
45-54	1	3
55-64	5	3
64-74	0	3
75+	0	0

Gender		
	Group 1	Group 2
Male	3	5
Female	5	5

Ethnic Group		
	Group 1	Group 2
White/Caucasian	7	9
Black/African American	0	0
Spanish/Hispanic	0	1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	0
Native American	0	0

Political Party		
	Group 1	Group 2
Democrat	2	4
Republican	4	3
Independent	0	2
Other	0	1
Not Registered	1	0
No response	1	0

APPENDIX B/WE 1

Make a list of improvements that you would like your local community to do. Place a * next to the issue that is most important to you. // For the most important issue, why is it important to you and what would you like done about it?

Group 1

- *More library activities; Better access to the MAX train; Traffic—possibly improve traffic flow on I-5.//I love the library. I would like to see more people drawn to the library. Maybe offer more classes/workshops for others.
- *East-west access (Barber); more SMART access at Villebois; Trader Joes; police presence.//Build a bridge at Barber; easier access to Villebois; less driving on Wilsonville Road; easier/safer bike traffic.
- NR
- *Better traffic flow—get roads extended over westside, Barber extension.//Traffic funnels down Wilsonville Road and back-ups can be bad. Boeckman extension has helped, but Barber would be best.
- *More childcare available with weekend hours for people who don't work M-F; traffic; police.//It is important to me because I can't advance any further in my position without an open availability.
- *Get the traffic lights more in synch so there is better traffic flow on Wilsonville Road by the freeway; get a Trader Joes store.//Ease frustration with traffic at certain times of the day, with light traffic, a person can sit at every light for no good or apparent reason!
- *More police officers; more pedestrian crossings with LED lights on floor; a jail room.//Because our community is growing—more negative situations have been happening, mostly during summer nights and all nights.
- *A police force that is friendlier with the community; back to small town Boones Ferry days.//It is most important because they currently have a reputation of trapping innocent people to look like they are doing something destructive.

Group 2

- Nothing.//The area that I live in has everything that I want.
- *Traffic problems; more Wilsonville community get-togethers.//I-5 splits Wilsonville and makes it hard to get around, also poorly laid out buildings.
- *Walking/biking trails with a possible connection to Tualatin trails; expand or make new public parks; improve traffic flow.//I like to bike and bike along with local friends. The opportunities we have in this area are limited. Extend trails.
- *Create a homeless shelter for families; build a public pool; fund the library and keep it open.//There is a need for homeless families to have temporary housing. We have a housing boom going on. It is hard to send them to separate shelters in the Portland area.
- *Smell of waste; used book store.//It smells outside—especially on Saturdays and BBQ time. Do eliminate process or change the process.
- *Lower water and sewer rates; swimming pool; less apartments and more houses.//Our rates are outrageous and it is not necessary to be charged so exorbitantly!
- *More bike lanes; more businesses.//It's most important to me because I bicycle around Wilsonville and some areas either don't have a lane, they just end, or they are only on one side of the street.

- *Streets are good—I'm very happy with services and conditions in Wilsonville; Taxes are low; I feel well represented; excellent library; new and useful parks; life is good; better walking and biking trails—are coming.//If you want to have cities, you have to build roads.
- *Community pool.//The community leaders need to use some of the money for building a pool that would be beneficial to all residents.
- *Swimming pool.

APPENDIX C/WE 2

How would you rate the quality of your drinking water at home: very good, good, poor, or very poor? // Why?

	Total	Group 1	Group 2
Very good	8	3	5
Good	9	4	5
Poor	1	1	0
Very poor	0	0	0
DK/No response	0	0	0

Group 1

- (Very good) Good state-of-art treatment facility. Before with wells we had high calcium levels and stains.
- (Very good) State-of-art water treatment plant.
- (Good) Intellectually I know the treatment plant is first rate, but I don't like the taste, however, so I filter it with a Brita filter before drinking it.
- (Very good) Because every other place I've lived, it was very poor.
- (Good) It is free of harsh chemicals and minerals; it tastes good, but not great; it is clear and clean; I filter my water with an ionizer for drinking.
- (Good) I use a filtered water system. The tap water tastes lousy to me.
- (Good) This is difficult. I drink filtered water and have for 15 years or so. But there is usually a period of time every year that even with a filter, the water still tastes bad, no matter what I do—new filter, new pitcher.
- (Poor) I never know when it could be safe to drink; it doesn't taste good—even with a filter; bacteria in the water can make you sick—it's reported on the news.

