

Date 19 July 2017

To King City URA Project Management Team

From Marcy McInelly, AIA, Urbsworks, Inc., and Keith Liden, King City Planner

KING CITY URBAN RESERVE AREA 6D CONCEPT PLAN PROJECT

Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) Meeting #3 – Summary Notes

On **Monday, July 10th**, the fourth SAC Meeting for the URA project was held at King City City Hall (15300 SW 116th Avenue, King City).

The following 13 people attended:

Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) Members

Janet Black, Rivermeade property owner

Mike O’Halloran, area property owner

Ruby Buchholtz, Tualatin Riverkeepers

Kathy Stallkamp, CPO 4K

Richard Werth, Rivermeade property owner

Jamie Morgan-Stasny, area property owner

Kyle Grant

Dave Robinson

Tom Hartz, Friends of Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge

City of King City Staff

Keith Liden, Planner

Consultant Team

Marcy McInelly, Urbsworks, Inc.

Erika Warhus, Urbsworks, Inc.

Other attendees: Jeff Roberts, Zach Pelz, Sharon Fritz, Barbara Sherman

Agenda

Welcome
Introductions
Last meeting: Recap and responses to feedback (including Q & A)
Discussion of survey for the SAC and the community
Update on project: TAC discussion and materials (including Q & A)
Discussion of the Street Types and possible network of streets and trails (including Q & A)
Adjourn and next meetings /next steps

Summary

Update on the Project

Following introductions, Marcy McInnelly gave an overview of what has been accomplished, and what remains to be completed. She introduced the meeting materials and gave a brief summary of what was discussed during the last SAC meeting #3. She reminded the SAC that a focus at the last meeting was the vision statements and feedback from the charrette, and she noted that a couple of SAC members requested changes and made comments. The Summary Notes of SAC #3 reflect the discussion.

Marcy McInnelly reminded the group that during the last meeting, they were in support of a survey. The purpose of the survey would be to collect comments from people who were not able to participate in the charrette, or not able to participate in all of the public events. The survey would show the different alternatives and ask for comment. Marcy asked for thoughts on how the survey should be distributed and what the contents might be. Concerns and comments were expressed regarding:

- Qualifications for the survey. Concerns about getting answers from people who don't have enough information about the project (Mike O'Halloran, Ruby Buchholtz). Ruby suggested that photos might be better than longer descriptions in text. Mike suggested that the survey be more about educating than about collecting data.
- Could there be a second open house, rather than a survey or a combination of the two? (Jamie Morgan-Stasny). A survey reaches more people who may not be able/interested in coming to a public meeting (Kathy Stallkamp).

There was general consensus for combining different approaches including: sending out a mailer with FAQ's (to help educate) and providing a link to a survey for evaluating the alternatives (to collect responses).

Survey links and FAQs would be distributed via the Regal Courier, Civic Association newsletter, Tualatin Riverkeepers listserv, and CPO4 email.

Financing Infrastructure

The planning process has two main components: *getting feedback from the community* to help inform a future potential master plan and zoning amendments, and *technical analysis*. The focus of the technical analysis at this point in the project is evaluating the feasibility of development through an *infrastructure financing plan*.

This exercise involves balancing the cost of infrastructure against the yield of new dwelling units and mixed-use development. The infrastructure finance plan is a major focus of the URA team in July and August. Marcy explained the three ways infrastructure could be funded, based on an in-progress Infrastructure Finance Plan from Leland Consulting Group. The report describes the three ways: 1) site-specific infrastructure paid by the developer; 2) district or URA-wide shared by different developments, and 3) off-site infrastructure improvements.

An example of site-specific infrastructure funding mechanism is a local street paid for by a subdivision. An example of URA-wide funding mechanism is an assessment district created to help pay for a collector street. An assessment district is entered into by willing property owners. An example of off-site infrastructure is the reservoir needed for water storage. The reservoir would be off-site but would serve the URA area, as well as other nearby neighborhoods and cities.

Marcy explained that the detailed infrastructure finance report would be ready by the end of August and will be available on the project website.

There are a number of other technical analyses available on the City's website, Marcy explained, including an outline for the Title 11 application to Metro for the King City Urban Reserve Area.

