



KING CITY MASTER PLAN Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #4

August 9th, 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 TAC members and thanked them for participation. Steve reviewed the agenda.

Project Status

Steve reminded the group of the study area and the project schedule. The team received helpful comments from the SAC meeting yesterday. The community meeting will be delayed to later in September. After that meeting, we will dive into drafting the master plan, additional meetings, then into the adoption process.

East/West Circulation Alternative Analysis

Anne Sylvester began by going over a summary of the analysis process, followed by the study factors, and how the analysis came to where it is today. The analysis results are relative to each other and fall into several categories. Anne reviewed the concept plan mobility system map and street system that provide the support to the proposed land uses. The concept plan calls for development of varying densities spread throughout the study area. Anne identified the recommended alternatives to move forward. Lastly noting that the concept plan gave timing and phasing considerations, highlighting access to utilities as a means for phasing choice.

Steve started by going over the ranked factors, noting option 2 ranked highest overall followed by 3. After today's meeting, they will take the analysis and incorporate comments from the SAC and TAC to identify the preferred alternative. The goal is to then bring the preferred option to the public in September, then ultimately the master plan process. The final alternative will then go to City Council and Planning Commission.

Land Use and Community Design

Steve went over the categories and factors noting how they scored. Options 2 and 3 scored the highest. They then opened for comments and questions.

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

- Did we go over land uses as a group? *We took the land uses in the concept plan and brought that forward. I do not remember what was proposed there. There is significant information in the concept plan, which is not set in stone but is the starting point. Modifications might be made. They are quite definite in the housing types in each neighborhood, they all have mix of housing types to be consistent with House Bill 2001. There is not any concentration of multifamily.*
- Looking at more centralized density, I would not presume that transit service would be along Beef Bend Road. Number 4 does not necessarily align with serving lower income households. *The idea has always been that transit is not necessarily on Beef Bend. The mix of housing of types will be all over.*
- Why wasn't the northern part of route 3 just considered an option? Also, there were some things that were confusing about the scoring. *In most cases, using the northern portion did not have influence. We wanted to avoid a massive matrix with overwhelming information, so there may be some lack of information for simplicity. At first, I was confused because I could not tell if there were options within the larger option. There could be a scenario just having option 3 to the north. Yes, there could be. That should be made clearer.*
- For the recreational evaluation, some of the benefits just assume proximity to river versus access? As in, scenic versus recreational access? *Recreation had a few aspects to it, mainly accessibility to parks and the impacts this could have on those facilities.*

Active Transportation Mobility

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

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

- Are you considering a Fischer and King Lear couplet? *We have 5 stud-out streets in King City, the problem with those is that they are a 28-foot roadway, Fischer is a 34-foot roadway. Fischer is the only one could handle it. Are there plans to make it an official couplet? Fischer has parking on both sides, we could put bike lines if we removed parking, but one side is possible.*

Vehicular Transportation Mobility

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

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

- Are you considering stop signs on Peachtree? *There are options we were looking at how to make this work via an operations analysis. Right now, there is not anything about that. We can flush that out with more detail.*

Public Utilities and Services

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

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

- Did you say one of the routes would require movement of lines? *Alternative 4 crosses where 2 of those wood poles are, the road might have to be routed around them or a minor relocation. Doing that with BPA will take 3-4 years. Yes, we reached out to them to talk about this issue.*
- As I am watching this, there are points of discernment where options 3 and 4 north and south, would rank differently. You cannot compare when they are combined that simply. For the recreation map, the figure it points to does not have any recreation information in Appendix A, Recreation Access and Impacts. *That must be an error, we will fix.*

Natural Resources

Steve went over categories and factors with how they scored. The no direct connection and option 4 scored the highest. They then opened for comments and questions.