Group 2

- (Very good) The treatment plant.
- (Very good) Tastes good and not a lot of sediment.
- (Very good) I have no issues with it. It tastes fine, is clear, and I don't drink it often. However, there is a ring in the toilets at times from it.
- (Very good) It always tastes fine to me. I don't have to use anything to filter it. Plants grow great using it also.
- (Very good) It is tested well water.
- (Good) Water tastes fine from the tap, but we use water from our refrigerator filter.
- (Good) No more rings in the toilet.
- (Good) It's filtered—the city water is OK.
- (Good) We have to use a filter on the refrigerator as well as our drinking water. The taste is difficult to get used to. Showers are OK.
- (Good) Sometimes it has a fishy smell. Always has a chemical taste—very slight. I have a Brita filter for my drinking water which does the trick.

APPENDIX D/WE 3

Hand out a list of words to describe water. Circle the three or four words that best describe your drinking water.

Group 1

- Clear; cool; good tasting; odor-free.
- Abundant; dependable; reliable; safe.
- Clear; dependable; good tasting; thirst quenching.
- Affordable; bacteria-free; good tasting; purified.
- Bacteria free; clean; fluoridated; purified.
- Clean; filtered; healthy; reliable.
- Clean; clear; purified; safe.
- Bacteria-free; chemical-free; filtered; good tasting.

Group 2

- Affordable; fluoridated; treated; soft.
- Clean; good tasting; reliable; safe.
- Chlorinated; fluoridated; surface water—has materials which stains my toilets.
- Clear; good tasting; odor-free; safe.
- Clean; dependable; good tasting; safe.
- Affordable; good tasting; odor-free; thirst quenching.
- Clean; clear; good tasting; odor-free.
- Clean; dependable; healthy; reliable; safe.
- Clean; filtered; good tasting; safe.
- Clean; fresh; good tasting.

APPENDIX E/WE 4

What is the source (or sources) of your drinking water? // Write down any thoughts, feelings or opinions you have about the source of your drinking water.

Group 1

- Not sure—river?//If it is the river, what is in there? What was in there? Is it contaminated? Now I'm sounding paranoid.
- Willamette River//Reliable, treatable, increasingly clean.
- I have no idea//I'm not sure that it's always treated or filtered the same. The taste can change depending on the time of years—it seems to me that the winter months it can taste worse than in the summer.
- Willamette River//It has many bad things. Newberg "pool" (waste) and farm chemicals from rain run-off.
- Sewer plant, Willamette River//Is one of the most polluted rivers in Oregon; many chemicals and chlorine in the water; not safe to drink for long periods of time; could have disease.
- Willamette River//I really don't like to think about this service! I know a lot about the filtration process so I know it's OK, and I also know Wilsonville is in a great water position because of this, and can "sell" water to other communities. But, I would really rather get water from a spring!
- I don't know!//I don't know.
- The Willamette River//I think Oregon has done an admirable job of cleaning up the river, but there is always more that can be done to keep it clean!

Group 2

- Willamette River.//It is safe.
- I don't know.//I should find the answer to not knowing.
- City water, filtered water is from the Willamette River.//I'm worried.
- Willamette River treated.//If you visit the river, it smells, it's not clear and is polluted. If you boat or swim in it, you have to shower afterwards.
- Willamette River with well back-up.//OK due to water processing system.
- The Willamette River.
- City water.//Happy we have our own water source—we haven't had the water issues like Portland has.
- Private well.//It is tested and filtered. It is clean, safe, reliable and abundant.
- Not sure.
- Well or Willamette River.//None.

APPENDIX F/WE 5

What agency supplies your drinking water? // Write down any thoughts, feelings or opinions you have about your drinking water supplier.

