



KING CITY MASTER PLAN
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #3
April 4, 2022 – 6 to 7:50 PM

SUMMARY

SAC members present: Matt Craigie, Mike Dahlstrom, Marc Farrar, Jennifer Johnson, Marc Manelis, Mike Meyer, Kate Mohr, Mike Morse, Michael O’Halloran, Shayla Otake, Smith Salmonika.

Staff and Consultants: Anne Sylvester, SCJ Alliance; Mike Weston and Keith Liden, City of King City; Steve Faust, 3J Consulting.

Welcome and Agenda Review

Steve Faust welcomed SAC members and thanked them for participation. Following introductions, Steve Faust reviewed the agenda and reviewed the meeting process.

Project Background and Status

Steve went over the project area geographic features. In 2018 King City completed a concept plan for this area, the master plan is attempting to add development detail which will result in comprehensive plan updates. From November 2020 –February 2021 the initial work documented exiting conditions and discussing opportunities and constraints. The first round of community engagement included a public meeting, online open house, Spanish materials and translation, Korean speaking outreach, and stakeholder interviews.

Key concerns that came out were related to feasibility of costs, protection and enhancement of natural resources, character of adjacent neighborhoods, and rate of growth and development. From March – May 2021, the second round of community engagement focused on the town center main street design, park and open space types and locations, and street types. Which established the need for transportation network and framework to move forward. Since the last time they met, they have been documenting the need for an alternative analysis and securing additional funding from Metro.

Steve moved into talking about why having a continuous east/west collector street is important, highlighting connectivity, achieving the vision, sustainability, mode choice, future transit, emergency vehicle access, and how it distributes the traffic burden.

Updated Project Schedule

Steve explained they are starting the next round of community engagement. Today's focus is on the evaluation criteria for the analysis and identifying the east/west connections we want to study. We will meet in summer to share those results. They gained funding for another round of engagement in the Fall for the draft master plan, followed by the adoption process.

Circulation Study – Evaluation Criteria

Anne began by discussing the development of evaluation criteria, explaining the physical and policy aspects of it. They considered certain criteria from a variety of categories including land use, mobility, public utilities, natural resources, and cost implications. The analysis is a mix of qualitative and quantitative, with a focus on differences using specific criteria. Steve asked Anne to walk through the criteria which included:

- Impacts to disadvantages population groups
- Providing seamless connection to existing infrastructure
- Stormwater and water quality impacts
- Impacts to wetlands
- Order of magnitude cost estimates

They want to take these criteria, score them, and compare them. This process will involve a lot of input from different groups. Steve and Anne paused for questions; is there anything we aren't considering?

Participants made the following comments (responses in *Italics*):

- Have they considered doing a paired comparison process, which may not take into consideration the concerns on both sides? *That is something that they could do here.*
- I want to see mobility broken into at least two pieces, not appeal to drivers but bike and ped users as lumping them will cause scoring difficulties. Is there a list of intersections that the quantitative analysis? *Yes, there is a tentative list but not finalized. They are relying on the TSP for the mobility aspect.*
- How do you factor in limited employment in this area? *VMT is not something they will be able to tweeze out of this, she appreciates the way he is looking at this, there is good potential for PMT trips.*
- What would trigger the decision to go to the next level of network implementation? *There are still some hypotheticals in that, his guess is that a lot of it gets triggered when utilities are triggered, that's when the transportation network gets triggered.*
- I suggest a strictly multi-use path closer to the river E-W with utilities under that, not allowing passenger cars to commute on.
- I echo that comment, when you're looking at these impacts, when you only have a city that's 2-miles wide, there is weight on certain criteria. *There is not currently a weighted list.*
- I understand that weighting criteria is desired, but a neutral balance on this criterion is best. *The scores that come out of this would be the scores compared to each other, but ultimate alignment would be determined from much further debate.*

- For the scope analysis we will look at them from a neutral standpoint and go from there, weighting them skews the analysis.
- There is inherent consistency when looking at these criteria and seem inconsistent when compared to each other. *Some would perform differently, there is a contradictory in this, some will do well and vice versa, there will have to be trade-offs. They are trying to gather data and assessments of the information available to them.*
- For qualitative evaluation, many of these attributes don't have the information to estimate the impacts. Asking them to look at these as criteria, is too early in the process. The committee should look at them as factors. *We wouldn't know how to move forward if they can't collect specific information, it won't lead to results. They are trying to structure the process; we don't have to score. They will be producing a matrix with key findings. We can provide some what they are going to be looking at do this evaluation. We will look at what is on the list. Any last comments?*

East/West Circulation Alternatives

Anne started by saying they have had a lot of input on this over the past years. When look at putting in new roads, for all modes, there are factors that need to be considered. The process has a big range of alternatives, goes to an initial screening resulting in a short list that goes into further analysis and from there they come out with preferred options. There are then a lot of design and development considerations and studies prior to implementation. Going back to the concept plan, the picture option came out of that process. The concept plan included different housing development types and fit.

