



KING CITY MASTER PLAN
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #4
August 8, 2022 – 6 to 8 PM

SUMMARY

SAC members present: Joe Cassanova, Mike Dahlstrom, Mike Farrar, Victoria Frankeny, Ezra Hammer, Ron Johnson, Marc Manelis, Mike Morse, Mike Meyer, Kelly Ritz, Smith Salmonika, Kathy Stallkamp, Tom Stibolt, Katerina Wolfe.

Staff and Consultants: Mike Weston and Keith Liden, City of King City; Steve Faust, 3J Consulting; Anne Sylvester, SCJ Alliance; Marcy McInelly, Urbsworks; Jim Hencke, David Evans and Associates; Chris Faulkner, Clean Water Services.

Welcome and Agenda Review

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

Project Background and Status

Steve reviewed the project schedule and noted that there will be another public meeting in September. Following that meeting, the consultant team will finalize the alternatives analysis report and resume work on the draft the master plan, then another round of community engagement, including SAC/TAC and a public meeting, in November. The team will take those comments into the final draft report, and move to the adoption process through meetings with the Planning Commission and City Council.

East/West Circulation Study

Steve thanked Anne who led the effort to prepare the study and all the team members who contributed to the preparation of this analysis. Anne shared the planning process and how they got to where they are now with all the alternatives considered. She then described the analysis process factors that were reviewed at a previous meeting of the SAC and TAC. The analysis was conducted by experts in their respective areas and evaluation reports are summarized. The analysis is not absolute. Anne gave a description of the evaluation categories: Land Use and Community Design, Active Transportation Mobility, Vehicular Transportation Mobility, Public Utilities and Services, Natural Resources, and Cost and Implementation. A map of the four alternatives considered was presented.

Land Use and Community Design

Steve reviewed the categories and factors noting how each alternative scored. Alternatives 2 and 3 scored the highest followed by Alternative 1 and No Direct Connection.

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

- I would like to better understand how the evaluation of those served by the greatest transportation needs is determined. *This was the result of the Environmental Justice Analysis. We are evaluating for future use, and the number of EJ households that currently exist in the study area right now is very low, correct? It's a larger area that includes eastern parts of the existing city as well and has a quarter mile buffer around each of the alternatives.*
- From what I understand if you look at a quarter mile radius of the middle section of the expansion area, a quarter mile radius encompasses the whole width. The results are skewed to the current situation, but the future could be different. This is a lot of content to go through. The overall rankings for the Land Use Community Design factors seem to be off. *We realize there is a lot of content to review and will take comments throughout this round of community engagement. We will go back and verify that the scoring is correct.*
- How was the EJ done? *The Land Use and Community Design report has a description of how the analysis was conducted. We don't know what things are going to happen in the future, we just know how the lines are drawn and where the population exists today, that is all it is reflecting.*
- Why is transit an option in the scoring if none of the alternatives would serve future transit? *Transit is unlikely in the shorter term, but as the area develops more fully it's something that could be considered by TriMet, when it would be able to generate the kind of ridership they like to see. There is potential for TriMet riders, but it will be determined down the road. It appears transit doesn't need to take a role in the alternative scoring because they are all similar in that way. We can make a better distinction between TriMet transit and some of the other transit discussed, like a circulator route. We will make sure that is clear when we talk about transit. We also need think about school busses, and the more central/direct the bus route is, the easier it is to service the route. Is there any consideration going forward taking the active transportation element from one of the alternatives and marrying it to the vehicular option of another alternative? I think it would enhance the safety elements of both. We haven't discussed the possibility taking the analysis further but wouldn't rule out that is something that could be included in the final master plan. We don't have the funds to add on to the analysis and look at new combinations of vehicular and active transportation routes, but we can consider that as we move forward with the master plan. I'd like to see documentation in the final report that says some of those things might/should be considered later. Thanks.*
- Separate active transportation with vehicular traffic was brought up in earlier public input and is worth looking at. As far as transit goes, TriMet is not currently provided in King City, and no plans have been made to add new service. If you're planning on a loop or other type of transit service, I don't think a circular system would be a problem for that type of transit service. *Thank you.*

- I would like to see raw data scoring evaluation, exactly what the criteria was, and the ranking order. Also, who is part of this, and their credentials. *We can prepare a list of authors and their credentials and add that. The ranking, rationale, and supporting documentation are all listed. The appendices contain more data.* Okay.
- Questions about the EJ population and what is being created versus what already exists. *The stated vision will permit and encourage affordable housing mix everywhere throughout the neighborhood. Transit has three different potential locations listed in the report.*

Active Transportation Mobility

Anne went over the categories and factors with how they scored. Alternatives 1 and 2 scored the highest. They then opened for comments and questions.