Group 1

- Still not sure—Bonneville?
- City of Wilsonville, public works.//Professional, well-run.
- Wilsonville Water District? //I think they can be expensive, aggressive and unwilling to provide individual service—more buildings than single condos.
- City of Wilsonville?//Just wish water was cheaper.
- Wilsonville Public Works, City of Wilsonville.//I have a family member that works for the city of Wilsonville who says it's safe to drink, but I still don't feel it is.
- Wilsonville Water is who the bill is paid to. // My feelings are neutral—I think it's gotten very expensive in the past year, and I'm not really sure why?
- I don't know//I don't know.
- City of Wilsonville.//I feel we are charged way too much for our water, especially for irrigation and sewage.

Group 2

- Self—private well.//Happy with it.
- City of Wilsonville.//Doing a great job—I hope it doesn't change.
- City of Wilsonville.//No opinion.
- I live in a condo that pays for the water—I don't know, but will find out.//I'm going to find out.
- I don't know the agency name.//The treatment plan in town supplies it.
- Wilsonville Public Water System.//The water stains my toilets and faucets.
- City of Wilsonville.//OK.
- Wilsonville city subs it out.//Charge exorbitant rates.
- Unknown.
- City.//It's OK, not good or bad.

APPENDIX G//WE 6

Some water systems are built through partnerships of several communities. Generally speaking do you think that partnerships are a good or bad idea? // Make a list of the benefits that come to mind of a water system partnership. // Make a list of any drawbacks that come to mind of a water system partnership.

Group 1

- Good idea.//Shared practices—both good and bad; shared cost; shared benefits.//Not sure, but not always a fair option; too many chiefs, not enough Indians.
- Not as good as a single owner.//Share cost, regional planning/new open areas for development.//Differing priorities, especially when the source is limited; agreement challenges.
- In theory it sounds good, but . . . //Bigger area from which to gather water; more monies to put toward treatment and cleaning of water for users; more money for repairs.//Not all communities want the same thing, some don't want to help repair another community's damage; one community wanting more money.
- Good idea.//Sharing overall expenses; hopefully more cost effective.//Perhaps an extra layer of management (like Metro).
- Maybe.//More money put together towards one source of water to improve it; more heads are better than one.//Might not have enough to supply all counties and cost of pipes put in.
- Good idea.//Spread the expense over several municipalities; get a broader base of knowledge/experience; system back-ups/"fail safe:".//The infrastructure would need to be bigger to serve a larger area and therefore more costly and more possibility of leaks, etc.
- Yes.//Sharing good water; helping use and generate good drinking water.//Affordability; prices for town and city will increase while sharing water.
- Bad idea.//Expenses are shared; cost of treatment; more users should drive prices down.//More users draw the resource down; disagreements among partners on billing, costs, treatment.

Group 2

- Good.//Cost savings.//Breakup of the partnership.
- Bad/Less expensive.//Problems arise within the partnership. They all have to share the cost and repairs.
- Good idea!//The water is cheaper.//Might not have enough water at times of the year.
- Don't know.//No benefits to this.//Areas in one town may have more expensive needs. Sherwood is hilly and has many farms.
- Good.//Cost share; quality of information; larger communication.//More finger pointing.
- Good idea.//Overhead costs are spread out.//One community could receive preferential treatment.
- Good idea.//Cheaper water rates; more accountability.//Maybe one partner will want a buy-out and ask too much; try to do things cheaper to make more profit.
- Good idea.//Reduce costs per project.//Consensus between communities can be difficult.
- Bad.//Less expense for users; more ideas.//Too many towns so too many people with opinions, etc. who would be the deciding voter.
- Good.//Cost is lower; No.

APPENDIX H//WE 7

Make a list of any communities that have water system partnerships with Wilsonville. If you don't believe that there are any, write none.

Group 1

- Not sure. Possibly West Linn.
- Sherwood; Tualatin—pending.
- Sherwood; Newberg; Charbonneau.
- Sherwood???
- I don't know.
- I think Sherwood gets water from Wilsonville; I know Wilsonville has plenty to share!
- I don't know.
- I don't know.

Group 2

- Tualatin.
- Don't know.
- Tualatin.
- I don't really know who else uses our water.
- None.
- Sherwood.
- No response.
- Tigard; West Linn; Sherwood.
- Don't know.
- Don't know.

APPENDIX I//WE 8

The Willamette River Water Treatment Plant is jointly owned with one partner organization. Write any reactions or concerns you have about this partnership.

