

KING CITY URBAN RESERVE AREA 6D

13 February 2017, 6:00PM

City Hall, 15300 SW 116th Avenue, King City

Work Task 1.1 - SAC Meeting 1 and Summary Notes

From Scope of Work: Hold TAC and SAC Meetings 1 prep and summary (same day). Proposed agenda: Purpose of the project; project schedule including dates for the Charrette, and discuss the expectations and desired outcomes for each TAC and SAC stakeholder member.

On Monday February 13th, Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #1 was held in King City City Hall at 15300 SW 116th Avenue. The following people attended:

Stakeholder Advisory Committee

Dann Black, resident, Rivermeade neighborhood

Ruby Buchholtz, Advocacy Manager, Tualatin Riverkeepers

Kyle Grant, resident, King City Edgewater Homeowners Association

Tom Hartz, President, Friends of the Tualatin River Wildlife Refuge

Jamie Morgan-Stasny, property owner, Metropolitan Land Group

Mike O'Halloran, property owner

Dave Robinson, resident, Rivermeade

Kathy Stallkamp, Washington County resident, CPO 4K

Dick Werth, resident, Rivermeade

Marcy McInelly, Urbsworks, Inc

Erika Warhus, Urbsworks, Inc

Other attendees

Sharon Fritz

Nancie Stimler

Bob Stimler

Jeff Roberts

Jeff _____

Zack Pelz

Councilor Gretchen Buehner

Councilor Chi Nguyen-Ventura

City of King City

Michael Weston, City Manager

Keith Liden, City Planner

Consultant Team

Welcome

[Michael Weston] General welcome to the SAC.

Introductions

[All] Everyone introduced themselves and described where they lived or worked.

Background and purpose of the project

[Marcy McInelly, Michael Weston, Keith Liden] Purpose of the concept plan and desired outcomes of getting Metro's approval into the UGB with the 2018 application. Description of where we are in the planning process. There were a number of questions asked.

Question: How does the annexation process work and how long will it take?

Response [Mike Weston]: Multiple ways for a city to approach annexation. Double majority is one common way that King City has approached this in the past and it was the way the Highlands was brought in. It requires at least half of King City residents and half of landowners in proposed territory to approve. Annexation can happen on a parcel-by-parcel basis and it is also possible that only part of the area comes in at the start.

Question: How is Tigard influenced by the URA 6D Concept Plan?

Response [Keith]: Ultimately this is a Metro decision and Metro has to determine the needs in the whole area. King City is working closely and collaboratively with Tigard. They have an Urban Reserve Area to the north of Beef Bend that they are not currently pursuing to be brought into the UGB. Eventually, the area to the North will come into the UGB.

Question: Why isn't Tigard or Sherwood taking this project on? King City is too small and lacks the resources.

Answer [Mike, Keith]: Sherwood and Tigard are not currently interested and are pursuing other projects. King City may lack the experience now but we are a small town investing in our own future. We see potential to form a new identity for King City. We will gain the experience and resources through this process. As a small town we are able to be responsive.

Question: How will the river be affected if this area is developed? Very concerned about health of the river and the impacts of stormwater if the land is built out. It is important to walk the site to see the impacts and understand them.

Response [Michael, Marcy]: The team is working closely with Clean Water Services (CWS) and they are an active member of the Technical Advisory Committee. The team is aware of these concerns. Many of them were expressed during the property owner interviews and at the Open House. Much of the stormwater will be treated on site. The city and consultant team has walked the site and we are setting up a similar tour to take place during the March multi-day design event (charrette).

Question: Water issues cannot be overstated. Where are all of those pipes for the infrastructure going to go? It's a vague process right now.

Response: Part of the Concept Plan work that is occurring now is the "base conditions" reports. Those reports document the transportation, infrastructure and natural resource constraints, and will be available to the public and the SAC soon. The concept planning process is a higher level plan, and may not reach the level of detail being discussed here, but a list of the issues are being collected and they will be addressed in the Master Plan process, which occurs if the Concept Plan is approved by Metro later this year.

Question: Will there be a need for more schools in this area? The Wildlife Refuge is interested in educational partnerships with schools and this might provide that opportunity.

Question: The idea of developing the area more like a community instead of just housing like we see all over is appealing but what about the significant traffic impacts?

Response [Marcy]: There will need to be more connections than just Beef Bend. We will need at least one street south of and parallel to Beef Bend. It will be a more local-serving street. More streets and connections help to disperse traffic. Transportation is also being analyzed as part of the base conditions reports.

Comment: Bull Mountain stormwater runoff is a huge problem. The current plan area is acting like a giant bioswale and cleaning the water before it gets to the river. That would change if this area is developed.

SAC Roles and Responsibilities

Marcy explained that the charge of the SAC is to provide continuing feedback and input to the city and the consultant as the Concept Plan for the area is developed. Responsibilities of SAC members include

- Attend up to five meetings between today and October 2017.
- Actively participate in the project by contributing to project meetings and reviewing materials before meetings.
- Represent the interests and perspectives of their constituencies.
- Ask questions and seek information to ensure understanding.
- Share differences of opinion on ideas—silence is considered consent.