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

- I am looking at the central location across the Kingston Terrace with walking distance being used, I think Alternative 4 is better. For the long cul-de-sacs, it looks like you could do loops, a road that comes in, loops around, and goes back out again. Is that considered a cul-de-sac or dead end? *If the areas are separated by the ravine, that's what we're talking about in terms of a cul-de-sac. So why can't you come in and loop out on a continuous road? The point was to have connectivity across the ravines so there aren't isolated neighborhoods. We don't know how this will be developed, you have to look at the buffers and engineer it to see what there is room for.* The cul-de-sac terminology is misleading. In addition, what public input have you received that made a change to the concept plan? I'm wondering about the rural character neighborhoods. *The concept plan is a city approved concept. In terms of making a firm decision on a city approved concept plan, we aren't at the at point yet. It is possible that through the master plan process, modifications to the concept plan will take place.* I didn't realize the concept plan was possibly going to be modified. *The status of the master plan, regarding the planning process, is an accumulation of all client work that goes into this from start to finish. We will build on the concept plan, and everything in the vision is still being pursued. There is mixed housing everywhere. Affordable and mixed income housing can be low density, it can be high density. A rural area would be a lower density area? It may have lower density overall, it might have cottage clusters, it might have some density in clusters. But overall, that density would be lower. House Bill 2001 and 2003 could change the whole density equation. The vision is lower overall density in the rural neighborhoods as opposed to the town center neighborhood or some of the other neighborhoods.*
- While not standard, you can put a bike lane on a collector. I think if you invest that much in infrastructure and were you to go with No Direct Connection Alternative, you need to make bike and pedestrian adjustments. We need ravine crossings for emergency services. Stating no cul-de-sac is different than having no ravine connection.
- The transportation planning rule allows you not to make these connections when you have geographical impediments. That's a reason not to cross. Also, you should look at

separating the bike lane from the collector. I don't think they should be together.
Thank you.

- I have a different perspective on this. We have four alternatives that are dissecting east to west in the overall master plan to the point that you cannot add another alternative. We need to weigh the pros and cons of the alternatives proposed and come to a decision on which is the best. The granular topics that need to be discussed will come later. *Thank you, I appreciate that.*

Vehicular Transportation Mobility

Anne went over the categories and factors with how they scored. Alternatives 2 and 3 scored the highest. They then opened for comments and questions.

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

- The documentation omits any kind of analysis of the intersection of 99W and Durham Rd. This is the reason northbound traffic uses Fischer. Was it included in the analysis and omitted from the table? *I believe it was evaluated as part of the Transportation Systems Plan. We did not reevaluate it in this context.* I believe the analysis and the volume projections, the forecast for Fischer west of 131st, are around the same as Beef Bend is today. That is likely underestimated. Also, you need a signal at Fischer and 131st for Fischer to work, but you can't justify it with the signal warrant analysis. *A signal and a roundabout are two alternatives suggested there.* If Fischer goes through, there is going to be a great deal of traffic that is not currently considered as part of the vetting process. *Thanks, a lot there for us to consider.*
- Could Alternative 4 dip into the town center? *What may come out of this is a hybrid of all these picking the best parts of all the alternatives. All the comments we're hearing are helpful.* Thank you.
- The proposed alternative is number 2, correct? *To continue with the Master Plan process, Alternative 2 scored the highest and our proposal is to take that alternative to continue with the master planning process, acknowledging things may change and be modified.* That is not being made clear. Also, do the two fire stations at the east and west sides of Kingston Terrace meet the standards of the Tualatin Fire and Rescue? *We are still waiting to hear back from TVFR, and it will be included in the final report.* It is a small city with unique topography and difficult to navigate with trying to provide connectivity. *We have dealt with challenging environmental areas previously and always had a collector road to get in and out as well as create some redundancy. Regarding the comments, I will go back and clarify the intent, I can see how it can be confusing.*
- Alternative 2 says lower implementation costs as one of the key factors at three times the proposed cost of Alternative 4. *We will revisit when we get to that part of the analysis.*

Public Utilities and Services

Steve went over categories and factors with how they scored. Alternative 2 scored the highest followed by 1 and 3. They then opened for comments and questions.

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

- What is the timeline in determining preferred approach for the plan once Clean Water Services is done doing their studies on stormwater and erosion mitigation in the area? *Once the preferred approach is selected, it could impact any of the modeling, and any standards would have to be met. Wouldn't the cost vary depending on the alternative? Great question. The cost today is about 10% of whatever the preferred alternative is because that assumes transportation must handle their own stormwater. If there are more regional solutions, it could bring the cost down. This is a more conservative number. It might come down if there are regional options.*
- When you are taking into consideration everyone's comments, please take into consideration consultant AKS's memo regarding the draft report. *Thanks.*
- Most of the co-location being used feels a little odd. Looking at AKS's letter, what are the franchise and utility providers looking at for the eventual integration of Tigard's River Terrace next phase? Showing Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 as the most viable artificially inflates the selection of those alterations for that particular criterion. *Murrysmith was the lead for looking at the utilities analysis and representatives couldn't be on the call tonight.*

Natural Resources

Steve went over categories and factors with how they scored. The No Direct Connection and Alternative 4 scored the highest. They then opened for comments and questions.