Group 1

- Hopefully, it's nearby.
- Overall good, however, it may be difficult if disagreement on availability, treatment, and cost sharing.
- I can't comment because I don't know the partnership organization, its goals, its management, its purpose, or its government.
- Who is the partner? No real concerns that I can think of.
- I don't know who they are partnered with to make an opinion about it, but two heads are better than one.
- I don't know who the partner organization is. I did see something in the community news about the water treatment cooling.
- Who are they partnered with and why?
- The partner may be a private venture capitalist that is looking for profit margins

Group 2

- It doesn't bother me.
- Who are they? How much say do they have in the process of getting clean water?
- Do we all pay the same?
- I am not surprised by this. Do you mean Charbonneau or Donald? I guess small towns would be reasonable to include.
- Who watches what happens?
- None.
- Maybe that partner is why the water rates are higher.
- Shared cost and responsibility.
- I didn't know there was a partnership. Are users being charged the same rates as us?
- None.

APPENDIX J/WE 9

Make a list of any issues or concerns you have about a new water pipeline through Wilsonville. Place a * next to your biggest concern.

Group 1

- .Construction.
- *Construction, traffic, interruption in service, sized correctly for future growth.
- *Who's going to pay for it? What businesses, homes, parks, and roads are going to be disturbed/disrupted to create this pipeline? How long will it take to create?
- *Construction inconvenience. Make sure Wilsonville citizens do not incur this cost.
- *Traffic—where they put it. Cost to Wilsonville customers.
- *Negative effects/unintended consequences on other systems that are disrupted during construction.
- *When will the construction start? Construction. Traffic. Cost.
- *How will the construction affect the livability of Wilsonville? Traffic, etc. Who pays for the pipeline?

Group 2

- No concerns.
- *Where would this waterline be—residential? More construction?
- *My concern is the aesthetics. I don't want to see a huge pipe put in underground. Cost.
- *Where will it go? Noise; construction mess; slower traffic around Wilsonville Road; Expense? Additional cost? Need?
- Where does the pipeline go? Who pays for the maintenance and infrastructure? Does it become embedded in our rates? How big is it? Who maintains it?
- *Cost of said pipeline—who pays and maintains? Location of pipeline?
- *Cost. Road closures and traffic.
- *Additional expense for existing clients/customers (The Wilsonville community). Community disruption for construction.
- If it goes underground maybe the ground above has potholes, cracks, etc. and this would need resurfacing. Employment.
- None.

APPENDIX K/WE 10

Handout description of types of routes: Underline anything you find positive, strikeout anything you find negative, and put a question mark by anything you are unsure about. // Write down your reactions and any changes you would recommend to improve the routes

Themes	Group 1	Group 2
Route A—The pipe is placed under a wide boulevard.		
Positive		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OK. • Could work. • OK. • OK.
Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a good idea. • Less desirable. • Interruptions. • Awful lot of disruptions and rebuilding. How would traffic be rerouted? • Will be very disruptive during construction. • No way. • "Won't even know it's there!" HA! Too much disruption, too much could go wrong. • Disaster. • Horrible idea—disrupts traffic and affects businesses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too little for that. • Bad idea—disrupts people's homes and local businesses. • Not a good idea—too much disruption. • Sinkholes or repairs disturbing the area. •
Other		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many wide boulevards are there? • NR

Themes	Group 1	Group 2
Route B—The pipe is placed along an unimproved two-lane road.		
Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better idea • Good idea. • Not a bad idea. • Yes, because if they are tearing up a road that needs to be improved anyways, two things are done at once. • Good placement. • This is a better route to start construction. • Probably best scenario— affects less traffic and residents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OK. • Sounds like it would disrupt traffic the least. • Best idea. • Good idea—doesn't disrupt anything. • OK. • OK.
Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would traffic be rerouted? Disruption to the farming community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More expensive.
Other		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What would happen when development came along? • None. • NR
Route C—The pipe is placed under a street in a neighborhood.		
Positive		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OK. • OK.
Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a good idea. • Disruption—rebuilding costs. Less revenue for businesses. • Not a good idea. • No. • Not so good due to maintenance, etc., disruptive. • Disaster. • Not a good idea—disrupts livability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No neighborhoods. • This would be very disruptive to traffic. • Very disruptive. • Bad idea—people don't want to come home to construction. • Not so good. • Sinkholes. •
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where? Whose neighborhood? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None. • NR

