



KING CITY MASTER PLAN
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #2
May 3, 2021 – 6 to 8 PM

SUMMARY

SAC members present: Joe Casanova, Matt Craigie, Mike Dahlstrom, Rachael Duke, Marc Farrar, Ezra Hammer, Ron Johnson, Marc Manelis, Mike Meyer, Kate Mohr, Mike Morse, Michael O’Halloran, Shayla Otake, Smith Salmonika, Ashley Short, Kathy Stallkamp, Tom Stibolt, Kat Wolfe.

Staff and Consultants: Mike Weston and Keith Liden, City of King City; Steve Faust and Anais Mathez, 3J Consulting; Marcy McInnelly, Urbsworks

Welcome and Agenda Review

Steve Faust welcomed SAC members and thanked them for participation. Following introductions, Steve Faust reviewed the agenda and provided project updates. The master plan process is closely following the TSP update process, which will be finalized at the end of June. This will push the schedule out slightly, but key TSP considerations will be incorporated into the master plan process. In addition, the project team is working closely with Clean Water Services to identify regional stormwater management approaches. Finally, a site tour was conducted with some Council members and the project team to refresh the group’s understanding of the area.

Outreach Summary

Anais Mathez provided an update on the first round of outreach and engagement activities, conducted between February and March 2021. Activities included a round of stakeholder interviews, a virtual public meeting, and an online open house. The purpose of these activities was to review and confirm the vision and goals of each framework, as described in the Concept Plan. Key takeaways from the public meeting and online open house included:

- There is concern regarding the feasibility of infrastructure and associated costs, particularly related to drainage crossings.
- More education is needed regarding the Concept Plan process and how it informs the Master Plan processes.
- Connectivity, access to nature, and natural resource preservation are paramount to success.
- The protection and enhancement of natural resources must be balanced with development goals and mobility needs.

Key takeaways from the stakeholder interviews included:

- Include a variety of housing
- Concentrate growth near Beef Bend and Roy Rogers
- Ensure adequate park space
- Promote pedestrian and bicycle safety
- Design east-west connections to serve local traffic
- Pursue regional stormwater solutions and inter-city water provisioning
- Evaluate costs of drainage crossings and other infrastructure improvements
- Protect and enhance the Tualatin River and wildlife corridors
- Create equitable access to the Tualatin River
- Coordinate among agencies, including TriMet and telecommunications

Steve noted that the team has communicated with the Korean-speaking community per requests from the SAC and City Council.

One SAC member asked about whether people actually identified the need to balance development and natural resources. Steve responded that the statement is a summary of some comments stating the importance of development and others for protection of natural resources.

Another SAC member said that these statements seem to indicate that the traffic analysis is complete. Steve clarified that the existing conditions report is the only task that has been completed thus far. The online open house questions do refer to the vision and frameworks established in the Concept Plan.

Steve also reminded people that the online survey is not scientifically valid. Survey responses are used to inform next steps of the process, not to make final determinations. Steve also mentioned that the consultant team has been working on an FAQ to help answer basic questions about the process.

Design Concepts

Marcy McInnelly presented information on design concepts that the consultant team has been developing over the past few months.

Town Center/Main Street Designs

Marcy reminded SAC members of the 4-neighborhood concept established in the 2018 Concept Plan. The vision is a mixed-use town center includes residential, commercial, and civic elements. The Concept Plan envisions major activity at key intersections, taller buildings with residential over retail, some single-story retail and restaurants, gathering places, and a city hall, library and other possible civic buildings. A campus style employment or institutional campus is planned for just south of the town center.

The next slides illustrated the proposed road network, though not exact routes. The road

network will be developed in phases over time from west to east. Coordination with Tigard's planning efforts for River terrace is underway, as well as coordination with Washington County and Metro. The focus is on the location and orientation of the town center. Marcy noted that the town center will need access and visibility from a regional street in order for uses like a grocery store to be effective. Even in 2045, forecasts show that Roy rogers Road would be the only road that carries sufficient traffic.

