



# **KINGSTON TERRACE MASTER PLAN COMMUNITY OUTREACH SUMMARY**

---

May 2021



# Table of Contents

**Introduction..... 1**

**Public Meeting and Online Open House..... 1**

**Stakeholder Interviews..... 4**

**Next Steps..... 5**

**Appendix A. Public Meeting #1 Summary..... 7**

**Appendix B. Online Open House Results.....**

**Appendix C. Stakeholder Interviews.....**

## Introduction

The Kingston Terrace Master Plan (KTMP) is committed to a public involvement process that engages community members, partners and stakeholders throughout the course of the project. The public involvement process aims to meet the following objectives:

- Inform the community with timely, transparent and accurate information.
- Educate community members about planning and decision-making processes.
- Engage the community through early, broad-based, and ongoing opportunities to participate.
- Strive for community consensus through a process that is inclusive and welcoming for all local residents, businesses, property owners, and community organizations.
- Make a focused effort to engage historically marginalized populations, including people of color, people with limited English proficiency, and people with low income, as well as people with disabilities, older adults and youth.
- Strengthen the level of coordination and cooperation between the city and agency and jurisdiction partners.

This summary describes the activities and outcomes of the first round of outreach for the KTMP. Activities included a public meeting, hosted in conjunction with an online open house, and a series of stakeholder interviews.

---

**Background:** Following King City's completion of the *King City Urban Reserve Area 6D Concept Plan*, Metro approved the inclusion of King City Urban Reserve Area (URA) 6D into the urban growth boundary (UGB) in 2018. The Concept Plan started the planning processes necessary to urbanize URA 6D, including a series of baseline reports addressing housing, land uses, transportation routes, parks and open spaces, public facilities, governance, and infrastructure costs for the area. The Concept Plan process also engaged the public to create a community vision and preliminary design considerations for the area. The *Kingston Terrace Master Plan* builds on the Concept Plan to provide additional development detail and implement the community vision resulting in Comprehensive Plan and Community Development Code amendments.

---

## Public Meeting and Online Open House

The purpose of the Public Meeting #1 was to confirm the vision themes and framework elements of the King City Concept Plan, review existing conditions, and discuss preliminary opportunities and constraints for the development of master plan alternatives. The Public Meeting was held virtually on March 15, 2021. Concurrent with the public meeting, an online open house was live from March 1 to 31 to provide additional opportunity for community members to learn about the project, review

and confirm the vision and framework elements of the Concept Plan, and share ideas and examples for how the vision and goals could be implemented in the KTMP. Detailed information from the public meeting and online open house are included in the Appendix.

A total of 108 community members participated in the Public Meeting and Online Open House. Notices for the Public Meeting and Online Open House were posted through the City's avenues of communication, which include posts to social media (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, NextDoor), the City website, local notice boards, a local media press release, and emails to the project mailing list. In addition, emails were sent to the following organizations with information about the project, opportunities for engagement, including the Online Open House and Public Meeting:

- Tigard Tualatin Aquatic District
- Tualatin River Keepers
- Ride Connection
- King City Lions Club
- Free Food Ministries Food Pantry
- St. Anthony's Catholic Church
- Tigard Senior Center
- Tigard Covenant Church
- Korean First Southern Baptist Church
- Unite Oregon (Washington County)
- King City Civic Center Clubhouse
- 1000 Friends of Oregon

A Spanish version of the Online Open House was provided for the community and a Spanish interpreter was available during the Public Meeting. During this first round of outreach, the project team made initial contact with 25 members of the Korean-speaking community. The project team will continue to engage them throughout the remainder of the project.

### **Key Takeaways**

There is a mix of support for the King City Concept Plan vision that is guiding the KTMP. General comments include the desire for greater pedestrian and bicycle connectivity, recreational amenities and protection of the Tualatin River, in addition to removing or minimizing impacts on existing neighborhoods. Key concerns focus on the amount of planned growth and development, both in King City and the region. Community members express concern over the protection and enhancement of natural resources, particularly in response to the proposed extension of Fischer Road and potential impacts to the Rivermeade community. Many community members expressed concern over the feasibility of infrastructure and associated costs and funding mechanisms.

In addition to the overarching vision, community members were asked to review the vision and goal statements for the four Concept Plan frameworks: Land Use, Mobility, Natural Resources, and Public Utilities and Services. Again, support is mixed for the framework visions and goals. Community

members were more likely to support the vision statements of the Natural Resources and Public Utilities and Services frameworks, and less likely to support the Land Use and Mobility visions and goal statements. Community members highlight the importance of good connectivity but also the potential impact of the street network on natural resources and subsequent traffic on existing neighborhoods. Written comments mirrored those provided for the overall vision.

Throughout the Public Meeting and Online Open House, community members were encouraged to share ideas and opportunities for each of these frameworks. Key ideas are summarized below.

#### Land Use Ideas and Opportunities:

- Build community gardens, cottage cluster housing and low-rise buildings for sun access.
- Make decisions that work with the existing natural and agricultural history of the land.
- Keep the housing density near Beef Bend Road and avoid housing near the Tualatin River.

#### Public Utilities and Services Ideas and Opportunities:

- Build bridges over drainages rather than culverts.
- Conservation areas should be expanded near sensitive waterways
- Keep roads, utilities and development out of conservation easements.
- Build multi-purpose rainwater detention facilities.
- Plan for additional right of ways and possibly pump stations.

#### Mobility Ideas and Opportunities:

- Prioritize car traffic on Beef Bend Road, not Fischer Road. Make sure we have connected neighborhoods, with paths, trails and bike lanes everywhere.
- Provide bike parking and storage by bus stations.
- Separate bicycle and walking paths from vehicles.
- Ensure a commitment from TriMet to serve the area.
- Support electric vehicles by incorporating charging stations.
- Minimize additional east-west corridors; focus on local traffic.
- Avoid making Beef Bend Road a highway by building and connecting Fischer Road.
- Require builders to connect roads and provide separated bike and pedestrian trails.

---

#### **Where have these ideas worked well?**

The community was encouraged to share examples of where these ideas worked well. Some examples included: Downtown Sherwood and Lake Oswego; Courtyard Apartments near Laurelhurst Park, Portland OR; Amazon Park, Eugene OR; Cook Park, Washington County; Fanno Creek Trail System, Washington County; Street grid networks in Bend, Eugene, Newberg and Portland; biking and walking paths along the canal and the river in Boise, ID; the Deschutes River through downtown Bend, OR.

---

### Natural Resource Ideas and Opportunities

- Provide kayak and canoe launches, interpretive signage, paths for walking, fishing areas, and work with the tribes to develop this.
- Preserve established tree groves. Create an urban forestry plan and code that preserves tree canopy.
- Use siting choices and zero impact development techniques to eliminate runoff from development.
- Avoid creek crossings.
- Assess current and future risk of landslides.
- Keep development away from the river wetlands, slopes and creeks.
- Preserve wildlife migration corridors and connections to the refuge.
- Incorporate disaster planning for earthquakes, ice and windstorms, flooding, landslides and fires into the community design.
- Make specific accommodations for sensitive species in this area.
- Partner organizations like Tualatin Riverkeepers, the Tualatin Wildlife Refuge, and other conservation/restoration entities to create plans to improve watershed health.

Overall, the Public Meeting and Online Open House provided the following key takeaways:

- More education is needed regarding the Concept Plan process and how it informs the Master Plan processes.
- Protection and enhancement of natural systems and access to nature are top priorities.
- There is concern regarding the feasibility of infrastructure and associated costs, particularly related to drainage crossings.
- The Plan should detail how dual priorities of natural resource protection and multi-modal connectivity are balanced.

## **Stakeholder Interviews**

Ten interviews with key stakeholders were conducted in March and April 2021. These interviews were designed to review core elements of the Concept Plan, identify areas of agreement, and unearth key issues for further discussion. Interviews were held with a broad spectrum of groups including property owners, community members, and partner agencies. In addition, several members of the project team participated in a tour of the study area with community members and property owners.

## Key Takeaways

- The Vision Statement from the 2018 Concept Plan largely captures the vision for current planning efforts.

### Land Use Ideas and Opportunities:

- Include a variety of housing so households with different income-levels can live in the KTMP area.
- Concentrate growth near Beef Bend Road and away from the river.
- Minimize impacts on existing neighborhoods.
- Locate the town center close to Roy Rogers Road to accommodate traffic.
- Concern about the livability of the proposed average of 12 units per acre. Make sure there is room for parks and natural areas.
- Create a flexible plan for the town center as it will take time for residential development to support it.
- Housing affordability is a challenge with the amount of infrastructure needed to serve the area.

### Mobility Ideas and Opportunities:

- Promoting safety in the transportation network is most important. Include lighted crosswalks, bike lanes, Safe Routes to Schools, and traffic calming measures.
- Multimodal connectivity is important. Explore alternatives to the Fischer Road extension.
- Explore options for autonomous and electric vehicles.
- Design east-west transportation connections to serve local traffic and not provide a direct route for cut-through traffic from Hwy 99W to Roy Rogers Road.
- Consider parking when proposing street designs.

### Public Utilities and Services Ideas and Opportunities:

- New transportation and utilities infrastructure should be smart, green, and coordinated both locally and regionally.
- Explore alternatives to serve eastern neighborhoods and minimize impacts.
- Coordinate with Tigard and property owners to facilitate water provision.
- Consider the costs of bridges over the drainages versus using pump stations and purchasing additional right-of-way along Beef Bend Road.
- Pursue regional stormwater facilities.

### Natural Resource Ideas and Opportunities:

- Create equitable access to the Tualatin River and natural resources.
- Mitigate negative impacts to the Tualatin River and natural areas while striving for equitable access.

- Concern about erosion along drainages caused by recent development on Bull Mountain. Ensure Kingston Terrace does not add to the problem.
- When planning the Fischer Road extension, work with the Columbia Land Trust to protect, to the maximum extent possible, the portion of the Bankston property covered by the conservation easement.
- Strengthen the vision to include the Tualatin River, its drainages, and wildlife corridors.

Miscellaneous Ideas and Opportunities:

- Coordinate with TriMet, PGE, telecommunications companies, and other agencies.
- Strive to engage more people in the KTMP process on a variety of topics.
- Make sure finance plan includes clear standards for system development charge (SDC) credits.
- Don't rely too heavily on SDC credits for financing.

## Next Steps

The purpose of this Outreach Summary is to document engagement activities and summarize key themes and ideas related to the vision and goals for land use, mobility, infrastructure and natural resources. This feedback will be presented to the Stakeholder Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee to inform master plan recommendations.



## APPENDIX A. Public Meeting Summary



### Public Meeting #1

### KINGSTON TERRACE MASTER PLAN

Monday, March 15, 6-7:30pm

### MEETING SUMMARY

#### **Webinar Panelists**

- City of King City: Mike Weston, City Manager; Keith Liden, Planner; Kenneth Gibson, Mayor
- 3J Consulting: Steve Faust; Anais Mathez

Mike Weston welcomed panelists and attendees. Mayor Kenneth Gibson gave opening remarks and thanked participants for their time.

#### **Project Overview**

Steve Faust, 3J Consulting, reviewed the agenda and provided an overview of the project. The City completed the *Concept Plan for King City Urban Reserve Area 6D*, which ultimately led to Metro approval to bring this area into the UGB at the end of 2018. The Master Plan is intended to refine the concept plan to provide additional development detail and outcomes consistent with the 2040 Growth Concept, Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, and the Metro conditions of approval for the UGB decision.

#### **Project Process**

Steve described how the Master Plan will refine the Concept Plan by more specifically identifying land use and development parameters. The Master Plan will conduct additional planning, design, and coordination with partner agencies regarding public facilities and infrastructure, including transportation, water, sanitary sewer, stormwater, parks, civic uses, and schools. It will also create a phasing plan for development and public facilities and refine the financing mechanisms.

Steve noted that the Master Plan will guide the necessary amendments to the King City Comprehensive Plan and Community Development Code (CDC). The project will be funded largely by a Metro 2040 Planning and Development Grant. The Master Plan will be coordinating with the city's first Transportation System Plan (TSP) to create a transportation plan that will be fully integrated with existing and future land use. The TSP is anticipated to be completed prior to the Master Plan.

However, TSP adoption will be delayed until the Master Plan is completed to allow for any final adjustments to ensure consistency between the two plans. The Master Plan is also closely coordinating with the City of Tigard on planning for River Terrace to the north.

Steve reviewed the project schedule, noting the key phases of work and an anticipated completion date of December 2021.

### **Public Involvement**

Key objectives for the public involvement through this process include:

- Inform the community with timely, transparent, and accurate information
- Educate community members about planning and decision-making processes
- Engage the community through early, broad-based, and ongoing opportunities
- Strive for community consensus
- Make a focused effort to engage historically marginalized populations
- Coordinate and cooperate with agency and jurisdiction partners

Steve reviewed a preliminary list of stakeholders to engage and their interests, as well as key engagement activities and tools to be used throughout the process. He noted that Spanish and Korean interpretation and translation would be provided upon request.

Steve reviewed the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) composition and explained that they were selected to represent a range of interests and neighborhoods within King City and the expansion area.

### **Existing and Planned Conditions**

Steve presented the Concept Plan's existing vision for the Kingston Terrace Master Plan area. He then reviewed existing and planned conditions for each of the four planning frameworks: natural systems, land use, mobility, and infrastructure.