Themes	Group 1	Group 2
Route D—The pipe is placed under a frontage road bordered by a mix of businesses.		
Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium idea. • Good placement. • This would be OK, but construction needs to start early. 4am. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OK. • OK. • Could happen but put in a bike lane. • Good idea—not as much traffic. • OK. • OK.
Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a good idea. • Disruption—less revenue for businesses. • Would be hard for these while under construction. • No. • No—affects business. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. • Sinkholes.
Other		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who fixes the road? • NR
Route E—The pipe is placed in the ground at the same time a new road is built.		
Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perhaps a better idea. • Good idea. Fewer interruptions in future. • Not a bad idea. • Good placement. • It's OK. • Possibly—affects a lesser used option. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OK. • Could solve two problems—water pipeline and a place to work. • OK. • OK. • Good idea. • OK.
Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconvenient to population temporarily. • Sinkholes.
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How long of a disruption is planned? Rerouting to the trail during the duration of installation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NR • Mixed feelings—pedestrians have needs too!

Themes	Group 1	Group 2
Route F—The pipe is placed under a pedestrian trail.		
Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The best idea. • Good idea, less re-work. • Good idea. • Great idea. • Yes, because they are already digging up that area. • Good idea. • Yes, it would be excellent timing and better construction time. • Good scenario. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OK. • OK. • OK. • Best option. • Best idea—kills two birds with one stone. • Best idea ever. • Good idea, less expensive. • OK.
Negative		
Other		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ? • Probably did this when they tore up Wilsonville Road.
Route G—The pipe is placed under a two-lane road fronted by warehouses.		
Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good placement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OK. • Industrial area is OK. • OK. • A choice. • OK. • 2nd best option. • Good idea—not as busy of an area. • Acceptable. • Fine. • OK.
Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not good. • Not a good idea. • Could be hard on businesses during construction. • No. • Disaster. • No. 	
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NR 	

Themes	Group 1	Group 2
Route H—The pipe is tunneled under a busy intersection.		
Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If needed, good construction technique. • Good! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OK. • Not a bad idea. • OK. • Tunnels are good, but expensive, no surface interruption.
Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worst idea. • That’s a disaster waiting to happen. • No. • Disaster. • Absolutely no way. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor—very disruptive to traffic. • Not wise. • Traffic. • Super bad idea—traffic is already getting bad in Wilsonville. • No sinkholes and if repairs needed; major chaos to areas.
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Tunneled” meaning no surface disruption? What about maintenance—would there be room in the tunnel? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NR
Route I—The pipe is placed under private property, not a public street.		
Positive	<i>Not asked in Group 1</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OK. • OK. • Good idea—if it doesn’t cost too much. • Fine, but again sinkholes if pipes break. • OK.
Negative		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very bad idea. • Not a viable option. • Nope. • Not going to fly. NIMBY. No way.
Other		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NR

APPENDIX L/WE 11

When a new water pipeline is constructed to deliver water to other communities, how could it benefit Wilsonville? Put a * next to the most important benefit.

Group 1

- Create jobs possibly? Add a feeling of improvement, a feel good attitude to community.
- *Cost sharing. Economy of scale. Actual moneymaking. Community influence.
- *More revenue for Wilsonville—but at what cost? Creates “good neighbor” feelings—perhaps. What is good for one has to be good for the other.
- *Other communities help absorb costs. If the other communities pay for it perhaps improved infrastructures or a better road over pipeline.
- Money from other sources. Creates jobs.
- *Sell the water and therefore reduce our water rates. Other monetary benefits that I don’t know about.
- *Brings income to our community; sharing great water to other communities.
- *Increases revenue—hopefully decreases our current costs. The increased revenue might help increase the quality of drinking water.

Group 2

- They can tie off of the new line to service new neighbors.
- *Help pay the cost for enlarging the water plant. Very neighborly.
- *Water price reduced. Wilsonville wouldn’t pay for the project.
- I suppose the other towns would really appreciate it. So it may be a neighborly idea, but most people couldn’t want it.
- *No benefit that I can think of.
- *Nice thing to do. Only if costs/rates are reduced.
- *Cheaper water rates of keep the water rates the same for years to come.
- *Shared expense. Combine with required new road construction.
- *If it goes underground, maybe the ground above has potholes, cracks, etc. and this would need to be resurfaced. Employment.
- *Lower cost.