Land Use and Mobility Alternatives

A recap of the two alternatives was provided and the group reviewed large maps and sketches around the table. The group talked about part or all of the area coming into the UGB and talked about various components of infrastructure. Comments and questions were expressed as follows:

- What did the TAC think of leaving the east side out? (Zach Pelz). Marcy replied that the TAC has concerns about the only east/west connection being Beef Bend Road.
- Concerns about traffic on Beef Bend (multiple SAC attendees). Marcy explained that Beef Bend is not close to capacity, though it is not currently safe or well designed for the amount of traffic it carries.
- Is the cost of transportation infrastructure looking feasible (Mike O'Halloran)? Marcy responded that it is too early to tell but the team should have the numbers in the next month or so.
- The internal streets would be developer costs and most people who live in the URA would not be responsible for paying for streets (Mike O'Halloran).

Keith Liden explained that the team is interested in internal connections east/west but not as an alternative for people using Beef Bend. The desire is for local traffic only.

Streets and Street Character

Marcy introduced seven different street types that the team has been looking at, including a boulevard design with a planted median and separated multi-use path for Beef Bend. Another street type is a more rural local street with a gravel shoulder (similar to many streets in the area now). She asked the group to consider where certain street designs might be appropriate. The seven types are: 1) Green Boulevard 2) Main Street 3) Local Neighborhood 4) Local Queuing 5) Rural Street 6) Alley / Shared Street 7) Trails/ Multi-use path.

The group looked at maps around the table. Marcy presented the idea that Beef Bend might be a street homes could face, rather than turn away from, with lower traffic speeds and better overall design. Comments and concerns were expressed as follows:

- Is the County open to the Boulevard design? (Zach Pelz). Yes, they're open to the idea, but they have reservations about certain aspects of the proposal.
 - Answer: The URA team is aware of Washington County's requirements, and is in discussion with representatives of the county who sit on the TAC. In August, the URA team will meet with Washington County to discuss Beef Bend in more detail.
- Who maintains the stormwater facilities? (Jamie Morgan-Stasny) Answer: Likely Clean Water Services (CWS).
- Concerns about ravine crossings and the cost of streets that cross them (Jeff Roberts).
- Concerns about adequate access to developments between ravines. They will need two access points, not just one (Jamie Morgan-Stasny).
 - Answer: This is an emergency response issue, as well as a street network and neighborhood-scaled block/neighborhood design issue. The King City URA team will discuss access needs with Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue (TVF&R). TVF&R has a representative on the Technical Advisory Committee.
- A multi-use path on Beef Bend would be a really good design idea. (Kathy Stallkamp, Mike O'Halloran).

- Concerns about homes facing Beef Bend (Jeff Roberts) and questions of reducing speeds on Beef Bend might lower its classification and lessen its ability to serve as a regional thoroughfare (Kathy Stallkamp, Zach Pelz).
 - Response: Keith Liden explained that the goal of design changes to Beef Bend would be to improve the character so that people stop driving at highway speeds. He also mentioned that an urban boulevard could carry lots of traffic, while being hospitable to pedestrians and cyclists.
- There are many driveways along Beef Bend, what happens to them? Especially if a median blocks them from turning left (Dick Werth).
- Maybe there could be a planted median that is phased incrementally, as properties develop; this would help solve the problem of driveway access in the interim (Mike O'Halloran).
- Rivermeade community doesn't want to be an obstacle to development but they do not want to see the Fischer Road connection. If UGB expansion were approved, Rivermeade residents would not be ready to annex at that time (Dick Werth).
- Interested in seeing a flood plain map and understanding the impacts of development on the flood plain (Kathy Stallkamp).
 - Response: Marcy explained that the whole ethic is to make development good for the river because it can help protect the river through stringent stormwater management practices. Nothing in the concept plan will propose developing floodplain areas.

Closing Thoughts

- Like the rural street types and thinks they are appropriate and forward thinking for the area (Jamie Morgan-Stasny).
- Likes to see that the proposed streets are small (Janet Black).
- Wants to see a bike path and trail that connects the area to public transit hub for connecting with future light rail (Ruby Buchholtz).

Handouts

- 17_0710_KC URA 6D_SAC Members + Agenda_public
- 17_0709_KC URA6D_Street Types.pdf
- SAC Meeting #3 Summary Notes_17_0519