### **Opportunities and Challenges**

Preliminary opportunities and challenges were identified across each of the four planning frameworks. Key points from the Concept Plan that remain fixed for the Master Plan include:

- Continued sensitivity to the Tualatin River and surrounding natural areas.
- Of the 528 overall acres in the planning area, 318 acres are developable.
- 50,000 square feet of commercial uses can be accommodated within a 10- to 20-year horizon.

- 3,576 dwelling units can be accommodated within the planning area across four districts: Main Street/Town Center, Beef Bend Neighborhood, Central Neighborhood, and Rural Character Neighborhood.
- A spectrum of housing types will be accommodated, with a focus on middle housing types. High density residential housing will be clustered near transit
- A pedestrian and bike network will be in place.
- The planning context remains, i.e. Tigar River Terrace, existing bicycle-pedestrian connections, including connections to regional trail systems.
- Opportunities for micro-mobility transportation options.
- Bridges will cross the narrowest point of the drainages perpendicularly to limit cost and minimize impact.

Key items that will be reviewed in further detail and may be considered as alternatives in the Master Plan include:

- The location and orientation of the town center.
- East-west road connections.
- North-south transit connections.
- Type of ravine crossings (bridge versus culverts).
- Future development in the Bankston property and airfield area.
- Local street alignments.
- Drainage area and alignments for sewer pipelines.

## Discussion

The following questions, comments and clarifications were received from the community. Some questions or comments that were received live through the video platform are paraphrased. Project team responses follow in italics.

- I found it difficult to figure out/access the link for tonight's meeting on the website. I would imagine I was not the only one. Can you please add upcoming events or links to these kind of events on the website landing page please or tab it? Thanks.
  - *I apologize for the issue and am glad you were able to navigate to the meeting tonight. In the future we will try to do a better job of raising the prominence of links to public meetings.*
- Please post the website addresses so we can see them. Thanks.
  - [www.kingcitymasterplan.com](http://www.kingcitymasterplan.com) and [www.kingcitytsp.org](http://www.kingcitytsp.org)
- Thank you all for your hard work and good, clear presentation. Will this project set aside land for a community Church?
  - *This is a good point; we have not addressed that yet.*
- How will you strive for community consensus?
  - *Hopefully through a robust community outreach program and activities such as these. We have a lot of competing issues, interests and needs that we need to weigh and balance in order to find the best path forward for the future of the city and residents.*
- What is SHPO?
  - *SHPO is an environmental review process that stands for: State Historic Preservation Office. It includes Environmental, Cultural, and Historic Reviews.*
- Any upscale eateries in the works?

- *We have considered several options for the commercial core and fine dining is definitely on the list. I believe the City Council and Staff would love to see some fine dining in the area.*
- Why are you proposing a major roadway through conservation property?
  - *"Major" or "Arterial" Roadways proposed for the planning area include Roy Rogers and Beef Bend. I do not believe there are other "Major" roadways. Fischer Road, however, would be considered a local road. I am not sure of what that alignment will look like at this time, or what status it will play.*
- Have any of the planning commission or consulting team walked the area, or are you doing everything from maps?
  - *Several of us toured the area a few years ago and walked through the different areas. Another tour may be in order.*
- How will Edgewater on the Tualatin neighborhood be impacted? How is the anticipated increase of traffic on Beef Bend and 99 and Fischer and 99 and 131st and Fischer being handled? There is already a lot of traffic and cars speeding through these intersections.
  - *These items are transportation related and being addressed by our transportation engineers. I'm not sure what these answers or the preferred alternatives will be at this time. I expect we will have better information soon.*
- Is Steve and those leading the project aware of the strong opposition to Fischer Road being extended?
  - *Yes, everyone is aware of the opposition to the Fischer Extension.*
- How does the communication flow between the TAC & SAC committees? Will there be a summary report of both committees on the King City website?
  - *Through the consultant team.*
- How many folks are attending this?
  - *Currently 63.*
- Who may I call to discuss why a town of this size needs a nearby church, especially for our seniors who do not want to drive long distances but would be able to attend a church with nearby access? (Contact: dennisbeatty@netzero.com 928-713-2458).
  - *Steve and I would be happy to discuss this with you. I believe you can submit comments to the Consultant Team or myself, and we would be happy to forward your inputs.*
- What is the cost of the Green Blvd? How much will property owners be required to pay for the roadway? Developers?
  - *Costs for improvements were projected to be paid by System Development Fees associated with the development.*
- I have a few [comments] related to Concept Plan and Master Plan specific to the transportation and sewer system options costs: The Concept Plan indicated that the Master Plan would conduct additional design for many things, including transportation and infrastructure. The drainages that would constitute one subdistrict have a heavy price tag and do not have an optimal alignment. Washington County Commissioners have agreed that each drainage crossing would be a considerable cost. In addition, the cost estimates for a gravity system versus a pump system are too generic and do not consider all the complications for the site. Option 2 in the original Concept Plan provided the fewest issues for the lowest cost. [I hope] these costs are being carefully calibrated and reviewed in the master planning process.
- Are other throughways being seriously considered outside of expanding and cutting through Edgewater on the Tualatin via Fischer? If so, what are they?

- *We need to figure out how to diffuse the traffic. If it captured by only one arterial it fails. The idea is to build on a grid and diffuse impacts on one specific community or roadway. As we look at alternatives and the TSP process, there will be a couple of options.*
- [I agree that] a grid of streets within the community would diffuse traffic and keep traffic to a dull roar on any individual road.
- How we pay for the improvements? At several points in the master plan it states the importance of equitably sharing the costs of infrastructure development. Early in the process, Mike Weston stated that no King City residents or current landowners would see any increased taxes or fees. How do the costs of development come into play?
  - *The improvements are paid through SDCs or supplemental fees. There are a number of ways for cities to apply this to developments that come in.*
- Are you working with Washington County for any improvements on the north side of Beef Bend since I believe that is in unincorporated county? Such as the turnarounds planned at specific intersections such as 150th? And what has been their response?
  - *The TSP is looking at the Beef Bend road alignment and design. Correspondence with Washington County has been positive about ways to develop Beef Bend to service the area. Neither King City nor Tigard want to see Beef Bend turn into HWY 99 to the point that it becomes unpassable and a barrier between neighborhoods. We are still looking at ways for traffic to flow through, potentially including a traffic signal or circle. Washington County is open to that concept while limiting number of connections to their arterial street.*
- I understand the need for connectivity, but can one do so without creating a boulevard for the purpose to move traffic from one end to the other? Beef Bend should be the end to end connector or road of choice to leave the area.
- Will current landowners be forced to sell their land?
  - *No. You can hang on to your land all you want. Some people decide to sell because of the value.*
- Don't the system development charges increase the cost of the developed property, thus affecting the "affordability" of the property? Doesn't that negatively affect your goal of providing for low-income housing?
  - *We are not talking about low-income housing but affordable housing. There are other options to promote [subsidized] low-income housing through other means. We want to ensure that whatever we do pays for itself and does not burden current residents.*
- This "affordable housing" will bring the value of our homes down. The current homeowners and the impacts of them should be greatly taken into consideration.
- What happened to the proposed commercial/residential development on the northwest corner of Fischer Road and 131st? Is that moving forward and is there a traffic light being considered at this intersection?
  - *This went through Planning Commission approval, but the project ran into some financial constraints and it has not moved forward. A traffic light was considered in the Concept Plan and SCJ Alliance mentioned that signalization of that intersection may be necessary in the future. The Traffic Study is Appendix J in the Concept Plan.*
- Why is there more rural development on the east end next to the existing developed area?
  - *There is more rural development on the east side because there are more private lots that are already divided up. Those areas tend to develop at a slower rate over a longer period of time. We still have large lots in other areas in the Metro region, even though they've been in the UGB for some time. We project that area will be very slow to develop, maybe through generational*

- turnover over 20-40 years. In addition, areas to the west are already serviced by major thoroughfares like Roy Rogers.*
- I just noticed today the tag Kingston Terrace. How did that come about? Was the community involved in that naming process?
    - *We've been talking about this for years but never moved forward with any decisions. In speaking with the Mayor over the last few months, we were tossing around Kings Town, (condensed it to Kingston) and River Terrace to the north, so "Kingston Terrace" reflected both of those ideas. We also want to stay close to the original identity.*
  - Mike Weston said King City has never done a forced annexation and has no plans to do so in the future. Is that still the official stance?
    - *That is still our position. Forced annexations are not an ideal situation.*
  - Cities cannot annex via cherry stem, but only through contiguous annexation. How does the City propose moving forward with development, especially with Mr. Weston's comment that the east end of the planning area will develop more slowly?
    - *There are enough interested property owners that we won't need to "cherry stem" development (i.e. over 1000 ft away).*
  - Are there any plans for development of the existing King City footprint, and how might that affect the overall city plan?
    - *We don't see a lot of redevelopment in King City because a lot of it is already in good shape. There are only a few properties that are available for redevelopment. We did do a town center plan that involved our commercial area along 99W that allows for more mixed-used redevelopment.*
  - Does the Master Plan allow for bike lanes on Beef Bend from Roy Rogers to HWY 99? Recent work on Beef Bend has resulted in patchwork for these lanes as well as repainting of turn lanes.
    - *It's a big push, but the City is trying to work with the team to pitch for separated, multi-use paths that are connected, including to the Westside Trail system. As far as Washington County is concerned, a minimum design standard would be to have bike lanes on the street, but a better situation would have these lanes separated from traffic.*
  - The proposed acreages for the community park and neighborhood parks are much smaller than community and neighborhood parks in Tigard and Tualatin. Based on the 3300-3500 new homes and up to 10,000 new residents, how were these formulations determined?
    - *There are already 200 acres of natural area in the planning area. Also, on the other side of Roy Rogers there's a chunk of property that is designated for ball parks and football fields that the city of Tigard bought 10-15 years ago. When that area comes into the UGB, that would be adjacent to King City. In addition, we will have pedestrian connections across the river to the Tualatin Wildlife Refuge, which is a Metro/Washington County regional project.*
  - I would like to take this opportunity "for the record" to voice the majority of Edgewater on the Tualatin's views on this project and the impact to our neighborhood, specifically Fischer Road. As a community we have come together and raised these concerns with you on a number of occasions. We did not buy into this neighborhood to have a throughway cut right through our neighborhood. I am taking this opportunity to voice these concerns again so you all can take this into SERIOUS consideration. We as a community do not feel our legitimate concerns are being seriously considered. Some of the major concerns are speeding, increase in crime, home values off Fischer being negatively impacted and the Edgewater homeowners overall. There are environmental impacts to the bodies of water, wildlife, vegetation and more. We are respectfully pleading that you seriously consider other options. Thank you.

- Running the Fischer road traffic through Edgewater would be devastating to that community and not what was anticipated when purchasing homes there.
- Have we thought of future schools with this increase in population?
  - *Yes, the Concept Plan identifies institutional uses.*
- Is Rivermeade Park going to become a public park?
  - *There are no plans for this. Currently the park is owned by a corporation.*
- Are there any plans to disconnect Elsner Rd from Roy Rogers? What about a Tualatin River Park south or east of Elsner Road?
  - *There are no plans to disconnect Elsner. I believe the Tualatin River Park is Metro-funded, which will also be a feature in our area.*
- Metro has appointed a new independent oversight committee for the regional government's park and natural areas. Is King City planning to access these funds to increase park and natural area size based upon the \$475 million bond measure passed in 2019?
  - *The City was pretty discouraged by Metro's proposal, which left out all of the southern Washington County cities out of the loop on these funds. The City is looking at all means to raise funds for our trail projects.*
- Does the Master Plan number of 3500 residential units include what is proposed for the corner of 131st and Fischer development?
  - *No.*
- Will survey results (past and future) be posted to the project website?
  - *Yes. The advisory committee meeting summaries are also posted. All the comments received tonight will be posted too, as well as interviews and the online open house.*
- How can we weigh in on Plan Alternatives this month and next?
  - *In addition to the activities that we will conduct through this process, we recommend providing comment through Planning Commission and City Council meetings,*

## Next Steps

Upon conclusion of the Q+A, Steve announced next steps. An Online Open House is available on the project website and will be live through early April. Stakeholder interviews and focus groups are ongoing. The next step in the process is to develop Plan Alternatives. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) have a meeting scheduled for mid-April.

The Mayor provided closing comments. He encouraged continued participation and expressed excitement for the future of King City. The meeting adjourned at 7:30pm.