APPENDIX M/WE 12

Present list of potential benefits to Wilsonville for a new water pipeline that serves other communities; Rank the top three benefits and add any comments.

	TOTAL	GROUP 1	GROUP 2
Top Tier			
Cost savings for Wilsonville ratepayers	39	20	19
Build new bicycle and pedestrian paths	14	2	12
Upgrade Wilsonville's water, sewer and stormwater lines	13	5	8
Restore wildlife habitat along nearby streams	9	4	5
Open up new areas for business expansion and jobs	8	5	3
Middle Tier			
Repave existing streets	7	1	6
Build new parks or open space	6	4	2
Reconstruct and widen streets	6	4	2
Move utility lines (power, telephone, cable) underground	4	2	2
Lower Tier			
Expand or improve existing parks	2	1	1
Plant trees along the pipeline route	2	0	2
Construct new streets to serve Wilsonville residents and employees	1	0	1
Improve neighbors' driveways and sidewalks along the pipeline route	0	0	0
Open up new areas for residential development	0	0	0

Weighted ratings: 1=3 points, 2=2 points, 3=1 point

APPENDIX N/WE 13

What is your final advice about expanding the water system to serve other communities?

Group 1

- Please consider the disruptive and negative costs to current residents of Wilsonville. Please be totally upfront and honest not just about the benefits, but the consequences while the pipeline is being built.
- Plan for the future. Locate the waterline where it will work for long-range growth, access, and repair. Be prudent with future agreements. Keep Wilsonville protected with our resource.
- Think long and hard on cost and disruptions. Who pays for it? Who will be disrupted in the construction and for how long? What will the cost of that disruption be to those who have to endure it? What will be the cost of lost revenue to businesses? Is it worth it?
- Be thoughtful of our own community first. Impact of cost and construction. Make sure we get a financial break in our water bills. Make sure we are protected and are #1 with water priorities.
- Please don't charge Wilsonville residents more money to help other counties—let me pay to reap the benefits. Don't tear up streets by homes or businesses, etc. that don't need to be improved. Make sure the streets are safe and kids have a place to travel. Wilsonville first!
- Think about cost-effectiveness first and foremost. Think about minimizing disruptions to get resident support for the project. Upgrade infrastructure where possible so that things are better than before. Use existing easements/right of way where possible.
- Make sure what you started is what was originally approved and discussed upon before construction.
- My advice is we must make sure that this additional partnership is in the best interest of all Wilsonville residents. The costs should be taken care of by the partners. It should have a low impact on the residents of Wilsonville, and most important reduce the current costs to Wilsonville residents!

Group 2

- Do it; it will help keep costs in line.
- Don't go through the neighborhood—it's a bad idea; under a walking path—sounds great; getting help to pay for the construction making sure the pipe is large so it would not have to be replaced; picking the best possible route; as not to be disruptive.
- I think it is fine. We have a large enough water system. The concerns are: disruption of traffic, no cost to people in Wilsonville, and revenue to the city from the parenting city. The other city will pay for the pipe.
- My advice is to not do it. If you do it, disrupt as few taxpayers, schools and businesses as possible. Don't dig up my streets in Rivergreen, but use the greenway, Graham's Oak Park trails and Bell Road to get to Tualatin directly.
- Why should I like this? Why not use I-5 for a state water supply? Use I-5 or Frontage Road. Let everyone know that this will benefit them. Make the community aware of what is happening.
- Charge the other communities enough to offset all costs, maintenance and improvements. Have an intelligent group look at a map and put the large capacity pipeline under roads, sidewalks, open space with cost-effective business practices.

- Don't make this water pipe go through neighborhoods and don't disrupt daily traffic, or 'busy areas'—maybe do construction at night time.
- Considering the expense—find the least disruptive route that will return the affected neighborhoods and roads back to the original condition or better. Have alternate routes available. Include as much as possible all communities in the decision making process.
- Make sure Wilsonville residents have the least impact during construction—just make sure everyone pays their fair share, so that Wilsonville residents don't pay for the pipe infrastructure we paid for already. If they want to use our water, they need to pay to get it. Have one person in charge of the bookkeeping, i.e., know where the money is going and make sure everyone pays their fair share.
- Lower cost.