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

- For impacts to habitat, how did you evaluate this? *We do not have our environmental planner with us, they conducted their analysis through desktop, windshield surveys, and on the ground tours. We can reach out to DEA and follow-up.*
- Wetland impacts shows how the north and south routes of option 3 shows the difference between the two. *Thank you, we will look at that and separating it out.*
- Does option 3 north impact the Bankston easement? That might be a good distinguishing factor. *At the very least that detail should be included.*
- For Bankston easement, early in the document it is talked about in natural resources, I was shocked I did not see it in the regulatory context. In the language for Bankston, if the path crosses it, there would be natural resource impacts, but it is talked about too casually and there are legal implications that should be articulated. *We put the Metro stipulation into the text (under Natural Resources). To this point we are operating under guidance from Metro to meet those requirements. For this study, we recognize lines on a map are necessary, but a lot more work is needed to determine the final route on the ground.*

Cost and Implementation

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

Chris Faulkner with Clean Water Services commented that they are still moving along with the same timeline, and mid-fall they should have their own full analysis. When we look at stormwater costs, this assumes that these alternatives manage their own water. Over time, we may see those costs come down with more clarity. Hopefully there will be a feedback loop with King City as this wraps up. Everything should be fully wrapped up early 2023.

Mike Carr added that this is consistent with the analysis they have done before; they will go through these analyses this fall.

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

- They are not taking into account right-of-way costs; I have been seeing \$15 per foot.
- Stormwater costs are higher on cross sections with separate bike lanes with closer spaced inlets.
- I want to comment on Meyer Airpark since every alternative crosses that, are there any statues around that? *We mentioned the airstrip in the report, we do not know if there are financial impacts. The report could dive deeper into those ramifications. All the alternatives would affect it, we acknowledged it was there, in the next step is there a need to address this and what is the process?*
- Under the sewer line matrix, for the aerial crossing, alternative 1 requires ravines but not options 2 and 3, why? *They are long crossings, we did not have definitions on the bridge crossings on 2 or 3, but that they would be shorter. They would be exposed, but the extent of the crossings for option 1 are very long. If that is even possible from a gravity point for option 1. There is an option for inverted siphons in the creeks versus ravines, but those are headaches.*

Overall Discussion

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

- None

Public Comment

- For the travel times, do you have any numbers? *We do have the documentation; it is in the technical appendix with tables of travel times. It is in the library on the website.*
- I can speak to the Airpark comment, it was established back in the 50's. There is virtually no commercial activity, there are a few aircrafts that pay hangar rent. It is in a family trust. Long-term, the days are numbered in my opinion as a family member.
- For TriMet, are there concerns about a full blown road coming down Kingston Terrace versus a roundabout type situation? *They have no plans for articulated bus to this location. If that did happen, it would be years for now.*
- Not sure if Ride Connection has been brought into the discussion, for the smaller streets. *At first, we talked about that but also an autonomous vehicle loop. We wanted to build street networks to accommodate that. Line 94 services it, but I was wondering if a smaller option was planned. Autonomous loop would pick up and go through town and provide connectivity.*
- With River Terrace 2 and Kingston Terrace, what service is being provided by TriMet on Roy Rogers? Would Beef Bend be viable for routing? *Annual service plan comes out in January, as of now there isn't a plan to go on Roy Rodgers Road, we don't have enough bus drivers right now.*
- How much input do the local communities have for the outcome for the Kingston Terrace plan? *We are in our fourth round of community engagement activities, plus other opportunities to comment online. We take all those comments into consideration. As we enter the adoption process, the public has a formal role by commenting and giving testimony. Now is a great time to be participating.*

Summary of Ranked Factors

- Alternative 2 ranks highest overall, followed by Alternative 3.
- Alternative 2 is proposed to carry forward into the master plan process but may not ultimately be the preferred alternative.
- Alternative 2 may be adjusted to accommodate land use, environmental, and other factors.
- Final east/west circulation will be submitted to Planning Commission and City Council for adoption with the Kingston Terrace Master Plan, Transportation System Plan, Comprehensive Plan and Development Code.

Next Steps

Steve concluded saying we are entering this gap between now and the September community meeting. We will use this time to look at and take into account the comments and hopefully propose a preferred alternative for the community meeting. We will have the public meeting in September once details are finalized. We expect a Draft Master Plan in the end of October. The final TAC meeting will occur after that, moving into final revisions, then into master adoption process in late fall/early winter. Thank you.