## APPENDIX B. Online Open House Results

### Vision Statement

#### *Question 1. Do you support the community vision?*

Options	Number of Respondents
I love it!	10
I support some items and do not support others	20
I do not support it	14
<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>

#### *Why?*

Response
Concerned about over population. This area is growing so fast, adding more will impact an already crowded area.
I think having a city that is easily traversed without an automobile is important.
Your plan does not protect the environment it destroys it.
Would like to have more details of commercial uses. Also- will there be a post office to replace the one King City no longer has?
I want to keep that country atmosphere not built up.
All of it sounds good.
We need to be a connected city.
This seems unrealistic. The last two points seem to be at odds with the first three. In other words, developing a community with reliable transportation (assuming that means expansion) and additional housing seems like it would negatively impact your ability to protect environmentally sensitive areas or provide equitable provision of costs with the existing community. This does not seem like a realistic set of goals. I would suggest determining if the actual goals within this list means eliminating the ones at odds with those. It sounds like there may not be a clear understanding of what you are trying to accomplish.
I'd like to add a statement about moving away from fossil fuels to more clean energy. Some ideas - community solar, electric vehicle charging stations, etc.
This is taking away the country feel of our neighborhoods. Too many expensive houses being crammed into small spaces. This plan only addresses wealthy housing and the expansion of Fischer Road will disrupt any quiet that is left in the area. It will devalue my home
Given the demographics of the current King City, creating a community of this size that focuses on "walkability" is not realistic. Even with a new and younger population in the future, there are few people who would consider walking - or even bicycling from Pacific Highway to Roy Rogers and back. We need to face facts - our dependency on automobiles is here to stay.



An 'equitable provision of infrastructure and associated costs' does not mention what those costs might be or whether the city - or its citizens - can afford them. From the very beginning, we were told that no residents would see increased takes or fees. It seems from this statement that that was misleading.
My biggest concern is that there are outdoor spaces that accommodate human activities; it is not enough to preserve the environment in sensitive areas.
King City residents were stopped from voting on this proposed expansion plan. Keep it small. Keep it centered for seniors.
Does affordability include low income? What does environmentally sensitive lands really mean?
Sounds great on paper, but can you pull it off?
The nature of the area with slopes, streams, groves and slide prone areas preclude infrastructure and connectivity vision.
The Community Vision addresses key elements important to me.
It will damage the current wildlife migration and land use. King City continues to ignore the current residents of the expansion area, and others in the current King City who have major concerns
I think "affordable" tends to mean low cost. In many cultures extended families live in the same home, grandparents and others. These tend to be larger homes and not fit the "affordable" label, although they are very functional.
The level of disruption for existing residents will be substantial. This vision does not include any form of costs and how all the infrastructure will be funded. The amount of traffic on Beef Bend and Pacific Hwy will increase exponentially, creating a regional impact beyond the proposed annexation of properties King City is targeting. Particularly with the substantial increases in housing in River Terrace. The mobility plan does not adequately address the full spectrum of transportation demands.
Things are great now.
The vision is not representative of what the people in this area actually want to see. It feels like whoever oversees promoting this has only selected input from those who are in favor of it. It will continue to harm wildlife in this area and create environmental problems for years to come. I feel the environmental impact has not been researched enough and the infrastructure needed is lacking. There are major issues that arise with each new development in this area that are completely ignored, and those should be addressed first before just adding to it over and over again. Terribly thought out.
I feel like the current concept plan has not been thoroughly thought out regarding infrastructure and natural resources. The natural landscape of the Kingston Terrace area has not been researched well enough to make accurate assessments to infrastructure plans. An example is the Beef Bend wash out area that needed to be repaired....many other creeks are ranging year round with the amount of water coming off of Bull Mountain. The concern it seems is so fixated on the housing issue, that land issues are not being addressed timely and accurately. A very small "select group" of people are making the decision for this area and not "hearing" the voices of many. When the mayor gets to choose the planning commission members, it seems a biased/personal process, not that of a group. Information from King City is limited and outdated. The name "Kingston" gives no historical value to the new area being incorporated into King City. The name again was decided by just a few people. Again....my point of a few are making the decisions for many.
The current plan does not protect the natural ecosystem as stated in the goal.

<p>I understand that Beef Bend is being compared to Garde and McDonald in Tigard in terms of the amount of future traffic. From what I have observed on both streets is the vast majority of the houses along these streets are single family homes. There is nowhere the density along these streets as will soon be on Beef Bend with having to comply with State of Oregon density requirements, I believe that the total number of cars will overwhelm Beef Bend and make commuting difficult. In my 35 years in sewage treatment I have found that one cannot put 20 gallons of sludge into a 5-gallon bucket without creating a very large mess. Gasoline powered cars will eventually slowly be replaced with electric cars and the fact is that most homes need two cars to make a family work. The state of Oregon needs to stop believing in the fairy tale that everyone is going to skip down the street to the bus stop, get on the bus and get every chore done off the bus line. What I would like to see is a poll of every urban planner and see how often all of them use mass transit or a bike to get to work.</p>
<p>It says protection of environmentally sensitive lands and retention of healthy ecosystems yet they keep pushing for an extension of Fisher road along the Tualatin River which will actually destroy sensitive lands, cause issues with creek crossings, add more runoff and erosion problems. Extension of Fisher road is a direct conflict, so to keep this vision and extend Fisher road is just a big lie.</p>
<p>I agree with the goals in theory. I do not agree with the way some goals are being envisioned. Turning a suburban/rural area into a 24-hr city will reduce the quality of life (peace and quiet, natural and country scenery), and attracting bored people from outside the area to nightlife not otherwise available here will increase outside traffic through the area. Since nightlife invariably brings alcohol, safety issues concerning both driving and crime incidents will rise. Plans stated thus far do not protect the sensitive erosion zone along the entire bank of the Tualatin River. Also, realistic expenses for the proposed traffic infrastructure have not yet been established, when they may turn out to be prohibitive. There are no published guidelines of how natural areas will be protected from further degradation in development of the larger area, where the responsibility of the City should be to do just that.</p>
<p>Its very clear that King City's desire to expand to the west is based more on the personal goals of the city's employees than it is on the overall goals of the residents or the land owners to the west.</p>
<p>It will destroy the character and safety of the Rivermeade community.</p>
<p>The vision statement is not accurate. This plan does not protect environmentally sensitive lands and maintain healthy eco systems. It will encroach on too many families' current land and create erosion of the river. Why not update the current city center/community on 99?</p>
<p>I support the transportation connections building bike and pedestrian facilities. I would like to see more attention given to parks, especially improved parks and recreational facilities allow with trails and river access.</p>

# Natural Resources

## Question 2. Do you support the natural resources vision statement?

Options	Number of Responses
I love it!	16
I support some items and do not support others	13
I do not support it	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>39</b>

### Why?

Response
Protecting the environment and habitat for native species is important to me
I would prefer we leave wetlands alone. Reducing erosion is important though
I support conserving the natural resources we have and would like further explanation as to how the addition of infrastructure and so many houses could possibly result in the protection of natural resources and habitat. This is what I am most concerned about in the entire plan.
There is a reason that the Tualatin Riverkeepers and the Columbia Land Trust do not support any roadway (2.8) going through the Bankston easement. Thousands of planting have been done by the Tualatin Soil and Water Conservation District. Five huge north to sound drainage stream ravines exist to the Tualatin River. A simple field trip by the major, city manager and KC council members would open their eyes to the environmental damage, floodplains and affect on wildlife. An estimated 3-5 million dollars cost for each ravine by Washington County and CWS is cost prohibitive. Even Roy Rogers, Washington Co. commissioner stated at a CPO meeting over a year ago that the so-called Green Blvd. is not cost effective. King City does not meet OAR goal number 5. A vision of Metro and King City that neglects to consider the ecological consequences of rapid growth is not an acceptable vision. A poorly planned and implemented development is not a legacy to hand down to future generations.
How do young integrate sensitive wildlife and wetlands into developed areas? They are on opposite ends of the spectrum and should be kept separate.
I do not understand what "integrate green spaces and wetlands into developed areas" means.
natural ecosystems are often off limits to people. Please protect these areas but don't call them green spaces for people.

<p>This development will only continue the destruction of this sensitive area along the Tualatin River. Why doesn't this area have a band of non-development along the river and drainages so only a much smaller narrow strip adjacent to Beef Bend Road is developed? Clearly it is greed. King City wants more property tax revenue than they can squeeze out of us senior citizens. Adding thousands of new residents along the river will have destructive impacts. Look at the impacts of developments on Bull Mountain. No matter what they say will be done to protect natural areas, development will never ever make the natural area better. Why don't they just develop the golf course and other lands already in town? Wasted space since it is hardly used and we are sick and tired of our KCCA dues increasing every year to cover the golf course since it losses money. Just waste our money dumping fertilizer and chemicals on manicured grass and then go to the west and destroy more nature.</p>
<p>We have such a limited opportunity to preserve wetlands, wildlife habitat and indigenous peoples history - we must protect this resource.</p>
<p>Seems good but under Stream &amp; Wetlands Why is the word 'may' be adopted there? I believe it should say will be adopted</p>
<p>Your vision statement says nothing about slopes and slide prone areas. It says nothing specific about protecting tree groves. It says nothing specific about wildlife migration corridors. It says nothing about protecting connections to the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge. It needs to be specific about avoiding road crossings of creeks and wildlife corridors. I like that it mentions the conservation easement. It needs to commit to no roads in the Bankston conservation easement.</p>
<p>The word "may" is used in adopting Clean Water Services standards. The project should have the Clean Water Standards as a minimum.</p>
<p>Not complete, but appropriate.</p>
<p>Putting bridges and culverts in the expansion area will further damage the River and wildlife living in that area.</p>
<p>Natural resources are honored as well as good living space and roads are in place as well. Hopefully there will be a commercial area along Roy Rogers Road.</p>
<p>The Bankston property sits right at the end of River Lane. This is exactly where King City wants to extend Fischer Rd. As you state, the nearly 13 acres in the Columbia Land Trust cannot have roads or houses built on it. This land is right at the end of River Lane. You, King City, have said that there's 200 acres that you cannot build on. That is the land that's just west of River Lane. The cost of putting a road from River Lane to just 150th would be quite expensive given the scope of the ravines that would have to be spanned. This is not even considering what it would destroy in the community of Rivermeade, which has been home to many since 1948.</p>
<p>Erosion from Peachtree has already caused issues. This will extend the issues westward.</p>
<p>This planning is extremely poor and is going to present many issues. This whole developing of this area is only going to create more erosion and more runoff and more issues. It will not protect the wildlife in the area. The above information is full of abstract ideas with no actual explanation of how they will be fulfilled. Please consider thinking this through more. Or, better yet, just leave it alone and fix the problems that have already been created in the area.</p>
<p>Reducing runoff and erosions should be top priority along with wildlife. With the development on Bull Mountain more recently, more wildlife is being displaced. I've personally witnessed the amount of animals living near the Tualatin River compared to 5+years ago. Their habitat is disappearing</p>
<p>I see absolutely no information about the development of the neighbor and community park system. This should be an integral part of your vision. Details please.</p>

What in the world does the statement about cultural resources mean? Tell us in plain English what you are proposing, please.
As someone with property below the uphill development I've seen the impacts of runoff and drainage problems
These areas currently have mostly agriculture runoff passing through these streams. When both Tigard and King City build streets, roofs and parking areas, the existing set of streams are going to have to handle considerably more water. I don't think that we can protect the existing streams and leave them as they are. I don't know what the solution to this problem will be.
They keep pushing for a gravity sewer line and Fisher road extension which is a direct conflict with these natural resource vision statements. Any east-west road needs to be as far away from the Tualatin River as possible. Each area between the four major drainages needs to pump sewer up to main line along Beef Bend and direct traffic up to Beef Bend.
The environmental impacts that King City's plan will impose, greatly out way any benefits of potential development, especially in the area's between 137th and 150th, where there is very limited development potential. The impacts of Metro adopting this area into the proposed urban growth area are already being felt. Many nervous landowners, on hearing the news of the UGB change, decided to clear sensitive areas of their property because they were worried what would happen after the UGB change. These were areas that would have been left untouched if not for this move. That's just a sample size of the impacts to the environment that this issue is creating. Just look to the north at the "River Terrace" project to get a glimpse of the impact on the environment that this type of development has. And those projects at least had large tracts of developable land, whereas this "idea" has much less development potential.
FEMA flood plains are not accurately shown on map. Most of this area is sensitive ecosystem for the Tualatin River. Further, the four large ravines shift due to hydrostatic pressure and therefore building bridges is economically not feasible.
I think the Tualatin river and these drainages have already been negatively affected, and need help recovering, which probably conflicts with "Protect" I would like to see these issues corrected and turned into community attributes.

**Question 3. How important is each natural resource goal to you?**

<i>Make the Tualatin River a defining feature of this area.</i>	
Not important	7
Somewhat Important	5
Very Important	10
Most Important	5
<i>Connect new development physically and figuratively to the Tualatin River and Wildlife Refuge.</i>	
Not important	12
Somewhat Important	6
Very Important	6
Most Important	3

<i>Transition density from center to edge, leaving a buffer between developed and the undeveloped areas around the Tualatin River.</i>	
Not important	3
Somewhat Important	5
Very Important	4
Most Important	15
<i>Integrate green spaces and wetlands into each neighborhood.</i>	
Not important	6
Somewhat Important	5
Very Important	6
Most Important	9
<i>Create parks and recreation choices in each neighborhood, with connected trail system.</i>	
Not important	5
Somewhat Important	4
Very Important	9
Most Important	9
<i>Why? Responses:</i>	
I suggest keeping the river as removed as possible to avoid damaging habitat and environmentally sensitive areas.	
The Tualatin River should be protected from any development and not be incorporated into the development. The great thing about the Tualatin is you can be on the river and feel like you're in the middle of the wilderness. Do not turn this area into a riverside park. The Most Important should be high density along heavily travelled roadways like Beef Bend and Roy Rogers with densities becoming lighter toward natural areas, streams and the river. The expansion area is long and narrow so a concentric high density plan doesn't work here. I think your elections should be a scale of agree to disagree with your stated goals.	
The proposed community and four neighborhood parks are woefully inadequate to accommodate the proposed 3,300 new homes with an estimated 8,250 to 9,900 new residents. If you look at the local community parks in Tigard and Tualatin, they average from 12.15 acres (Jurgens Park) to 79 acres (Cook Park) and acres in between those sample parks. Neighborhood parks in this same geographical area were anywhere from 4.68 acres (Sweek Pond) to Jack Park (8 acres). Parks are not just a place for recreation but should be given full priority in the final master plans. Metro Council has appointed a new independent oversight committee for the regional government's parks and natural areas. I suggest you contact Metro and use part of the \$475 million bond measure that passed in 2019 to significantly increase the acreage for both community and neighborhood parks. In addition, even though the Tualatin River is not officially a Wild and Scenic River it would be advantageous to incorporate Section 4 through 10 as pertaining to the Tualatin River. The 17 acre King City Community Park was actually designed for 700 homes and 1995 new residents.	
Our forbearers stole all of this land from people who have lived her for 35-40,000 years because of systemic white racism. I am of that extraction and I believe we should do what we can to leave as much as we can in this whole project "as is".	

