



KING CITY MASTER PLAN

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #2

May 4, 2021 – 11AM to 1PM

SUMMARY

TAC members present: Anne Debbaut, Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD); Chris Faulkner, Clean Water Services; Tim O'Brien and Lake McTighe, Metro; Seth Brumley, Oregon Department of Transportation; Schuyler Warren and Dave Roth, City of Tigard; Jessica Pelz, Washington County; Larry Klimek, Tualatin Wildlife Refuge; Carol Bellows, Planning Commission.

Staff and Consultants: Mike Weston, City Manager; Keith Liden, City Planner; Steve Faust, Anais Mathez, 3J Consulting.

Welcome and Project Updates

Steve Faust welcomed TAC 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 and Engagement Activities

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

Design Concepts

Steve presented some alternative design concepts for the Town Center/Main Street, Parks and Open Spaces, as well as different potential street types for Fischer Road and the River Terrace Boulevard extension, based on a review of the 2018 Concept Plan, more detailed existing site conditions, community outreach, and discussion with the TAC/SAC.

TAC comments include the following (*italics are team/consultant responses*):

Town Center/Main Street Alternatives

- The Main Street should extend all the way to Beef Bend Road to connect with Tigard's main street.
- There is a site distance issue at Lasich Avenue that would have to be mitigated, so Option 1: Beef Bend Main Street is not preferred.
- The Tigard River Terrace process did still flag Beef Bend as a “special study area” that will carry over into the community planning phase. This more nuanced study will be heavily transportation-based considering there are a lot of coordination needs.
- Maybe we should consider a pedestrian bridge over Beef Bend.
- If Lasich Road is not a real option and Tigard is not considering the density of commercial development that King City is thinking about, I prefer Option 3: Node at River Terrace Blvd.
- How critical is Fischer Road cutting across east-west, versus just focusing on north-south connections? *The assumption is that a Fischer Road extension would be a longer-term phase of this plan. It is more likely that the western portion of this area would be built first and extend up to Beef Bend in the near term. We will have more information on that once we get more from the TSP.*
- Option 3: Node at River Terrace Blvd seems to have more potential to capture King City's vision. However, is there enough need or demand for the amount of commercial activity required to connect all the way up to Tigard? *We know that it would take a long time to develop the commercial activity envisioned there. Todd Chase has numbers on that. It would be secondary to rooftops first. The potential for a large grocery store is likely out by 10-20 years. However, creating visibility from Roy Rogers will be very important. And we'll need some patient landowners.*
- The connectivity to Tigard across Beef Bend is critical and having that permeability is important. We will need a safe crossing there, otherwise that arterial will create a barrier for any kind of crossing/sense of connection/permeability between areas.
- We should consider wildlife crossings over highways.

Parks and Open Space

- A more urban park/plaza makes sense as part of a Town Center.
- I agree that an urban park makes the most sense in the Town Center. It would be interesting to see some sort of linear connection to the urban park from the river.
- A multi-use pathway/trail should run diagonally from the Beef Bend/Roy Rogers intersection, to the urban park in the Town Center and connect to the Tualatin River. This wouldn't compete with a potential ballfield. Rather it would be a meandering nature trail that goes from the northwest to the southeast. Ideally the trail is large enough that it's through a natural area and not boxed in by development.
- An urban park makes sense to activate businesses in the Town Center.
- I would really like to see pocket parks in the neighborhoods. This is important for access to nature. Play structures aren't necessary for play, but they are a central attraction. It's important to bring neighborhoods together with a common space.
- Integrating walking and bicycling paths that link small pocket parks along the edges is important.
- We need a *variety* of parks. In North Bethany, some developers are placing parks at the same time as homes, while others were only placing homes first. The difference in activity is amazing; those neighborhoods that had parks going in at the same time as homes were seeing so much more use. This is something for the City to consider down the road - working to get those parks put in at the same time those houses are going in will make a huge difference.
- Does King City have level of service standards for parks? How parks might be balanced across that boundary between Tigard and King city? *King City identified 1.5 acre per 1,000, but we don't have it outlined by type of park. Maybe that's something we can take another step forward in the master plan. There's an opportunity to coordinate so we don't overbuild or under-build certain types of parks across the two communities.*
- I think that a sports field in or around the area could be a big draw as well.