Option 1 locates the town center/main street along Beef Bend Road assuming that the arterial function of the road would be re-routed to the north. Option 2, as shown in the Concept Plan, orients the town center/main street along a new east-west connector road south of Beef Bend Road. Option 3, developed in response to recent plans for River Terrace, locates the town center at the intersection of the east-west connector and River Terrace Blvd. This would provide a stronger connection to the proposed River Terrace commercial area north of Beef Bend Road along River Terrace Blvd.

SAC members were curious about Option #1 and the likelihood of re-routing Beef Bend Road. The re-route would make Fischer Road less desirable as a cut-through road. Marcy noted that, as a designated arterial, the spacing requirement for Beef Bend Road is 600 feet between intersections. The vision for Beef Bend Road is for a human-scaled street that carries traffic, but is designed differently to accommodate easier north-south crossings.

SAC members made the following comments (responses in *italics*):

- I like the diversion of Beef Bend Road to the north. That would require a jurisdictional transfer, would it not? *Yes, it would require a transfer. It is not clear who would build it. Those conversations are ongoing.*
- The dots on the map are 600 foot spacing. Are those proposed intersections? *Yes. That is what we are proposing. I thought we were trying to limit connections to Beef Bend Road. The vision for Beef Bend Road is as a more human-scale street. It will still carry traffic, but be designed for slower speeds and more frequent crossings. It will likely be a transit corridor in the future. We consider 600 foot spacing between intersections to be a minimum.*
- Has the City had any coordination conversations with the City of Sherwood? *The City has had conversations as part of larger, regional discussions, and more conversations are scheduled for the near future.*
- I prefer the Beef Bend Road main street. The town center and commercial/retail component would work best together holistically. We should find out what the City of Tigard would support. *Initial conversations with Tigard tell us that they are interested in Beef Bend being a different type of road than it is today. This is one way of making the road more of a connector than a divider. They are supportive of 600-foot spacing.*
- This road network doesn't seem realistic given the terrain and potential costs. It's hard to talk about conceptual designs without data. I don't know if Tigard would be happy with Beef Bend road crossing through a major drainage.
- Option #1 is my least favorite. Moving the arterial will drain area traffic from the roadway and diffuse throughout whole expansion area. There are not alternatives for

the road network to the east. The road goes through a conservation easement and it's labeled Fischer Road. It should not be named at all. I don't think the 600-foot spacing is possible in some of these areas.

- *It's difficult to think about the degree of change that happens over a 50-year time frame. Change occurs on a piece by piece basis. The town center may develop first since it's in a flatter area and is more likely to generate near-term development. Fischer Road extending to 150th could occur over time. That phasing assumption is part of original concept plan.*
- Tigard owns parkland connected to Tigard at the intersection of Roy Rogers and Beef Bend roads. We wouldn't want to make that an island and not connected to the city. How far have discussions about Beef Bend Road gone? *The concept from the Washington County transportation planning effort is that the Tile Flat Road extension comes down and connects to Lasich Road and crosses Roy Rogers and eventually connects to Beef Bend Road.*
- Option #1 moves traffic away, but also moves people away from the commercial area. *If King City controls design of that street, we want wide sidewalks, buffered bike lanes, street trees, etc. It is not possible to have a true main street on a Washington County-held street. We want to achieve network of collectors and local streets. It requires a smaller block size and more frequent streets. Each street carries a little more traffic so no one street is overburdened.*
- Would King City acquire the land north of existing the Beef Bend Road? *It is unlikely that Tigard would transfer this land to King City.*
- The alignment in Option #1 was proposed to connect to Lasich Road and connect with Tile Flat Road in the long-range plan for Washington County. That would drain traffic through Tile Flat and Lasich to Beef Bend Road? *That is the long-range plan for Washington County. It is in their urban reserve study – a 30-40-year vision to collect and move traffic through these areas. How would that work with 600 foot spacing and the inability to increase the capacity of Beef Bend Road. Looking at 8,000 to 10,000 people in King City area and Tigard and Beaverton have more land than King City. That means another 30,000 people out this way in 30 or 40 years. That requires a massive street network. That is why we are trying to make Beef Bend Road more of a local street so it is less attractive for cut-through traffic.*

Parks

Marcy shared a diagram from the Concept Plan that shows the general locations of six parks throughout the study area. SAC members viewed three options for a park in the town center area:

Urban parks, such as public squares or plazas located in busy, higher-density areas

Linear parks that could connect the town center to the river and to parkland owned by Tigard northwest of the Roy Rogers/Beef Bend intersection.