This area has unique natural resources including the river, the refuge, wetlands and tree groves. It also needs to consider the geophysical risks of development on slopes. It needs to address the additional runoff from development and how that will affect flooding, water quality and landslides.
King City not allow any loss of Waters of the US as defined the Corps of Engineers. If there is loss it should be offset by in-kind waters.
Everyone in the community should have access to nature close to home.
I would like the plan to stay away from the river.
The trick is to not attract so much new traffic to this beautiful area that we destroy it. We want to maintain the livability of our neighborhoods, first and foremost.
There are already enough access points to the river in other areas that are not even that popular. This is a complete waste of resources and will only take away the safe spaces our wildlife depends on to live.
It seems the need for each neighborhood having their own parks and wetlands/green spaces might be over kill. It would make more sense for the wildlife to have bigger areas for their habitat. Small parks, wetlands and green spaces are not conducive for wildlife habitat with the amount of animals living near the Tualatin River.
People who currently have access to the river should not have to open up their area to the general public.
Don't make the Tualatin River a defining feature since it needs to be protected from development and not developed as part of this area. Don't physically connect to the Tualatin River and the TRNWR since that would destroy both.
Development will destroy the character of the Rivermeade community.
This will be an urban area, we should be able to have some interaction with the wildlife areas, whether that is a nature trail, a boat dock, etc. There needs to be a balance between conservation and development.

**Question 4. What opportunities are there to achieve the natural resource vision and goals?**

Response
Would be nice to have easier access to Tualatin River for kayaking.
I think the 3,700 home goal will put a major strain on the natural resources in this area. Achievable in an area not surrounded by rivers and streams.
Completely prohibit roads and development within established conservation and cultural areas. Go around it, not through it.
Kayak and canoe launches, interpretive signage, paths for walking, fishing areas.
Work with Indigenous People to see what and how this can be done (thru Federated Tribes and maybe OSU).
Yes. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preserve established tree groves.</li> <li>2. Use siting choices and zero impact development techniques to eliminate runoff from development.</li> <li>3. Avoid creek crossings.</li> <li>4. Take a look at landslides in this area and prevent further impacts of this type.</li> </ol>

<p>5. Keep development away from the river wetlands, slopes and creeks.</p> <p>6. Preserve wildlife migration corridors and connections to the refuge.</p> <p>7. Keep roads, utilities and development out of conservation easements.</p> <p>8. Create an urban forestry plan and code that preserves tree canopy.</p> <p>9. Plan for shelters and affordable housing to keep campers out of natural areas.</p> <p>10. Incorporate disaster planning for earthquakes, ice and wind storms, flooding, landslides and fires into the community design.</p> <p>11. Make specific accommodations for sensitive species in this area.</p>
<p>1) Road crossings over creeks should be avoided to the maximum extent possible, while working to protect wildlife corridors.</p> <p>2) Restoration of degraded creeks or wetlands is necessary now, and the City should be prioritizing protection in the future.</p>
<p>If the natural resources are the priority and central focus at the outset, we will not go wrong. We cannot compromise that aspect of the vision.</p>
<p>There is already the opportunity to leave the natural areas alone and fix the erosion and damage that has already been caused as a result of these terrible development ideas that damage it more and more each year.</p>
<p>Keep the housing density near Beef Bend road and avoid housing near the Tualatin River or the drainages.</p>
<p>The city should form alliances with organizations like Tualatin Riverkeepers, the Federal Refuge, and other conservation/restoration entities to create plans to improve the watershed health, and follow their advice.</p>
<p>Don't draw elements on the master plan that will never make since financially hard to implement. (fischer rd extension through rivermeade). Instead focus efforts on areas with more development potential and less negative impact on property owners. (150th to roy rodgers).</p>
<p>Very few. The plan appears naive because the Tualatin River rises 15 feet every winter, and much higher from time to time. There is no realistic way to create a river path (not even considering the fact that all riverfront property is privately owned).</p>



**Question 5. Are there examples of where these ideas have worked well? Where? Why are they great?**

<b>Response</b>
Cook Park has kayak access but not nearly enough parking at boat ramp madras. Would be nice to provide similar ramping but more and easier access. Seniors have difficulty hauling a kayak far by hand.
How can 3,700 new homes in a 300 acre area along side sensitive wildlife and wetlands be great?
I don't know of any but surely there are some in process across this nation.
In Boise, ID, they have beautiful biking and walking paths along the canal and the river. It encourages outdoor activity in a safe manner (away from traffic).
Other areas of the river that have remained undisturbed are the best examples. You can see that wildlife is flocking to these areas after being pushed out from developments and parks.
King City does not have enough parks for the current residents. Doubling the residents under this plan will make the problem worse. Do not put developed parks in sensitive areas near the Tualatin River or in the drainages. All these new residents will need more parks and these should be closer to Beef Bend road and surrounded by the higher density housing so those people can walk to the parks.
Tualatin Riverkeepers rents canoes and other small craft from Cook Park in the summer. It is low-impact and allows people to enjoy the river. It is popular with paddlers.
Just take a look to the north at "River Terrace". Do you think the residents and land owners in this proposed area would like to see this area impacted like that example?
Cook Park does a nice job, Bend does a great job integrating the Deschutes River through the town, etc...

## Land Use

### Question 6. Do you support the land use vision statement?

Options	Number of Responses
I love it!	7
I support some items and do not support others	12
I do not support it	18
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>

### Why?

Response
no, too many houses. Would like to keep the area rural
King city and surrounding areas already have enough safety and security concerns. There is more crime in this area than there should be. We already have issues with crime and public safety. Additional development will compound existing issues. I would suggest minimizing focus on additional development and instead focus resources on improving safety of our existing community.
I do not support it because I think it's not achievable but it sounds good. If your definition of transition is 30 units per acre down to 11 then there is nothing rural about that. There will be nothing rural about this expansion as I understand it so I think this vision is a farce. Will there be 3,000 square foot homes or will this all be row houses and high density living? Wide range? How wide?
With the increased passings, I can only imagine negative impact to the already poorly planned and very busy Fischer and Hwy99 intersection, let alone the volume of traffic from people cutting down fischer to 99. it's already a high traffic - travelling too fast - neighborhood. Additionally, why doesn't the city invest in the real estate and builds already owned. nothing like abandoning areas so you can build new through taxes and levys. no thank you.
I suppose "urbanization" is however you choose to define it. In my experience, dwelling units that are in close proximity to each other creates a potential for widespread disaster in the event of a wildfire, earthquake, or other natural disaster. Creating housing that is largely geared towards low and middle income families does not resolve poverty issues, it only exacerbates them. And just a hint - once the development costs are added to the price of building new housing, these are not going to be "affordable" homes at all.
Too many houses. This narrow strip of land should be used as buffer between densely developed Bull Mountain and the Tualatin River. This plan simply adds thousands of densely packed houses with hard surfaces dumping more chemical laden runoff water directly into the Tualatin River. Don't you know there are Coho Salmon in the river and the tire chemical

runoff from paved roads was proven to kill them. This should be rural, or better yet protected lands, not super dense housing.
There is too much development targeted for an area with unique and significant natural resources and significant geological risks. It offers no homeless shelters.
Too dense. Too much negative environmental effect on the Tualatin River and the attempt to overtake conservation land to build a road.
I do not think putting main road as Fisher is a great idea. This road is meant to be a quiet access point to the edgewater development. Making it a through street will over congest an already busy area. This road was not meant to support access to a whole city.
I don't understand how this can preach to be a gentle transition between rural and urban when it is directly taking away what is left of the rural areas to make them urban. The plan does not take into account what the terrain is like in these areas, at all. This really, really needs to be better thought out.
I do not support the expansion of King City. We never got to vote on it. No choice, no vote.
There is very little development potential to justify drawing an east/west through road paralleling beef bend rd. The impacts to this area and property owners would be devastating. If King City decides to draw these elements into their master plan I'm sure they will face legal battles for many years to come, that will outlast the current King City employees tenures.
Any new East-West road Road through Rivermeade will destroy the character and safety of the neighborhood.
It is intrusive to the existing neighborhoods and wildlife. It is harmful to the river. It makes no sense to cut a road through a quiet, mostly 1 lane road neighborhood and encroach on and take the land from the families that live there. There are other options on the other side of hwy 99. Still not sure why King City thinks they are going to grow so much...
I like the fact that lower priced housing will be available to people instead of the massive cost rentals and condos in downtown Portland. The fact that the homeless population is getting larger is just another example of ostentatiousness about housing in general.
Need much more detailed information about the potential commercial uses. What types of retail shops? Will they have wheel chair access? Will sufficient parking be available and will it be elder friendly? What kind of sound buffers will be provided for frieght delivery to retail stores- to protect livability/ambience of residential areas that border that use?
This are needs more affordable housing, reducing impacts of traffic need to addressed though
I don't know what is meant by Rural character. Won't it be out of place? in twenty years? I know it's because of insistent residents. Please limit manufactured housing on leased lots. The people behind me are paying more for their rent and unit than I am paying in mortgage. They are not a good deal and are usually owned by out of state corporations. We have enough in this area.
There are professionals out there who can guide us toward not creating income level "ghettos" in this Kingston Terrace area.
Too many appartments and condos. There looks to be a longer term trend (partly from COVOD) toward a need for more single family residences with enough room for home office and perhaps parents or older children.
Do not extend Fischer Road straight through. This will destroy the tranquility of this neighborhood by making our streets dangerous for our families. Currently, we enjoy walking

and biking in our neighborhoods. Allowing more cars through leads to more noise pollution and danger for our kids.
If you build it, they will come.....King City does not need to be a mecca for people. Less is more, which is what King City's vision has been since being established, a small quiet hamlet. I'm sure the need for tax dollars plays a big part of this whole drive to grow King City.
I'm concerned that there is too much emphasis on dwellings for a King City tax base and not near enough focus on the number and acreage of parks to sustain these systems.
It's one story to develop areas that want to be developed, but to infiltrate an existing neighborhood with additional roads and pushing streets through is unspeakable.
There is no plan for Tiny Housing. This is a popular option, and one or more Tiny House "parks" could provide some space for personal usage, and a large area of communal space/green space. More Tiny Homes than mobile homes will fit in the same area. It is likely the most affordable type of housing.
I'm not the biggest fan of how intense the development is. I'd like to see homesites with decent sized yards that aren't built on top of one another.
I think it is hard to create affordable housing, so would be interested to see what is meant by this. I would like to leave Rivermeade alone and of course to not connect Fischer Road with the proposed new development. Why destroy our community to build another community?