Streets: River Terrace Boulevard

- What is the thinking regarding the orientation of housing along River Terrace Boulevard? *Because River Terrace Boulevard is intended to have more of a neighborhood character, it will be more "frontage" oriented. We don't have as much authority over Beef Bend. It would be really hard to make an argument for the market to provide housing that faces a roadway that wouldn't be very accessible. While it is not ideal for housing to be faced away, it will likely need to turn its back to Beef Bend.*
 - We need to figure out design, crossings and speeds for Beef Bend if we're trying to keep it at a neighborhood scale. In the spirit of not creating the divide, we can't have houses facing away. Then why even have any crossings at all? *If we can get a better road condition for Beef Bend, there are certainly many more urban design options.*
- Why is there both a sidewalk and a multi-use path? *We feel it's important to separate pedestrians and bicyclists.*
- We need to understand expected traffic volumes and whether they are appropriate for bike sharrows. I think a separated bike path would be a better option.
- I think we need a clear separation of modes along River Terrace Boulevard.

- I agree with all these sentiments. I would like to see Beef Bend with a separated multiuse pathway, that provides a nice urban interface with the neighborhoods to the north and south
- An extension of the River Terrace scheme might connect well to Mike's idea of connecting to a linear park south to the river.
- Speeds that are safe enough for shared bicycle facilities need to be 20 mph or lower.
- I like having pocket parking as shown in Option A; maybe there's a melding of ideas that include a protected buffer strip but also a large sidewalk that is curb tight.
- It seems like the design will depend a lot on the land use context. Options B and C are more urban feeling. Option C would be preferable to support safer cycling.
- I would prefer Option B or C.
- I think we need buffered bike lanes.
- Option C is essentially what is being envisioned for the commercial portion of River Terrace Blvd. A raised cycle track or mountable curb would be beneficial.
- Could bike lines be re-routed around the main street?
 - I think it is important not to move bikes off of the Main Street. There are economic benefits to people arriving and shopping by bike.
- I have seen different examples of delineating space on a street. One example is where the pull-out/parking area is gravel, and another is a different asphalt color. The City of Cornelius is doing a version of this where concrete is being used for parking areas to help delineate space.
- A lot of the buffering concerns with parked cars and bike lanes can be addressed through good urban design.
- Option C is very similar to what downtown Gladstone is envisioning.

Streets: Fischer Road

- Have we pulled together any concepts for roads that are not car-oriented? Like a pedestrian plaza design? *Let's bring that up when we talk with the team next.*
- These options don't show any separated bike lanes. I always thought Fischer Road would be more like a linear park. What is the benefit of a curbless design? *I think it has to do with stormwater management. The neighborhoods on the east end are more rural in character, so we wanted a more rural feel.*
- I think the volumes will be too great for shared lanes, especially for families and/or all but the most committed bikers.
- Designs that share lanes are non-starters. I think people won't be comfortable. I think we need to have dedicated facilities from each end of Fischer. I strongly support keeping bike facilities separate.
- I agree a separated path would be preferred; I think this is where a riverfront trail could provide a nice alternative to Fischer.
- A riverfront trail won't be feasible the entirety of the stretch, as you will not be able to cross the easement property.
- Whatever happens to the roadway, it has to evolve over time to provide the mobility that will be needed over time. This might not be a popular idea, but I don't think the City should assume this road will never evolve and always have a rural character. I've yet to find a UGB expansion area that is popular for everyone, but these roads do evolve over time and we need to allow for that to occur.