Community parks that are larger green spaces that accommodate large groups of people and host organized activities on facilities such as ball fields, stages, or skate parks.

Park and open space options for other areas include:

Pocket parks that are small and often include a looped walking trail and picnic area

Tot-lot/playground with a play structure that is geared for young children

Nature park that includes protected natural features, less structured recreation areas, and could include interpretive signage and seating along trails or paths

SAC members made the following comments (responses in *italics*):

- I like the idea of a trail or park connecting to the river in two places.
- There is a need for regional sports fields.
- I would have concerns about a riverside trail. The river needs a vegetative buffer. An apartment complex on other side fell into the river because the banks aren't stable. How is it constructed, how close is it, what materials are being used? We advocate for equitable access, so I'm not saying don't do that, but we need to maintain natural system functions as well. *It is a high priority and all of those things will be considered.*
- A nature trail could serve as a pedestrian network to the town center. Trails will help connect people further away from town center, so they don't have to drive. The trails can weave through these behind new neighborhoods, not necessarily along the river, but in green belt way that doesn't disturb nature, but is a part of nature.
- It is important to respect those gorges, and emphasize that these parks are an extension of the natural edge, but not part of natural resource areas.
- I like having an east-west connection, woven like the Fanno Creek Trail.
- We really need a second community park to the west in this new area. Otherwise the existing park would be the only one with sports fields, playground, basketball court, bike trailhead and river access. It will always be a massive or the largest draw without a competitor site with river access and fields. Regarding a giant sports park, I am concerned about lights and other impacts on the wildlife refuge.
- The Tigard Tualatin School District intends to locate an elementary school in the River terrace 2.0 area and add a sports complex for public use. Has that been discussed as an alternative to supporting the King City expansion uses?
- I understand that there is a requirement to accommodate a certain number of dwelling units. For every acre of park and roadway, you have to increase densities to reach that number.
- Spring Garden Park in Multnomah has some really great features - integration of natural features, art, and some play structure-esque elements.

<https://goo.gl/maps/vCYgFaJgu6yY2UiG7>

River Terrace Boulevard

The next concepts showed design options for River Terrace Blvd. Option #1 is one lane in each direction separated by a planted median with pockets of on street parking and a meandering multi-use path. Option #2 is a traditional main street with one lane in each direction, on-street parking, and generous sidewalks and planting strip with room for café seating. Option #3 adds buffered bike lanes to Option #2.

Fischer Road

The final design concepts were for several segments of the road shown in the Concept Plan as

an extension of Fischer Road. Note from the Concept Plan about the phasing of Fischer Road. The road may develop in phases so the eastern portion serves as a partial collector in the near-term and the rest of the street develops over time. At the town center, the road would use the traditional main street design shown in River Terrace Blvd Option #2. In the central neighborhood, the street would be a typical neighborhood street with shared travel lanes, low speeds, on street parking, sidewalks and street trees. The rural character neighborhood would employ a curbless street design with intermittent on street parking. Bikes and cars would share the road.

Public Meeting

- I'd like to reiterate comments from Mike about the shortcomings of the original Concept Plan. I participated in that and gave direct input, but failed to reflect the resistance to the extension of Fischer Road from neighborhoods along the existing alignment and continue to name Fischer Road on maps and show it like it's a done deal. The community engagement summary comments were much heavier at seven to one but not reflected in the summary statements. It seems to show this is being steamrolled through. Although you want consensus and input, it is not reflected.
- River Terrace planning is focused on River Terrace Blvd as the north-south commercial center. Is that not contemplated to extend that north-south activity into the center? *One of the town center options does assume that River Terrace Blvd is more like a main street. I was hearing more of a focus on an east-west town center. There are three alternatives. One of them has the main street on River Terrace Blvd north-south. Part of the financial analysis and market study said it would be best if we had some exposure to Roy Rogers, so that's where the potential of a linear park, viewshed or access from the Beef Bend/Roy Rogers intersection is being considered.*
- Since Metro included a specific requirement in their 2018 Ordinance why does not a single map or document in the plan acknowledge this fact? 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 Exhibit C to Ordinance No. 18-14274.