**Question 7. How important is each land use goal to you?**

<i>Create a mixed-use with neighborhood-serving commercial.</i>	
Not important	11
Somewhat Important	5
Very Important	5
Most Important	2
<i>Balance denser development with green spaces.</i>	
Not important	4
Somewhat Important	2
Very Important	6
Most Important	10
<i>Incorporate civic amenities.</i>	
Not important	10
Somewhat Important	2
Very Important	7
Most Important	3

<i>Mix of housing for a wide range of household types, incomes, and needs.</i>	
Not important	9
Somewhat Important	4
Very Important	5
Most Important	4
<i>Housing affordability is prioritized.</i>	
Not important	10
Somewhat Important	5
Very Important	4
Most Important	4
<i>Draw on agricultural tradition (highlight opportunities for urban farming, farm-fresh foods, and community gardens).</i>	
Not important	5
Somewhat Important	4
Very Important	5
Most Important	8
<i>Focus on communities of concern, especially the senior community.</i>	
Not important	7
Somewhat Important	5
Very Important	8
Most Important	3
<i>Create connections between new development and existing development in King City and in neighboring River Terrace.</i>	
Not important	11
Somewhat Important	5
Very Important	3
Most Important	4
<i>Why? Responses:</i>	
<p>Safety is my main concern. Developing connections between existing and new community would provide an easy way for criminals to maneuver the entire area. The addition of low income housing is also concerning to safety and criminal behavior.</p> <p>I can't see how there will be an opportunity for farm fresh foods. Sounds really good though but willing to bet it won't be realized on any measurable scale. A huge portion of King City is already 55 and older so that box is checked. I can see connections to River Terrace because you have a completely undeveloped area on that end. A connection to the existing King City and the expansion area is unattainable in any meaningful way unless you clear a swath of homes between the current shopping area and the power lines.</p>	

<p>Most important to me is the ability to garden on some of the best soil in the country. we need the ability to grow our own food.</p>
<p>This is just how I feel. Lofty words in vision statements are often jus words. I expect us to do better than that.</p>
<p>It's important to focus on our senior communities, but King City now has many young people who need vigorous outdoor opportunities. It is also important to create opportunities to bring the new and the old neighborhoods together without destroying the existing quiet and safety we all value.</p>
<p>King City does not need to be a stand-alone community. King City doesn't need all the amenities etc. since the proximity to River Terrace, Roy Rogers and Hwy 99 provide necessary amenities for most people. The draw to the new area will be the natural habitat. The senior community is well established in the current area of King City. The need for more is not necessary. Why move all the amenities to the Roy Rogers side when some revitalization of the current civic area should be considered. Again, moving civic areas to the opposite side serves no purpose and perhaps seniors won't be able to access things since they may not drive.</p>
<p>These goals miss the target of what should be prioritized because it relies on a plan that is fundamentally flawed.</p>
<p>The way these statements are written assumes that the development should happen. "Draw on agricultural tradition"...just let the agricultural areas remain. We don't need a farmer's market if we have the farmer right there. It's so frustrating that the survey is written as a fait accompli rather than, "Should this even happen?"</p>
<p>It's clear that these "community involvement" avenues are just a way for the King City employees to make things appear that they are getting the communities feedback and incorporating their ideas into the master plan.</p>
<p>Creating connections with River Terrace would bring even more traffic into the annexation area and have no positive impact on the neighborhood, except for the businesses.</p>
<p>None of the proposed King City expansion is beneficial to existing residents, and much of it is damaging (particularly a proposed additional East-West road)</p>
<p>I think it is important to build the City to accommodate the future needs and ensure the development is done responsibly so it provides a unique area that defines King City. It seems King City lacks a metaphorical community heart, the closest thing we have is our Community Park in Edgewater. I like the City's idea of building a town center. This could be a really cool community if we can ensure the developers don't turn it into a strip center.</p>

**Question 8. What opportunities are there to achieve the land use vision and goals?**

Response
Community gardens, cottage clusters, low-rise buildings for sun access.
Very few, based on the fact that much of the valley is watershed and swale. There is no study showing the impact on the river or local habitats.
Again, make the existing condition of the land and surrounding developments better. There is no room for this unrealistic, idealistic plan.
Do this in an area without so many natural constraints (ie slopes, floodplain, slide prone soils, creeks, wetlands).
Make sure we have connected neighborhoods. Pathways, trails, and Roads.
It takes the involvement of people who care about the land (all of it: soil, trees, scrubs, birds, small animals, fish, etc) and not just about land and building on it because it produces money and wealth for a few.
Make decisions that work with the existing natural and agricultural history of the land. Respect and don't change existing neighborhoods. Give this area a name that corresponds with its own history and character rather than naming it like a royal land grant. We don't have kings in America because we fought to get rid of them here. Don't encourage outdated colonialism practices by taking away the people's own names for the places where they live, which are a part of their identity. Develop away from natural resources, into areas where people want to congregate, and leave some areas just for nature. Provide additional green spaces around developed areas for the clusters of people to enjoy.
Car traffic should be prioritized on Beef Bend, not Fischer. Bike and hike lanes everywhere.

**Question 9. Are there examples of where these ideas have worked well? Where? Why are they great?**

Response
Sherwood does a great job in their downtown and so does Lake Oswego. Both are built with lots of connections and opportunities. I would emulate their designs.
I'm not so informed.
My daughter lives at NE 44 <sup>th</sup> in Portland, near Laurelhurst. The apartment development contains different size apartments and cottages surrounding a large lawn. Because of the different sizes, there is a mix of families, singles, seniors, etc. On a nice day, people come out and hang out in the common area (they have to park in a lot and walk to their front doors). It's lovely and the way things should be instead of lining up houses and playing on the street.
Yes, currently it is working great. Funds should be better allocated to make Beef Bend safer, fix the damage from existing developments on bull mountain, and improve the already existing King City. Also, the name Kingston- where did this come from? Consider renaming this if you really are going to move forward.

## Mobility

### Question 10. Do you support the mobility vision statement?

Options	Number of Responses
I love it!	11
I support some items and do not support others	12
I do not support it	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>

### Why?

Response
Safer sidewalks are always appreciated
Don't want Fischer Road to go through.
Need more sidewalks and paths. Do not need additional roads to Roy Rogers
I do not support the extension Fischer Rd
Connections need to be thought out and planned well.
Encourages getting around without needing your car.
Already too many homes using Fischer to get to 99, now you want to double the volume of traffic?
More roads mean more cement and destruction of vegetation. This means higher temperatures less moisture and last habitat for wildlife. Widen Beef Bend Road.
I love the connections; Fisher Rd doesn't need to be any bigger than Royalty Pkwy. Well, maybe so. Anyway, Full sidewalks should be prioritized on 131 St, Kids need to walk safely to school and that empty lot is very hazardous, even for adults coming upon it as pedestrians.
If King City can't even fix and maintain its current network how can they cover a larger city? The King City map shows it needs lot of work to increase mobility right at home. I have to walk in the street to get to the swim center for lack of sidewalks. No expanding the city until they take care of us that are already here.
The environmental constraints preclude a complete network of streets. Consider the slopes, landslides, wetlands, floodplain and most of all the creeks. You need to scale back your transportation plan considerably.
Don't support the connection of Fischer Road with the new proposed community
Fischer Road was not meant to be a throughway. It is a gateway to Edgewater and connecting it to new development would be too much for this already busy entrance to Edgewater neighborhood.
City desperately needs it.
No mention of public transportation.



Less is more....We do not need a hwy going through the new area. The reality of walking from the east side to the west side to access shopping, civic, etc. is very unlikely for people to do, especially seniors.
I would support having better transportation network in the area, but it's already accessible in other ways. It's hilly so I don't imagine dumping a ton of money into sidewalks and things will pay off at all. People already don't use exiting beef bend sidewalks all that much in the steeper areas.
The proposed trail goes right through people's back yards along the Tualatin River. Picture that in your own back yard. And it goes through Rivermeade's park. This park was not created to be taken over by King City. please be respectful and consider if you would like this done to your neighborhood.
In some of the earliest examples, which have not been totally agreed upon, there is inadequate parking for future residents with development having to comply with State of Oregon mandates. With all of the "freedom" protests going on currently about having to wear a mask and social distance ones self, people are not going to be happy that the State of Oregon has taken away their freedom to have two cars safely stored away. Their freedom to choose their form of transit is also being taken away from them with the idealistic everyone is going to ride mass transit. It would be interesting to know how many people in King City and Tigard currently use mass transit instead of owning two cars.
Connection of the transportation network must not include an extension of Fischer road. Do not destroy Edgewater with thousands of vehicles through our neighborhood.
It doesn't make sense to draw a street into the master plan that will never be feasible to build.
Additional East-West corridors (road or path) will have an immeasurably negative impact on existing residents. Privacy, safety, and character of neighborhoods will be destroyed. Further there is no practical way to make a riverfront path due to annual rise in river water level. Not to mention the entire riverfront property is privately owned.
The connectors to Beef Bend are fine, but the green boulevard needs to be further north, nearer Beef Bend Rd. That is where the population will be denser, and there will be need for the most car travel. Small feeders and paths can drop down to the smaller number of homes nearer the river.
A complete networks alleviates traffic congestion.

**Question 11. How important is each mobility goal to you?**

<i>Prioritize walking and bicycling over driving for local trips within the URA and nearby areas</i>	
Not important	6
Somewhat Important	6
Very Important	4
Most Important	11

<i>Create routes to ease burden on Beef Bend Rd</i>	
Not important	13
Somewhat Important	5
Very Important	6
Most Important	3
<i>Create connections to transit and trail systems.</i>	
Not important	7
Somewhat Important	4
Very Important	7
Most Important	8
<i>Align conventional street and trail system with existing King City street types such as curbless green streets, alley-trails, and "country roads."</i>	
Not important	11
Somewhat Important	5
Very Important	6
Most Important	4
<i>Why? Responses:</i>	
No extending Fischer Rd.	
<p>I suggest breaking roads at regular intervals to keep from developing another main road like Beef Bend Road. If you have roads that end where people have to turn you will help to make sure that speed limits are observed, pedestrians and children are safer, and accidents are less likely. I understand the need for additional connections between the existing community and the new development, but we definitely do not want to create any additional high speed and high traffic routes. Think about what has happened to Fischer Rd between 99 and 131. Cars treat that road almost like a highway. I would suggest something like you find in Sellwood or Ladds Addition where a road will go several blocks then will not be able to continue and you may need to move down a block or two if you want to continue in the same direction. This will help to ensure the safety of those on the road and those sharing it with vehicles.</p>	
<p>Beef Bend is the busy road so keep it the busy road and don't make another street within the community a busy road.</p>	
<p>That is the way I see the bigger picture.</p>	
<p>It is difficult to create a network of bike trails when the terrain is so steep. Is TriMet planning service on Beef Bend Road?</p>	
<p>Many places in KC need improvements, so why start a new project. Even our King City park has dangerous walking spaces, and nothing is done about it. Walkways that flood and freeze in the winter, broken up walking path around the soccer/baseball field. We don't need the drive the traffic through an existing neighborhood. I live on the proposed "green roadway" and would not like to see this happen. I think that you would be hard pressed to find many local residents of KC that are in favor of this project, and yet the council pushes forward. I don't call that representation. Rivermeade is against this project, and Edgewater is against it, but you are moving forward anyway. This project will cause many new projects for KC, and I know from talking with neighbors, that people will move out to avoid what is being proposed.</p>	

Beef Bend is built to be a throughway. Fischer road is not. Just because you want something after the fact does not make it a good idea.
Please do not route more traffic through the neighborhoods. It is very quiet and there are kids playing everywhere. Fischer Road should not be considered as a connection to the new developments. We want Rivers Edge to remain a great place to raise our families.
Your choices above seem messy and not thought out. A lot of thought has to be given to this situation. Consult true experts.....again looking at already existing terrain, creek crossings and habitat impact.
We have enough trails in the area. The roads that already exist are not heavily trafficked. Seems like another misallocation of funds to create a bunch of roads when the existing ones remain quiet.
Again...speak clearly. What does "align conventional street and trail system" mean?
Do not create routes to ease burden on Beef Bend Rd which then puts all the traffic through the planned neighborhoods. That would be crazy.
King City should use Beef Bend rd. for the east / west travel.
Widen Beef Bend Road if needed. Do not add any more connectors or paths. This applies to King City or any other municipality that might stake claim to the southeast corner of Beef Bend and Roy Rogers roads.
If you want meaningful answers please describe what you mean by alley-trails and your definition of a country road. Also, there is no response for feeling "more than somewhat" but less than "very" important. That is a large gap, and I would have selected it in several of my answers already, had it been available. When you talk about prioritizing walking/biking over cars, that seems to overlook the fact that elderly and alternately-abled residents would be disadvantaged, and since King City was originally a retirement community, that seems like a clear conflict. I agree those alternatives are important and desirable, but how will you honor both?
I would prefer to use local roads rather than getting caught into all the traffic on 99W, Roy Rogers, or Beef Bend. I try to avoid these congested areas as much as possible. We also enjoy the walking trails throughout King City and would like to see that continue to develop and expand.

**Question 12. How important is each mobility goal to you?**

Response
If you keep the livability a priority then very achievable. If your goal is to build cheaply and reduce costs, then it won't be realized. Additional right of ways and possibly pump stations are the costs that need to be paid now so the rewards can be realized for decades to come. Don't go cheap now because it can't be changed later.
I think we need some type of bike parking by bus stations. I'd ride my bike to the bus, but there is nowhere to store/park a bicycle.
bicycle and walking paths that are separate from cars.
The steep terrain makes it difficult to have a network of bike trails. You need a commitment from TriMet to serve the area.
Support your electric vehicle community by incorporating charging station parking, possibly a Tesla supercharger station. By the time this community is live, multiple auto manufacturers will have gone mostly electric in their offerings. If you are creating a network of homes that are for all incomes, you will want to have ride share, or park and ride, nearby, if the transportation is linked up for public

transportation. This will make it easier for all people to live in this community who may work elsewhere in Portland.
If you want to preserve the neighborhoods, leave them have a peaceful existence without trying to over congest and connect them. Fischer road should not be extended beyond it's current boundaries.
More hiking and biking please.
If anything, widen Beef Bend Road. That would be the best, most effective solution.
More paths and trails. Fewer roads. No traffic cutting through neighborhoods.
None. River access is all private land. Beef Bend Road should be widened if needed. No additional east-west corridors should be added.
The opportunity to have meetings and other two-way outreach to the community to openly discuss the actual needs and desires of the people in public forums. Information has not been consistently available to the public, and people do not feel that their input or any concern they have has a chance of making any difference. Trust needs to be built and earned to achieve worthwhile goals.
Stop allowing builders to create dead end roads, require builders to connect roads, provide protected bike and pedestrian trails that are separated from roads. Avoid making Beef Bend a Highway, by building and connecting Fischer Road.

