



KING CITY MASTER PLAN Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #2

April 5th, 2022 – 11AM to 12:30PM

SUMMARY

TAC members present: 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; Natasha Muro, TriMet; Jarvis Gomez, Tigard-Tualatin School District; Troy Gagliano, PGE.

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

Welcome and Project Updates

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 and development code updates. From November 2020 –February 2021 the initial work documented existing 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. They are looking for order of magnitude by scoring. Last night we saw a reluctance to scoring, we can work with you to work on how to compare the alternatives, and what is more and less valuable. Steve added that we want to make sure we aren't missing any criteria, and that there was significant pushback on the quantitative scoring, if anyone has any thoughts or experience with a similar process that would be helpful. They paused for questions:

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

- What is meant by neighborhood cohesion? *Steve will need to follow up with Marcy, limit impacts to existing neighborhoods. We should be careful with this as it could be subjective. We're bringing in new neighborhoods, how do help them mesh and create a positive transition.*
- For the wildlife connectivity, what data was used for that? *We haven't connected the data yet, there are what we need to collect. The subconsultant was looking at minimizing the stream crossings, careful about slopes, habitat conservation issues, and impacts to wildlife corridors.*
- The metric magnitude construction and OM cost estimates for public utilities, could that account for the positive benefit of colocation of infrastructure, is that intended to roll into that metric? *We are thinking of street and bridge construction, not the other needs in the area. We haven't thought about that. We could combine those as a benefit. We can make sure it's a part of it.*
- Did they have an alternative way to scoring? *They didn't like the term criteria, and the numerical scoring. They liked the term factors, is this a positive or negative, not degrees of either. If we do a subjective analysis, they could be more prone to appeal. Unless you draw conclusions about what the info is telling you, it's hard to make a choice. We are open to other ways, but you need an evaluative process to be able to make decisions. They said we should split mobility into vehicle versus active transportation. We are trying to keep an objective approach to these criteria.*
- It would be helpful to have explanation of terms, so people don't have to guess. *I have gone each of these criteria, and this is how I'm evaluating it. We can commit to having that information in the write-up*
- Criteria and factors are different, need to decide on and be consistent with language. Factor may be better.
- Looking at mobility, level of service, is that applying to all modes? *We are looking at specific intersections in the analysis, when we start to talk about bike and ped, we will be looking at can you get there from here. The quality of connection you would get on the ground wouldn't vary from alternative to alternative. I don't see safety and comfort for bike and ped, wanting balance to what that impact will be. There are a bunch of different factors with trade-offs, we*

aren't saying this is more important than that. The concept plan is focused on the comfort of walking and biking, which is where we would lean in terms of results.

- On mobility, provides one continuous connection, is there more information on that? *It is simply that you can get from the proposed development into the existing city. That will be clearer in looking at the proposed alternatives.*

East/West Circulation Alternatives

Anne started by saying they have had a lot of input on this over the past years. When looking 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 options came out of that process. There is a range of qualitative to quantitative evaluation. The concept plan included different housing development types and their fit.

There were principles to the alternatives that were considered gained from a series of input types. We are doing initial screening, 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. We saw a lot of comments about alignment one, against it. There is a flaw where 154th comes down and enters this triple ravine, it's very narrow and steep. Not a lot of room for vehicular transportation. 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):

- [Referring to the northern and southern alignments] did these consider that fisher road would connect to 137th in every scenario? *In these we assumed they would connect; it could have been taken further. This could be longer term down the road. The possibility of realigning*

137th, we could line up with Coulier and have a 4-lane system. There are opportunities there, to get as many connections as we can.

- *Do alternatives 1, 2 and possible 3 all go through Bankston (?) Possibly yes, I was following trails in concept plan. Are impacts on Bankston easement going to be considered? Most of the valuable wetlands are in the south, there is already that culvert which is the most efficient connection to 147th Ave. not sure how to get around that peak of the easement. We are looking at the layers, and I'm sure we will adjust these alignments. We still have the water feature coming down the west side segment, which causes a need for multiple crossings.*
- *I like the different typologies for the streets, you wouldn't want speeds higher than ideally 7 mph. in the concept plan, we had the rural street with a protected zone for bike/ped.*
- *Does that street typology meet ADA requirements? The graphics were to present a street feel*
- *Would one take the pace of the trail? One was proposed to access the natural spaces, this is a modified version of that to use the terrain and road network*
- *If we are going to reject one, we shouldn't throw it out as it could be a potential for ped/bike connection. We are challenged to think about micro-mobility, that one could be a perfectly accessible route for that.*
- *I would keep one in for the analysis to let the factors drive these conversations*
- *I want to make sure, 137th with those offsets that it is being considered in this process and the issues. We are considering these intersections in this analysis, there could be challenges down the road. I think there are a lot of constraints there, no easy answer. We will look at that and how that might all work*

Public Comment

None.

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 will have a public meeting for the broader community to give input on this. Clean Water Services 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.