SAC members made the following comments (responses in *italics*):

- Option A of River Terrace Blvd, I worry about where to put bikes in that. Thinking about longer distance recreational users if tied into regional trails. I worry about having the multi-use path between the sidewalk and front of houses.

For Option B main street, I don't like mixing bikes and traffic since there is an emphasis on maintaining a tree canopy. You will need good lighting to facilitate mixed use. Set a precedent for design with bike lanes set aside.

Option C. 3-4-inch-high curb and pin to roadway. If option C, with a buffered bike lane, you need to protect the bike lane from people parking poorly. If this cross section, consider a bike route that does not go through the main street area so they aren't

slowed down or encounter conflicts with slow moving traffic.

Regarding Fischer Road, I don't like shared roads for cars and bikes without a dedicated portion of the roadway for bikes. If this is a connector and not a local road, it will draw more traffic than you want it to.

Option C also needs a dedicated bike path or bike lanes. There will not be bike lanes on Beef Bend Road, so there needs to be an east-west connection between Roy Rogers and 131st.

- I agree with what Smith said about bike lanes. If River Terrace is going to be a main street, it's great to have a pedestrian refuge to make it easier to cross the street. I also like the idea of separate bike paths that go along the river to get through town.
- One of the major themes of outreach is that people care about natural resources. Continuing to push this alignment and not wait for more analysis and determination if you can afford to do that crossing, impacts on wildlife corridors, impacts on degraded drainages. I know you are talking 50 years from now, but Tualatin Riverkeepers wants it to function for the rest of time. We want creeks and stormwater to function from the beginning or you are talking about multi-million-dollar problems. Massive erosion sites and drainage problems result in multi-million-dollar problems. Tigard Bull Mountain estimated cost is \$7M. It's important to think about how streets will impact these drainages. Talking about this as the main option is doing a disservice in the long run because you are causing problems in the long run that you may not be able to fix. I would like to see other options considered and consideration for these drainages.
- I keep thinking what is happening with the Bankston land trust, culturally sensitive land, and the airport runway. How are those being worked into things. It would be nice to hear a report on those. *All three are ongoing with different levels of discussion on those different issues. We will have more to report the next time we come back to this group.*
- Thanks to Marcy for comments about Fischer Road extension from Roy Rogers to 150th is most likely to happen and east of 150th may be many years out or maybe never. Can we change the name of it and not call it the Fischer Rd extension? Also, when looking at rural character street, it referred to a 62 ft ROW. Along River Lane, that will wipe out people's yards and go right up to their doorways and I don't think that's fair. Might want to reconsider rural character design. Planted medians are insane. I looked town 131st planted median and that road is more dangerous because pedestrians can't see traffic and vice versa. Please eliminate planted median idea.
- Have you considered on-street parking that is in the median? I've seen it in some other places where there is parallel or angle parking that is median facing with a strip sidewalk in between. It pushes cars and bike paths further to the outside and provides the pedestrian refuge. One example in the US is downtown Carmel, CA.
- Incredibly frustrated that any Main Street puts shared bike/auto use. As a 20-year bike commuter to both downtown Portland and Hillsboro, looking through Concept Plan and community input to have separated bike/ped/auto usage, why is traditional roadway use being considered? It is the worst idea to share usage.

- Page 3 of the Community Outreach Summary reads, "Prioritize car traffic on Beef Bend Road, not Fischer Road." I know this isn't the same as do not connect Fischer Road, but it is mentioned a bit.
- Main Street design with parked cars as buffer - try riding Broadway in Portland through PSU and see how many door openings challenge the ride. It's constant between car doors and pads crossing the bike path - many conflicts. Try riding it sometime and be careful.
- Some of the greatest downtown areas, and I think of Denver and many European cities, is the pedestrian only corridors. Hope this is being considered.
- It would be nice to rename these streets with something that is more fitting with the master plan theme and character.
- A center median provides a nice refuge for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Next Steps

We will go through the chat to add those comments to the meeting summary and review the draft outreach summary to make sure the summary statements in that document accurately reflect what we heard from the community. The next round of engagement will take place in late July and into the first half of August. We will refine these concepts and put forth an online survey and supplement with hard copies for those who need them.