**Question 13. Are there examples of where these ideas have worked well? Where? Why are they great?**

<b>Responses</b>
Amazon Park in Eugene, OR
It would be amazing to have a Fanno Creek Trail system nearby so that residents can recreate without having to drive.
Lake Oswego added lanes to existing roads which relieved traffic. This worked great. Their road systems work super well.
Bend, Eugene, Newberg, Portland and many many more. All were built on a grid street network and work well to reduce traffic congestion on side streets. It seems like all the streets around here wander around and dead end, which forces everyone to get stuck on 99W.

## Infrastructure

### Question 14. Do you support the infrastructure vision statement?

Options	Number of Respondents
I love it!	14
I support some items and do not support others	8
I do not support it	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>

### Why?

Response
It appears to me that the majority of wastewater will flow downwards to a new major sewage lift station located near Roy Rogers and the Tualatin River. Then the wastewater will be pumped up to a sewer main in Beef Bend Road. When this line reaches 131st it will turn and flow towards the river and eventually will flow under the river on its way to the main sewage treatment plant located behind Tigard High School. We will all pay for the energy to pump wastewater up the hill to Beef Bend, only to have it gravity flow down 131st and eventually reach the sewer plant. The supposed "sacredness" of the six streams this wastewater could pass under would greatly reduce electrical energy costs if a line was allowed near the river instead of having to be located in Beef Bend.
We need to reduce the erosion along the Tualatin River.
I am assuming people who have studied and planned this have done their 'do diligence'
Storm water/erosion issues urgently need to be addressed. However, no mention is made about all the residents who have wells and septic tanks. Conversion can be costly and should not be put on landowners who do not need and/or desire city water and sewer services. Zoning should be created to grandfather them in.
The ravines as illustrated on the map are deep and wide and continue to evolve. I think that any development should be avoided in these areas both from a financial and an environmental standpoint.
The entire existing Rivermeade community is on fresh, delicious, private well water. All waste is handled through private septic systems. Using Tigard water and Cleanwater Services is not beneficial. Especially since the existing well water and septic systems are free to landowners.
Make sure these ideas are viable for years to come. Mitigation of water works for awhile, water eventually finds it's natural path.
The runoff and erosion is already a disaster. This really needs to be addressed, and quickly. I am extremely concerned this whole plan will exacerbate the preexisting disaster we have. I would really support focus on this area.

I love it, but get it right the first time. Build the water management for the community it is going to be. We lived through the stormwater / sewer upgrade x 2 because they made mistakes, and it was a nightmare on earth for an entire summer on our street.
I believe that the project will further destroy the natural areas and damage the river. Development should not approach the river or add more stress to it. I have gone and seen the current erosion of the creeks that empty into the river and it is sad. More development will make it even worse.
I like this as long as there is no or positive impact on natural areas and habitats.
Need to fix existing erosion areas as a condition of expansion into these stream corridors.
They keep pushing an extension of Fischer Road which violates all the water vision statements.

### **Question 15. How important is each infrastructure goal to you?**

<i>Plan for two phases of infrastructure development with more immediate development in the west and more incremental development in the eastern portion of the KTMP area.]</i>	
Not important	5
Somewhat Important	6
Very Important	5
Most Important	5
<i>Integrate stormwater management throughout.</i>	
Not important	3
Somewhat Important	1
Very Important	8
Most Important	12
<i>Reduce runoff and heal erosion.</i>	
Not important	2
Somewhat Important	0
Very Important	6
Most Important	16
<i>Use best practices for stormwater management and mitigation</i>	
Not important	2
Somewhat Important	0
Very Important	9
Most Important	11

<i>Responsibly allocate infrastructure costs.</i>	
Not important	3
Somewhat Important	1
Very Important	9
Most Important	8
<i>Why? Responses:</i>	
I still do not understand nor envision the allocation of infrastructure costs.	
What does responsibly allocate infrastructure costs mean? If it means that those who are making money off the development pay for it all and that there will be no skimping to make it cheaper then I am all for it.	
The runoff water and River Terrace development are already a problem to the new area, so why stress it more. In the West part of the expansion area, it is flatter, and people are more interested in selling, but in the East, people are not interested. So, starting in the West makes sense.	
This is a huge issue in the new area and a huge cost. Again, experts need to access the current situation to make practical decisions. Asking landowners who have had their land for decades will give experts a guide to the history of the habitat/land to be able to make logical smart decisions for the future. It's already a water mess south of Beef Bend...	
What does the last statement mean? It sounds like it means, have the tax payers pay for it.	
Avoid development along the Tualatin River and in the drainages. Only develop the western area and a narrow band along Beef Bend road and leave the rest of the area more natural or minimal rural development. Do not extend Fisher road.	
These surveys are a joke. Forcing people to pick options based on the agenda of the King City employees. If erosion and runoff are a concern to King City, then they should abandon this project right now.	
As previously stated - Rivermeade is entirely on private wells and septic systems. Nothing added will improve this, and would likely be detrimental.	
It seems like if the system is going to work properly it needs to be built in the same reasonable time frame. Phasing the development may or may not be a smart approach and may limit the abilities to build important infrastructure in a reasonable time frame.	

**Question 16. What opportunities are there to achieve the infrastructure vision and goals?**

<b>Responses</b>
You need to enlist water experts to be able to strategize options for the water issue that are already happening before wildly thinking about the next steps. It's a layering effect....current problems/issues will drive the work, then you can make informed decisions.
Avoid impacts to natural resources.
The best plan is to leave it alone and fix the current problems. But if you are going to do this, you need to fix the old problems and use bridges over ditches and not culverts.

I like the City's approach to promote connected neighborhoods. When the City did 131st Street there was no way around. We need a connected transportation network.
Extended conservation areas near sensitive waterways. rainwater detention facilities.
Distill the answers using the best information and science you can get, and don't let attachment doing things a certain way cloud the facts about the best way to do them.
Step one of this whole thing would be to fix what is already broken. You really need to have this be your #1 focus with the majority of funds reserved for this.

**Question 17. Are there examples of where these ideas have worked well? Where Why are they great?**

<b>Responses</b>
No responses

## Demographic

**Question 18. Do you live or work in King City? (check one)**

<i>Prioritize walking and bicycling over driving for local trips within the URA and nearby areas</i>	
I live in King City but work elsewhere	11
I work in King City but live elsewhere	1
I both live and work in King City	6
I don't live or work in King City	6
I prefer not to answer	3
<i>Other:</i>	
Live in KC and retired	
I live and work in the area west of king city.	
Retired and live in King City	
I live here (I am retired. Where is that category?)	
What? Thousands of us are retired. Where is 'I live in King City and don't work'? Do you know your city at all?	
I live in the area that will be directly impacted by these plans.	
I own land in the planned expansion	
Live here and am retired	



**Question 19. What is your age? (check one)**

<i>Age</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>
Under 18	0
18-24	0
25-34	5
35-44	8
45-54	5
55-64	7
65-79	7
80 years old and older	4
I prefer not to answer	2

**Question 20. Which best describes your race/ethnicity? (check all that apply)**

<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>
Asian	
Black or African America	
White	30
Hispanic, Latinx or Spanish	
Native American or Alaska Native	
Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	
Prefer not to answer	4
<i>Response for Other:</i>	
EuroAmerican	

**Question 21. What is your annual household income? (check all that apply)**

<i>Annual Household Income</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>
Less than \$20,000	
\$20,000 to \$34,999	
\$35,000 to \$49,999	3
\$50,000 to \$74,999	4
\$75,000 to \$99,999	4
More than \$100,000	16
Prefer not to answer	6

## APPENDIX C. Stakeholder Interviews

### Vision Statement

Community aspirations for the area informed a series of designs organized around four frameworks: *Natural Resources, Mobility, Land Use and Infrastructure*. Each framework acts as a layer supporting specific aspects of the **Vision Statement** for:

- a vibrant, walkable, and complete community where every day needs are easily accessible.
- housing choice and affordability for all current and future residents.
- safe, efficient, convenient, and reliable transportation choices to enhance connectivity and minimize automobile dependency.
- protection of environmentally sensitive lands and retention of healthy ecosystems.
- the efficient and equitable provision of infrastructure and associated costs.

### Do you support the 2018 Community Vision Statement? Why or why not? What, if anything, would you change? (*Answers in italics*)

- *People are trying to organize a site tour. There are significant erosion issues in the area. I had a 12-foot pedestrian bridge built across the creek with water three feet deep. It's now 50 feet across and 20 feet deep. There are sheer walls of erosion and sediment is polluting the water. This is due to development upstream that followed regulations established by Clean Water Services. Hydromodification studies have been done to prove it. CWS said it's not legally responsible as it followed the established regulations at the time. The legal avenue is not viable for me. CWS is not a viable avenue. King City Park has the same problem. I am skeptical that the City will remediate the problems on my property as new development happens if they're not even fixing the problems at King City Park. How can they take care of my property when they haven't done so at the park? I'm concerned that the City won't take the property steps when crossing the ravine with a roadway. Rather than a bridge, they will probably do a culvert and fill the ravine. Developments are better at capturing groundwater and putting it into the ground. This can stop further damage. Development will take care of that. They will not add to the current flow, but I don't see how they can do anything to reduce current flow. How do you heal the land in order to accommodate the current flow? You'd have to bring in a very large amount of rock in order to stop the cutting.*
- *I do not support transportation choices if doing so makes my neighborhood not safe. Enhanced connectivity between neighborhoods is what City Council mentions, but that will damage our community which is a quiet community.*
- *I agree with the vision statement in general. But what the vision is on paper and what happens in reality are different things. Protection of the Tualatin River and drainages, sensitive areas, and wildlife are my main concerns for that area. Once the area is changed, it will make a significant difference for years to come. Drainages #1, #2 and #4 are the worst, but there are other creeks going into the Tualatin River that are not tied into the drainages. I am concerned about Clean Water Act 404(b)(1), the wetlands fill law, that says it is not good idea if there is an alternative roadway north towards Beef Bend Road.*

- *I don't support the vision statement without the following changes: protection of the Tualatin River and drainages, environmentally sensitive lands, wildlife, and retention of healthy ecosystems. The efficient and equitable provision of infrastructure and associated costs fees to be paid by new development activity.*
- *I do support it and I wouldn't change anything. We're hitting on how we have to expand and in doing so, we can build wholly new. I like that it is open-ended and I like the ideas especially around walkable and community-centered.*
- *I support the vision statement. I particularly like the last bullet as the infrastructure piece is important to me, especially the equitable provision of infrastructure.*
- *I wouldn't change anything about the Vision Statement and I support it. The Concept Plan from 2018 really does capture the essence of what we're trying to do with the area.*
- *I would like to focus more on the diversity factor because I see DEI as important in the next phase of building King City. A lot of people build a city first and then try to address DEI second and I think you address it from the beginning. It's not just the city expanding, it's city hall expanding also and the community has to keep in mind what kind of community are we going to make? It is better to have diverse staff available for the people coming in and new people coming (who may be POC). Will we think about DEI? Will we actively recruit and market for more diverse families? Infrastructure is not there enough: no nearby hospitals, clinics, medical facilities. No affordable housing for seniors and there is an issue with studio and 1-bedroom apartments for rent for elderly communities. Korean American community: elderly people usually single and not enough affordable single bedroom apartments and not enough available on the market. It's not clearly stated that we want all walks of life from youth to seniors, different race/ethnicities*
- *There are different response models based on our service area, and we work with planners to develop these communities. We make sure we can roll into water supply for hydrants and we can different vehicles for different calls. Our vehicles are costly, so some traffic calming tools like speed humps can deteriorate the bottom of vehicles, so we work with Washington County on street design. Response times shows us where we need to put a fire station. We support multi-modal transportation systems, and we're supportive of health aspect of it. This includes affordable housing too. We also live here, so it affects us as well.*

## Frameworks

### Natural Systems

The community envisions an area with a mix of uses in harmony with environmentally sensitive lands and the Tualatin River.

### Goals

- Protect the Tualatin River, sensitive wildlife habitat, and other natural systems.
- Reduce runoff and heal erosion.
- Integrate green spaces and wetlands into developed areas.