- Help create an atmosphere in which differences can be raised, discussed, and melded into group decisions. Divergent views and opinions are expected and are to be respected.
- Talk to others in the community to give and receive information.

The facilitator (Marcy) will:

- Ensure that everyone has an opportunity to participate.
- Keep meetings moving and focused on the agenda.
- Start and end meetings on time unless the group agrees to extend the meeting time.

SAC Discussion

Marcy asked SAC members to share their concerns, questions and issues, as well as values that could inform the project. SAC members were given priority but everyone in attendance was encouraged to participate in the discussion.

Rivermeade Resident

As a resident of Rivermeade, has concerns that come from working with King City in the past. Rivermeade is unique. It's multigenerational. There is real pride in the unique character. There are about 44-45 families. They have their own park and boat launch. Hard feelings about King City from before. Perhaps the city didn't have the expertise. It was, here's what we're going to do. Assumptions were made. People want to retain that rural character. They don't want to see change. But he is willing to listen and be a bridge. He is an attorney but hasn't practiced for many years.

Friends of Tualatin Wildlife Refuge

Tualatin Wildlife Refuge. When founded, it was one of a few national wildlife refuges within 25 miles of a population center. Now there are over 200 urban refuges. He is anxious to see how it plays out. The "concept" and the solutions should be thought about concurrently. Keep the refuge where it is. The refuge wants to partner, to "bring the refuge to the community." Very concerned about the interface between the river, the refuge and development. It would not be hard to screw up. The Tualatin Wildlife Refuge has an arrangement with the federal government, gets 1 million annually to meet the mission of bringing the refuge to the community. Is glad to see we have Larry Klimek (Tualatin Wildlife Refuge Manager) on the TAC.

Property Owner

Owns their family's farmland south of Roy Rogers. He and his sister were given the land by their father. Now consider themselves to be "farming a bioswale." They rent it to growers of cabbage and berries, but the land is not viable for even those crops. Between mid-October and May it's not possible to drive a tractor, the land is so wet. It was always a little wet. Earlier, farmers used open drain tiles to reduce the water. Now it's worse. So it's 40 acres they can't live on or do anything with. But they pay taxes on it and would like to see it developed as a nice natural space. It's not sellable as farmland. It needs to be taken over by someone like King City. They would like to see it brought into the UGB so it could be developed.

Rivermeade Resident

In Rivermeade, residents are on wells. At 45 residents, no more wells are possible. He is at the end of a dead end road and the edge of a creek. Has a big yard. Has kids and moved from Phoenix. He is here to listen but doesn't "need what King City wants." 137th is already a barrier. Has no prejudice against the effort but wants KC to know his feelings about the concept plan: "Why would I want it?"

Washington County Resident

Biggest issues: stormwater, transportation, ensuring a smooth transition from current King City to new development; from residential to commercial to industrial. Preserve the natural area. It's true that people who own have a choice to sell, when they are ready. But in Tigard, people are feeling pressured; they can't *not* develop. The stability of soils and building in the area is a real issue. Her own house is in the floodplain and it moves. Soils are saturated with water. Has an issue, thinks it may be too detailed for this concept plan effort, but would like to mention it: parking. In concept planning, the details of parking cars is often not considered. Examples: parking might be provided on the street, but

people can't park in the garage, because they have too much stuff. When people park in the driveway, the stick out into the sidewalk. Thinks this project should consider parking.

Tualatin Riverkeepers

It's phenomenal the way we are going about this, with everyone getting to say what is important. She is concerned about the preservation of natural resources. A boat launch and a park is important. If people can have access to the river, as studies show, then they'll want to protect it. Recommends this project go beyond Clean Water Services requirements. This neighborhood should have naturescaping and rainwater gardens. Recommends we consider adding to the SAC a business owner. Ask them, what would they like to see here?

Property Owner/Developer

Thinks the approach we are taking is great. Stormwater is key. It was a big problem when Bull Mountain was developed. For this project stormwater will be a big lift, but it is also a big opportunity. Another opportunity is for commercial that is not strip-based—it's a necessity for cities. Also, because of the housing shortage, so is housing of all densities, thoughtfully planned.

Other attendees comments

Property Owner and Resident

Concerned about taxes.

Property Owner Representative

As a planner, and someone who works throughout the metro area, thinks having commercial here will make it possible to walk more. Also, don't assume this project is just about developers having a heyday. Lots of work has to go into making sure it's feasible.

Property Owner

Grew up in Durham. This feels like a small town, with kids able to catch crawdads in the creek. It's important to maintain the neighborhood feeling. The URA is "people land." Do it right, and provide homes and neighborhoods for future people and future families. He would like to have his kids live nearby, for example, and development in the URA makes that possible. Sherwood used to be where you stopped to get your gas on your way to the coast. Now it's a new city center. Likes Sherwood but doesn't like Tualatin.