The screening process has a host of questions to further reduce the available alternatives, to ultimately incorporate into the master plan.

Anne went over some observations, noting some details that northern alignment meshes with planned system but is insufficient on its own. Southern alignments connect to the city but crosses several ravines. Looking at sewer alignment, Clean Water Services is working with them and is doing some master planning in this area. Anne spoke to two types, one with separate pump stations and one that connects to existing infrastructure, but CWS hasn't given final comment.

Anne spoke to the TSP alignments and cost estimating and how the different options could connect. This all leads to thinking about where are the through streets, offering some separation from Beef Bend, and can connect into the existing city. This gives us opportunities to think about multiple connections to service all these areas. Topography wise, there is a mixture of ravine crossings. For sewer alignment, CWS is interested in proceeding to connect to King City, and lastly the natural resources were taken into consideration.

Anne concluded by explaining that they will consider what alignments will be carried forward to developing information. The alignments are not fixed, there are processes that will follow this effort. There are four alternatives, nearly parallel to each other. They would like to take these through that comparative process. Asking what the best option for the corridor is.

Lastly, they looked at some potential street characteristics for different areas for different traffic types. As well as timing and phasing, early phases will be in the western part. Over the longer term they will work east. Anne opened to ask if these are the alternatives to move forward.

Participants made the following comments (responses in *Italics*):

- I don't see a value in alternative 1. It seems too far south, too close to river. *I see what you're saying, and the bridges are too big, and the ravines are too wide. It may be good for a trail for the access to the natural resources.*
- I echo the sentiments of concerns for option 1 in terms of cars, but great for bike/ped.
- None of them go past 137th, why wouldn't you start at 150th and Elsner for the time being? The eastern area is highly developed, impacts with have an adverse effect on the area.
- I agree with the issues with alignment 1, even if it was just ped/bike, getting over the ravines would be very expensive, should go around.
- I'm strongly opposed to 1, a combo of 3 and 4 makes sense. West of 150th, you can drop it down anywhere north of the ravines. I can't imagine the expense of running vehicles across those ravines as well. Utilities are a consideration as well, how far north they can go. The USGS has a slide map that may be something to consider. *The state level has that info as well, that will be a part of the database of information collected.*
- I agree that number one is not viable at all. The ravines are deep, the soils are unstable. Trying to do number one is going to be expensive, and disruptive to natural environment. Something where you go over the top of the western ravines.
- I would discount number 1 for all the obvious reasons including the environmental impacts. I want to caution against creating circuitous bicycle routes, and discounting connections to fisher road. I agree to 3 and 4, or the lower extension of 4 are practical.
- I feel like decisions have been made to reduce the options. It seems like a lot of this depends on if the land use supports it. You're only looking at King City, look at the topo lines on king terrace. We need to figure out where people are going outside of King City. People are going to use subdivisions as cut throughs, look outside the planning area. *We recognize that this area does not exist in isolation.*
- When we look at the stormwater runoff from the mountain, any ideas on practices that have been effective? *We are trying to get CWS to be reasonable with what they are proposing. Stormwater is the huge elephant in the room, look at them closely.*
- Our goal is to combine the elements as we can for infrastructure
- There is a lot of water that comes off that mountain now. We are looking for development to reduce the water does not increase it.
- I did home inspections; the crawl space was saturated with water. There was ground water saturation coming from off the hill, leading to issues of black mold. Is there a way to measure the saturation of the soil?

Public Comment

- Taking out option 1 knocks off the lower part of option 2 and 3. Has anyone been looking at the village homes project in Davis, California? It dealt with a lot of stormwater issues.

Next Steps

We are in the midst of creating the master plan with a focus on these alternatives. We will take your comments into consideration. We are meeting with TAC, and then we will have a public meeting for the broader community to give input on this. Clean Water Service will be there. Following engagement, next steps are to conduct the analysis and identify preferred courses of action. We anticipate this group will meet again in July or August. Steve will reach out to you to identify some dates and times that work for the majority. Thank you.