**Do you support the vision and goals for Natural Systems? What are the opportunities to achieve the Natural Resources vision and goals?**

- I've seen the destruction from water coming down the mountain and destroying ditches and washing silt into the river. I've walked the land and seen what has been damaged from the last development. I don't think they're taking that seriously. In Oregon, we seem to be more environmentally concerned or it's a higher value than in some places. We have Columbia Land Trust and Tualatin Riverkeepers that are against the road going through, but City Council is not slowing down. To put in bridges across drainages is going to be an expensive effort. Culverts will increase the speed of water coming down. I've talked to neighbors and walked the land. We already have a major issue with the City saying they can cross the Columbia Land trust Land, but don't think that meets the original intention. The King City Civic Association is asking why King City is going to develop a new community when there are places around the city without sidewalks. Hard time seeing people from the community who are interested. I am concerned about runoff. No one has talked to the people who live here. How do you create a concept plan without talking to the people who live there? I don't think King City has thought through the issues. They want to increase revenue and make town bigger. Cutting through Rivermeade is a main concern for four neighborhoods. Appeasing Rivermeade by keeping rural is an idea, but to try to drive through Rivermeade with a road doesn't make much sense.*
- There has been development in the Peach Tree area north of Beef Bend Road. I've noticed the impact it's caused near the river over the last several years. Have we had a chance to read the Tualatin Riverkeepers reports 5, 6, 7, and 8? You can obtain them from Ashley Short. They are extensive summary reports relative to erosion, fissure, Peach Tree, current, past and future impacts. They involved many specialists. Photos show the impact of runoff into river, that have turned into ravines. They documented a fissure ¼ mile along the river.*
- I don't support the goals without modifications. The Metro Council UGB expansion Ordinance No. 18-1427 contained several "Conditions of Approval on Land Added to UGB" including six requirements for comprehensive planning, six requirements that applied to all four cities, and nine requirements specific to King City. King City Requirement No. 8 said "The Columbia Land Trust holds a conservation easement over portions of the Bankston property, which King City's concept plan identifies as the intended location for a key transportation facility serving the expansion area. King City shall work with the Columbia Land Trust to protect, to the maximum extent possible, the portion of the Bankston property covered by the conservation easement." The following Natural Systems goal must be added to the KTMP: Protect the Bankston conservation area environmentally sensitive lands to the maximum extent possible. The KTMP area currently provides important wildlife corridors to the Tualatin River and important wildlife habitat. Wildlife swims across the river to access Metro's Heritage Pine Natural Area and the Tualatin National Wildlife Refuge. The KTMP has daily sightings of black-tailed deer, coyote, beaver, and other animals with periodic sightings of elk and cougar. The nearby Tualatin National Wildlife Refuge reports that black-tailed deer and occasional elk are observed on the refuge, as well as smaller mammals such as coyote, river otter, bobcat, raccoon, beaver, muskrat, and mink. Beef Bend Road restricts wildlife movement and a significant east-west transportation facility located near the Tualatin River could cut off critical wildlife corridors. The Concept Plan highlighted this interest in protecting habitat connectivity. The first Natural Systems goal should be modified as follows: Protect the Tualatin River, sensitive wildlife habitat, vital wildlife corridors, and other*

*natural systems. There are opportunities to achieve the Natural Resources vision and goals in the KTMP, but only if multiple thoughtful alternatives are developed and included in the KTMP that prioritize shared public interests instead of predetermined objectives and decisions by King City council.*

- *Yes, I support the visions and goals for Natural Systems. I would love to see something added in the goals in regard to public participation in natural areas and expanding trails. The more you spend time in natural areas, the more you want to preserve them. I'd like to see more integration of people into the natural systems and more emphasis on access.*
- *I support the vision and goals. I want to see parks for the community and provide access to the river while mitigating negative impacts to the river.*
- *I support the vision and goals of the Natural Systems framework. It's hard to say we're going to make changes and disrupt these systems, but we have to try to not impact these areas too much. We have to understand the costs and benefits of what we're doing with the KTMP.*
- *Two things came to mind: expansion ends at the Tualatin River and if you could develop the river with walkways and bikeways, and use the river as wellness healthy environment might be better and parks near it. There are also a lot of deer and how will the developments affect that? Access way for animals to go across Beef Bend or a sky bridge so they can easily access?*
- *Rock Creek Corridor and greenspaces are the biggest thing for us – we want to ensure someone is maintaining these areas because it is a big fire risk to have a more wooded, lush area that is unmaintained.*

### **Land Use**

The community imagines a range of housing types to support inclusive and diverse neighborhoods. Residential areas are supported by commercial and civic amenities and connections to the wider KingCity community and neighboring River Terrace area. A gradient of density creates four distinct neighborhoods.

### **Goals**

- Provide a mix of housing to accommodate a wide range of household types, incomes, and needs.
- Create a new mixed-use area with neighborhood scale and character.
- Allow for gentle transitions between rural and urban development.

### **Do you support the vision and goals for Land Use? What are the opportunities to achieve the LandUse vision and goals?**

- *Rivermeade and 147<sup>th</sup> are the two dominant communities in the area. Property owners west of 150<sup>th</sup> want to sell. Those have houses on large parcels and are owned by developers. My goal is to try to protect this area. That can be achieved. There is so much property to be developed and there can be work-arounds. We can have the growth that King City desires and protect these areas. In the concept plan diagrams, the Rural Neighborhood is shown up to Beef Bend Road. It ought to be pushed south and extend west from Rivermeade to 147<sup>th</sup>. That would help protect what we have down here in this area. Higher density belongs in the Beef Bend Road Neighborhood and can continue on to Deer Creek Elementary. The Rural Neighborhood could extend west to*

147<sup>th</sup> and more towards the south. Increases wildlife corridor and ecological protections. Town center, in middle of west end. Should be shifted more toward the corner. Traffic having to go through neighborhoods, transit.

- We envision a dense area with civic uses and parks in line with the Concept Plan. The area will be more dense in the town center and transition toward the 15-20 acre range in the Beef Bend Neighborhood. Preliminary layouts have not established exactly where the town center will be located, but plans can be easily adjusted to accommodate it. We assume it will be centered around the River Terrace Blvd and Fischer Road intersection where there will be higher intensity with civic uses. We assume Fischer Road will intersect with Roy Rogers south of Al's property and result in the repurposing of Al's property. The pond in this area site was created artificially by the property owner 40 years ago for fire suppression on Al's property. We are investigating the potential removal of that pond.
- Half of this area is floodplain and steep slopes, so it's important to agree on a form of development if possible. Trying to build multifamily housing on the land will be a challenge. I envision something like 45 Central. The vision for that area is courtyard three story buildings. It can be done at 18 units per acre. It's done best at 15 units per acre or you get too much of a Gotham City feel at three stories where everything is too close. With more room you can have a dense product that allows sunlight. We don't differentiate between townhomes and single family detached done on narrow lots. We do differentiate between attached and detached from a marketability standpoint. We would prefer to see high density detached housing over three-story multifamily. We want residents to be able to walk to the town center from brownstones or quads, like in Orenco. The town center is an asset. There are challenges when working with two governments (King City and Tigard). Beaverton should be involved too and we should be planning one town center. It will take a long time to develop enough rooftops to support the commercial spaces. The market might be different by that time, so build in flexibility for the town center. In order to have an emphasis on housing affordability in the area, the City needs to be thoughtful about tradeoffs. It is hard to build affordable housing in a Planned Unit Development.
- I notice that the vision calls for housing from 3,300 units to 3,500 units at 12 units per acre. I have some concerns about how many homes are going in those particular areas in the Central and Beef Bend neighborhoods relative to parks and natural scenic areas. There might be an overabundance or overcrowding in those areas. We need to think about the livability of these areas. Roy Rogers has houses and condos and apartments that seem to be packed into narrow area. I don't know how they came up with the number of houses, but they need to make sure to have enough space for parks and scenic areas. There is wildlife in that area, but no wildlife corridor that I have seen.

I understand about the current housing situation, but there needs to be other alternatives to preserve natural resources. I have concerns about that as well. Comparisons between Tualatin and Tigard and community parks and natural resources could be separate entities in themselves. Bull Mountain Park is at 8 acres at 13960 SW Alpine Crest Way. This is an ideal neighborhood park at 8 acres would be nice for King City to incorporate a similar design. I've spoken with Marcia Sinclair and Beth Cohen at Metro. LCDC previously stated that Washington County was out of compliance in protecting natural resources. There are standards for parks in the Concept Plan. People will go to neighborhood parks and community parks, so you need to think about the whole 518 acres and people going to those parks. King City Community Park draws people from whole surrounding area – Edgewater, Bull Mountain, Rivermeade, River Terrace – who go to that 17-acre

*park built for 2,000 new residents and 700 homes. 3,300 to 3,600 homes will result in 10,000 residents. The City needs to consider what is needed for neighborhood park and community park. (See attachment)*

- *I support the goals after clarifying the second goal, possibly as follows, to avoid any confusion that the goals might be misinterpreted to support mixed-use in the three neighborhoods: Create a new mixed-use Town Center near Roy Rogers Road including commercial and civic amenities and a transit hub with neighborhood scale and character.*
- *Yes, I support the vision and goals for Land Use. I think the continued dialogue with current residents of the KTMP is important. However, there's been so much emphasis on Fischer Rd. and I could see more opportunity for residents to look around and see how we are trying to keep the rural feel. More public commentary and more bigger picture emphasis for public commentary.*
- *I am concerned about equity when it comes to accessing the river -make sure that the houses near the river are not all large homes, put in some apartments and denser housing there. The river should be accessible for all to use.*
- *HB 2001 and 2003 really addressed the variety aspect of affordable housing. We were ahead of the game before the 2 bills and we had that vision for the community already. We allow manufactured homes and mobile homes in our code already. Originally, King City was a 55 and older community, and this provides for a certain income and time in life. As we develop, we don't envision a new 55+ housing development but we see a need for a variety of housing and we need to do the best we can to allow for minimum income folks to afford housing. I'm talking about different housing types and not subsidized housing –middle housing.*
- *One thing to add: I think the state of Oregon focuses on families with kids. In reality, there's a population where so many young singles and elderly need more studio units and 1-bedroom units and that's the trends with countries with high population; affordability is an issue and single people cannot afford it or you need a roommate but that is against the policy. Mixed use areas so residents can depend on public transit, reach clinics and more condensed areas.*
- *We see with the wildfire season last summer that people are most concerned about that and are also concerned about COVID. Community engagement is key. With the Tualatin River and the refuge, we see people actively using those spaces and we support that, and we hope people of all income levels can access these spaces. We want access and want people to be safe not just from wildfires. Can we make sure we can access different areas in case of medical emergencies? Can an ambulance access different areas? Are good questions.*

### **Mobility**

The community envisions that users of a variety of transportation modes will be safely connected to and throughout the area by a new internal network of streets and paths.

### **Goals**

- Provide a complete network of streets and path types.
- Connect the transportation network.
- Support all modes of transportation.
- Create a complementary walkable urban environment to support the provision of viable transit service.



## Do you support the vision and goals for Mobility? What are the opportunities to achieve the Mobility vision and goals?

- Several community members prepared an alternative and presented it to Mike Weston. It uses Capulet Ln as the east west connector. It heads north at the power lines/137<sup>th</sup> Avenue and then west at Myrtle Ave. It goes across about 100 yards south of Beef Bend Road, so it doesn't affect anyone at 147<sup>th</sup> Ave and just a few some at 137<sup>th</sup>. It doesn't have the impact of the Fischer Rd extension. Understand need or desire for east-west connection for connectivity. Opposed to thoroughfare from 99W to Roy Rogers. Just allow inner King City traffic to connect. Internally. When Beef Bend Road eroded and they put in a new culvert, it shut the road down and took away connectivity. That shouldn't happen again for a long time. Sewer and utilities would be shifted up further north. There is a concern that there will not be the ability to use gravity feed for sewer/ co-locate utilities with the roadway. Rather than put in a road just for utilities, the City should just pay for pump stations or to dig deeper or buy additional right-of-way. Do it now and do not think cheap. "Livable, walkable, safe community." It's the narrowest section of the ravine and shifting 500 feet won't make much difference. Further south, the ravine is wider. Further north is a narrow canyon, so you can cut across with less impact and less expense. There will be less adverse impacts on the new community with denser development further north and preservation for wildlife and corridors further south. I don't know how to avoid a five-lane Beef Bend Rd. There will be thousands of new homes in Kingston Terrace and River Terrace and on the other side of Roy Rogers. What is the alternative for people west of Roy Rogers? They are not going to go all the way down to Sherwood. Beef Bend Rd or Bull Mountain Rd. Are you going to channel traffic onto the "Green Blvd" through the middle of King City? Now is the time to understand that Beef Bend Rd is the road. If you have to buy right-of-way, do it. There is no other alternative. My understanding is that the road can accommodate traffic from Kingston Terrace with two lanes. For example, Durham Road is two lanes as cut from 99W. The question is what happens at each end of the road. The west end is a blank slate. At some point they will have to increase the road width for turn lanes. The Problem is on the 99W side because there are utility poles, carports for condos, and other infrastructure that would have to be removed to accommodate a wider road. I don't see any way around increasing the size of Beef Bend Rd and making it the connector between 99W and Roy Rogers Road. The term "Green Blvd" in the Concept Plan disguises what it really is – a connection road, a busy road. Get away from that being an alternative from Roy Rogers Rd to 99W.*
- Aside from the eventual road network, we will want to understand the finance plan and how that will work. What will be creditable? It will be important to have clear standards and direction about how credits will be applied and when. In some cases, right-of-way is included, but at what value? We'll want to remove the ambiguity of how to value right-of-way.*
- Fischer Road is necessary, and the general location is good. The expectation is that there will not be too much access to Beef Bend Rd.*
- I live right on Fischer Road. People in King City say it won't have a big effect on us. I started pointing neighbors to it and got involved with Rivermeade, Meyers Farm. Neighbors had no idea what was happening. My big concern is that there was public input. Edgewater is 437 homes and I didn't find anyone who knew about it. People have negative feelings about the plan. There is a lack of communication between City Council and the community. I'm trying to get people involved.*