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

- Was Bill Hall, who prepared Appendix D, part of the site tour? *Yes, he went on a full site tour from the east end to the west end. He identified that KPMPS (a stream corridor) condition is good. I believe it is not because of the erosion of upland development. We will check back. We are working with another staff member from DEA and will revisit. Also, do the consultants and others believe this is a viable alternative to cross the Bankston Easement? We went to Metro to ask specifically what it meant when they said not to cross the Banskson Easement. Metro said we need to do an alternatives analysis, and we needed additional funding for that. It is not yet complete as it will include information from here today, TAC meeting, and information from the public are also important to getting to the final analysis. Per this analysis, it's a viable option. It's probably not the city that will developing across that area. A developer will probably put that road in.*

Cost and Implementation

Anne went over categories and factors with how they scored. Alternatives 2 and 4 scored the highest. They then opened for comments and questions.

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

- Would the No Direct Connection include Beef Bend Rd. all the way to Roy Rogers Rd.? *There is no local street cost estimate. It's about the same cost as Alternative 4 where*

you are creating a new roadway. *We didn't assume any cost associated with Beef Bend Rd in that area.* Thank you.

- Please clarify potential funding using TDT and other resources. Also, none of these incorporate right of way acquisition. *We don't have the city engineer here with us, but the way it has worked in the past is for right of way, the developer dedicates the right of way for the streets that go their development. A collector or connector street, the developer is expected to dedicate that right of way and make a collector street improvement instead of a local street improvement. There is a system that gives the developer a credit for doing a collector street vs doing a local street on his SDC fees. I understand the city doesn't pay for the right of way acquisition, the developer does. I was just trying to understand that and where funding could come from. I was describing what is happening when development is proposed, building the street in advance of the development is different.*
- I wanted to add having developed two large sites, for all the onsite costs we had to dedicate the right of way for no compensation. It is standard procedure for condition of approval. And on the collector road, we would be reimbursed the difference between the construction of the width of the collector versus the standard neighborhood road. Offsites have been funded by a combination of a local improvement district, and any right of way acquisition we needed to perform in order to improve on an offsite condition of approval. We get TDT credits back for the fair market value for the type of right of way that we can acquire for offsite. *Thank you, I appreciate the clarification. Anne added, information that came from this was provided by the financial consultant of the team. We will loop back with them on that.*
- The question of the collector built ahead of time or with the development, I've seen it done both ways. SDCs are collected from the builders who are currently building in the project, but the city built the collector road. *Thank you.*

Summary Results

Steve presented that Alternative 2 scores the highest. We will review potential errors in the data and consider all the comments when we go back and do the analysis. We propose to take Alternative 2 into to the master plan or a hybrid using the best attributes of the four alternatives. We have refinements to make and appreciate your comments. We will be taking questions and comments through the public meeting in September.

Overall Discussion

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

- The errors in data are feeding into the concern that there is a predetermined outcome when some of the statements are inaccurate. *I apologize for the errors; we will go back and rectify them.*

Public Comment

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

- Does the Bankston property analysis override any protections the property has? *No. Can you build a road through that property? I'm not an expert on the conditions of the*

easement and what the possibilities are moving forward. One more thing, there is currently no public transportation through the King City/Tigard area. Are you taking into consideration the livability of the neighborhood? *We have heard comments from the members of the public about impact on existing residents and we do take the residents' concerns seriously.*

- Are there any plans to put in schools, shopping, or businesses in the eastern end of the development? *There are the existing mixed-use areas and planned little neighborhoods serving retail or restaurants that were envisioned throughout the plan areas in the vision for the concept plan.*

Next Steps

Steve concluded saying we have a TAC meeting tomorrow, and a public meeting in September. We hope to have the Kingston Terrace Master Plan draft completed by the end of October. The final SAC, TAC and community meetings will occur after that, moving into final revisions to the master plan. We will then bring that to the City Council and planning commission for the adoption process. We are happy to accept questions and comments though the public meeting in September.

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

- Is the transportation network alternatives report going to be voted on by the Planning Commission and City Council? *Steve will be giving briefings to the planning commission and City Council at their meetings in August, but they will not be voting on it.* It will be voted on as part of the Master Plan? *Correct.*

Closing

A lot of great comments to think about and look at, along with comments from the TAC and public. We will take another look at it and make revisions accordingly. We will do everything to keep you in the loop. Please reach out to Steve or Mike Weston for questions and comments. Thank you.