- It's unclear what the speed limit will be across the three sections of Fischer Road. Generally, it should be much lower than Beef Bend. *This road has always been talked about as a lower speed street. While it is one of two full east-west connections, we really want to serve the local traffic in the area.*
- The rural character of this road will go away over time. It would depend on what kind of housing is around. What is the process and conversation with TSP team? *These concepts will help inform the work of the TSP. Their work will come back to us and then we'll provide feedback. It is an iterative process.*
- I look forward to talking about how different "smart city" aspects (e.g., solar, battery storage, electric and autonomous vehicles) can be incorporated into the planning. PGE is able and happy to assist with those things.

Public Comment

1. In response to Tim O'Brien's comment on the rural character neighborhood I want to point out that Rivermeade was established in 1948, nearly 2 decades prior to King City in 1966. Mr. O'Brien's opinion that our community would simply develop in time as other areas he saw in the last 20 years come inside the UGB was received by members of our community as uninformed and arrogant. In my follow-up conversation with Mr. O'Brien he clarified his comment was more directed at the road in the rural character neighborhood, proposing that it be larger to incorporate and plan for more urban development including a wider right-of-way. However, a wider right-of-way would severely impact our community by removing several ancient trees, severely reducing front yards, and possibly causing removal of existing structures or homes. The Rivermeade Community is opposed to any increase in right-of-way along the current River Lane which was proposed in the Concept Plan to become an extension of Fischer Road. The Rivermeade Community is also opposed to extending River Lane through the Bankston Conservancy Lands held by The Columbia Land Trust, and reminds that METRO Ordinance No. 18-1427 included this requirement *"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."* We expect that protection to result in alternative alignments included in the TSP, to be considered in comparison to the currently proposed alignment. Those new alignments would not be impacted by existing road right-of-way dimensions, such that they might be able to address Mr. O'Brien's concern.

2. As I discussed in the earlier Public Meeting, there is a lack of engineering and cost analysis for the extension of Fischer Road as drawn in the concept plan by planners with no engineering experience. The trail and road alignment were proposed on unstable slopes, which were shown to the participants during the April field trip that included Metro Counselor Gerritt Rosenthal. It is foolish to continue to propose a road alignment that: crosses several deep ravines requiring at least 4 expensive bridges when a small realignment adjustment northward could reduce future road costs by \$20 million. There would also be increased costs for sewer pipelines as well as concerns with pipelines along these unstable slopes being a risk to the Tualatin River and the ravine streams when more slides inevitably occur. The proposed alignment continues to receive strong and consistent objection from both the Edgewater and Rivermeade communities. A small realignment would also follow Metro's requirement to protect the Columbia Land Trust's Bankston Conservancy Lands. The

Master Plan should include engineering estimates in the TSP based on accurate Lidar topography and on-site inspections of any site conditions that would significantly influence costs including the instability of the slopes along the ravines. These costs should be compared to estimates of other alternative alignments for east-west connectivity.

3. The Tualatin NWR representatives on the TAC should specifically address the issue raised at the #2 SAC meeting regarding outdoor lighting for any proposed ball fields or concert venues. Now would be the best time to get any concerns addressed. Given potential impacts to wildlife and migratory birds, do wildlife biologists prefer ball fields with powerful white lights be located further from the refuge, possibly at the Art Rutkin Elementary? Is the noise or lighting of a concert venue so close to the refuge a concern that should be avoided or instead designed to mitigate the impacts? Also, given the proximity of an active nighttime Town Center to the refuge, should the street lighting be amber instead of white, directed downward with new designs that reduce sky lighting, or are there any other issues for the refuge?

Next Steps

Steve thanked the TAC for their discussion. The team will update the project schedule and push out the next round of engagement to the second half of July so this process is aligned with the TSP process. These design concepts will be shared with the broader public through an online survey in the next month. The TAC will meet again in July where there will be much more information and substance to review and comment on. As a reminder, a final draft of the TSP will be ready at the end of June, but the City is holding off on adoption until after this process is complete so we can make adjustments as needed.

Adjourn

Mike adjourned the meeting at 1pm.