*There was a transportation survey and outreach in the park, but you had to dig deep on the website and go to ODOT and the mayor to find out what's happening in the park. When the HOA has a ballot measure, people go door to door and posted notices on the backs of the mail boxes. I want to see an in-person public meeting. I've never met anyone who is happy about this plan. The only people who think it's a good idea are those on City Council. We don't want a green road to come through here and destroy our neighborhood. Build out west, but we don't want a road to connect 7,000 cars through the neighborhood. There are very few people in support of that. I talked to the mayor, and he said that is something to worry about down the line. Don't we care about the future of the Edgewater community? The Roseberry HOA says we don't like this because our kids walk through Edgewater to get to King City Park. I do not think there is not much support for this in terms of running through Edgewater. It was on the Edgewater ballot and the response was overwhelmingly negative to go forward with road through Edgewater. The City is about to receive the same kind of feedback from Rivermeade. There is no interest in a road going through the community. People say that Fischer Road will operate at 25 MPH, but I don't believe that. There is already a lot of cut-through traffic from Hwy 99. They try to avoid congestion by taking Durham and Royalty to Beef Bend Rd. There is more traffic coming up 131<sup>st</sup>. Fix Hwy 99 and use Beef Bend Rd. I don't think Beef Bend Rd has to be a five-lane road. Think that is a distraction. Don't think that is the case.*

- Tualatin Riverkeepers identified an alternative route. I don't see a problem with connecting to Beef Bend Road. The Fischer Road extension is concern. An east-west connecting roadway close to river is a poor consideration. Closer to Beef Bend Rd is better from cost and environmental/runoff perspective. Wash County TSP - 4-13 says that permanent dead-end streets are prohibited except where a through road is impractical. 3.1 says to strive to maintain and enhance the livability of existing neighborhoods. You can build and concentrate on the west end where the town center is located. People in the Rural and Central neighborhoods moved here because they want to keep it in a rural capacity, but understand that development will happen in the next 10-20 years. The street network should support local traffic. There are over 200 people in Edgewater that signed a petition several months ago about not being in favor of the connection. What are the plans for the existing commercial shopping area? If the City builds a new civic center off of Roy Rogers, what happens to the existing King City shopping area. Will that be improved too? Why build a commercial center off of Roy Rogers when you have an existing one? What is the cost estimate? From information we have pulled together and through talking with individuals, the City is looking at building crossings over ravines that will cost \$3-5 million. That is a lot of money compared to moving the road north toward Beef Bend Road. Information on the Green Boulevard indicated a cost of \$26 million two years ago. Developers would pay \$8.7 million and property owners would pay for \$17.4 million. There was a CPO meeting 1.5 years ago where Roy Rogers, the transportation commissioner for Washington County, said building roadway was way too expensive. The Columbia Land Trust easement #2.6 says no structures or improvements on easement land, and #2.8 says no roads or trails. The Tualatin SWCD planted thousands of native plants in easement area.*
- I don't support the mobility goals without including a new goal, as follows: The street network should support neighborhood traffic and provide access to high-volume roads but must avoid creating any direct connected alignments that attract cut-through traffic. The opportunities are creating dedicated walking and biking paths off-street, and slower-speed low-volume neighborhood streets that support alternative vehicle use by including the new goal.*

- *Yes, I support. Again, we have such focus on Fischer Rd and in some ways we need bigger picture for folks to discuss and get behind. With this opportunity, we have the ability to create mobility with environmentally friendly means (electric autonomous bus route for example).*
- *It would be great to have walking paths near the river and wetlands and that can become educational for students and, if you put in placards along the walk, to everyone. I am concerned about making Beef Bend Rd safe for students coming to Deer Creek and the new school. I'd like to see lighted crosswalks, etc.*
- *I do support the vision and goals for mobility. This will be a hot button topic. We have an issue, since the Concept Plan, of how to make sure we have an east-west connection from 99 to Roy Rogers. We envision a nice, residential connection from east to west and Fisher Rd is the road for that, and some people are concerned because of misinformation –they think it will be a thoroughfare. Fisher Rd will be a residential roadway with calming effects –it will look good and be highly functional and safe. Can we accommodate autonomous vehicles? We don't know when that will happen, but we need to plan and we need a Smart City. We need charging stations for EV and safety for bikers, children, and pedestrians. Safety always rises to the top. 131<sup>st</sup> Street is an example of this (bike lanes, lighted crosswalk at Deer Creek, etc.)*
- *Related to autonomous vehicles. King City still has a high percentage of older residents and the things that makes sense is having a particular route, for example an oval, and have some elder care spots on the route, hospitals, doctors offices, etc. This needs to be considered when planning new streets and coordination with TriMet, keeping in mind bus lines, and working with city engineer, the TSP, etc. All autonomous vehicles will be electric vehicles and PGE will be the electric grid and charging stations; right place to put charging stations, etc We have power lines and vaults all over the place, and we can work with the City to plan out charging stations by looking at the route and saying we have power substation here, etc. there may be a need for additional structures outside of existing infrastructure we have if route deviates from it. With AV, you also need a path of smart streetlights, etc. that need to be wired correctly.*
- *Transit within the project is needed. A local van or shuttle connecting the MAX station or main roads could be beneficial. Shuttle service that is consistent, frequent, and connects to main hubs.*
- *Promoting regional biking, walking, trails and healthier communities reduces medical calls. Street work that incorporates emergency response is key to reducing response times as well.*

### Public Utilities and Services

Infrastructure development in the Kingston Terrace Master Plan area will align with the “gradient of density” and integrate stormwater management and mitigation throughout.

### Goals

- Integrated stormwater management throughout
- Reduce runoff and soil erosion
- Use best practices for stormwater management and mitigation

**Do you support the vision and goals for Public Utilities and Services? What are the opportunities to achieve the Public Utilities and Services vision and goals?**

- *Sewer is a concern because of the desire for gravity feed. Once you get west of 150<sup>th</sup>, you can put a sewer line wherever you want to. It's a blank slate. From east to west, you need to go deeper or put in a pump station rather than co-locate along Fischer Road. Alternatives are not going to be cheap. If you have to, pay for right-of-way to keep away from Fischer Rd, then do so.*
- *Gravity sewer to the pump station moving from west to east. We are working with King City and Tigard on solutions to bring water to the area and how to pay for it. Water and sewer service will require cooperation between property owners.*
- *The biggest infrastructure issue is financing. It may not be as big of an issue here, but in North Bethany and Cooper Mountain, those cities relied too heavily on SDC credits. It's a good tool, but it forces the developer to finance infrastructure for the city without any interest in financing it for them. The value of credits diminishes over time to the last credit. SDC credits are not sufficient to make developers square. Washington County built in a service district. The finance plan theory for North Bethany was three pots of money: 1) MSTIP funds to commit to projects to benefit the overall area; 2) a supplemental SDC; and 3) a service district. Washington County has a lower millage rate than Beaverton. Beaverton took a part of the difference in millage and built a service district around it. That way, people who participate are those who are actually using it. It doesn't rely too heavily on SDC credits. The Pump station is on the far west end of the study area and water will come into the center part of the project area. The key capital project to help implement the plan is the water line. The sewer line will make its way across. Everything will probably start on Sharlin Farms where the sewer is. Construction of the water line is a substantial cost even though it will benefit a much larger area. Anything the city can do and get it done will be a big help. There are good opportunities for regional stormwater facilities in this area. Clean Water Services is flexible about when the permanent solution is put into place for water quality, but not for detention. Clean Water Services can target a capital project for quality and detention. The City would be the implementer for the district. Stay away from Low Impact Development Approaches (LIDA) as CWS doesn't prefer them. They emerged through the public process for North Bethany, but ultimately, the district had to implement them but has found it is difficult to maintain them. There is no water quality benefit and no credit for LIDA facilities. Impervious surface calculations and size of facilities not affected by that. Be thoughtful about street lighting and fixture type. It was very expensive in North Bethany. You don't have to put in a cobra head, but try to stay away from the gold-plated option. Consistency is great to get neighborhood feel with lighting and signage. It gives you a feel that you're in someplace unique or special. Parking is always a big deal and we try to provide as much as possible. I don't know what the City parking requirements are, but we always make an effort to exceed them. We tried to exceed Washington County on-street parking requirements. Skinny drive aisles with parking on both side is uncomfortable for people. Not every street needs to be 32 feet, but make sure they are big enough and safe to get in and out and have space for garbage cans and parking.*
- *We are already having a problem with storm drains. Will decision-makers be able to mitigate the past problems?*
- *I don't support the Public Utilities and Services goals without including new goals, as follows: New development will repair damage to drainages from previous upstream development that did not*

*follow current best practices. Protect salmon and other Tualatin River aquatic life by treating stormwater to remove chemicals known to be harmful, such as 6PPD-quinone, before it enters natural drainages. Opportunities with the above new goals will be to not just balance impacts of new urban development but also reduce the impacts from previous urban development.*

- *Yes, I support. I would like to see more update of infrastructure discussion, especially high-speed/telecommunications related. High-speed broadband should be included in goals and to convey that we are helping all folks access this service. Public buildings could have more green energy; maybe convince a solar provider to develop a small field here. Better city with green energy!*
- *We benefitted from the stormwater drains. They had to put in different management systems through the field and they put in drainage in our field and that's helped tremendously.*
- *Vitally important –runoff issues and Bull Mountain runoff on the north side of Beef Bend. We need to think regionally and make improvements that benefit us and the surrounding areas. We want to be a smart city when it comes to these things and King City has a unique opportunity because we are a “clean slate” and we have the ability to create something new.*
- *Clean energy -you think about solar on a residential rooftop and, eventually, batteries in homes. For example, the Tesla Power Wall -you can put it in your garage or outside of your house, and it's about the size of a TV. Eventually with ice storms and the fires last year, you'll have the price right for them and instead of a diesel generator, you'll have this battery to connect to. The battery could be connected to solar or the existing grid. Beaverton Public Safety Center – they have solar on their rood and the battery. They have a backup generator as well. When the grid is down, the batteries are great for emergency management. Any new city construction has to be wired out for the batteries and for ev charging stations. So, the possibility here is requiring that houses be plumbed with the wiring, costing housing developer around \$1500 to plumb, through the code. California cities are looking at this code option, not yet in Oregon. When it comes to small cell (small booster towers 300-400 feet), we own the telephone poles and telecommunications wants/needs space. With existing substations and infrastructure in the KTMP area, there might be some older ones and they may not have enough capacity. Is related to density.*
- *Smart Cities are key. When you come into King City, you shouldn't need data service as everything should be connected to wifi and secure. Electric outlets for EV are key. Starting in 2030, manufacturers will just make electric vehicles so we need massive electric vehicle charging stations and more a futuristic, smart city.*
- *We usually find that infrastructure and utilities are planned well for our needs.*

### **Is there anything else you want to share about the KTMP area?**

- *I would feel better if there was a hands-on field trip because even City Council hasn't been out there in a few years. Roy Rogers wouldn't come and look at how it's damaging the area. Everyone is trying to turn their head and hasn't bothered to walk the land. I'm one block from where the new road would go through and it will completely change my neighborhood. It's good to walk the land. There should be a public meeting in the King City Park. Things are changing so the City shouldn't rush forward without the master plan. In the previous planning efforts, people didn't feel like they were heard. We were told it would be three years. We've been asking questions and*

*getting involved. An alternate plan has been proposed to cross over at Capulet and connect neighborhoods, but not damage Rivermeade. It is acceptable to the community even though we prefer to have no connection. There would be a way out, but not have Fischer be a main thoroughfare. If the Master Plan includes Fischer Road extending through Rivermeade, you will see people putting houses up for sale and moving. A lot of people are involved and not happy about what's going on. They are also not happy about what's happening to Tualatin Riverkeepers. If start building on far west side, it will sandwich people in between the expansion area and the city. Once both sides are developed, people might annex the area. If property owners want to sell, that's fine, but Rivermeade is not going to sell. Save time and money to research this. If you come and walk the land you will see it's rough and rugged country from Rivermeade to 150<sup>th</sup>. Through this rougher country, it will be a different situation.*

- *We are planning a field trip for SAC members, Planning Commissioners and City Councilors. Ashley Short is giving a presentation at CPO 4K on Monday, March 29<sup>th</sup>, 7-8:30PM. Development is inevitable, but we want to have input and comments on what goes forward.*
- *As was said at the beginning, the KTMP alternative evaluation and alternative selection processes need greater transparency and public involvement. They should provide more information on options and alternatives. These processes must include established current residents and document in the KTMP how decisions were made to minimize the impacts to them whenever possible. In the western area, landowners of open farmland will sell large acreage parcels. But the established residents of rural home sites, homesteads, and small farms in the central and eastern KTMP areas have the right to continue the peaceful enjoyment of their land and maintain their way-of-life that has been established through multiple family generations. Their rights are not lost simply because King City chooses to grow their tax base and large farmland owners choose to sell for instant enrichment.*
- *Make sure green space is being added and parks with soccer fields, etc. more active and passive greenspace.*
- *I want the residents to be more involved and be excited about this opportunity. There will be differences of opinions and changes create that. I want people to try to be involved so they understand the process. We hear mostly from people in opposition, and it would be beneficial to also hear from folks who support the KTMP and who have exciting new ideas.*
- *It's all about fiber. Fiber optic cable should be putting it in the ground while they can! Overcapacity to fill future demand.*
- *Schools are very important for families, and many families focus on the schools first. King City should focus on that as an attraction for younger families.*