

Date March 16, 2018

Subject King City URA 6D Concept Plan

From Urbsworks, Inc.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMMENTS, INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING STRATEGY

Response to Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Comments on *King City Urban Reserve Area 6D: Funding Strategy*

The King City URA 6D Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was given the opportunity to review and comment on both the *King City Preliminary Draft Concept Plan* as well as the *King City Urban Reserve Area 6D: Funding Strategy*, (Leland Consulting Group, December 2017). The table below shows all comments related to the Funding Strategy and the project team's response to those comments.

Note: Most responses to the funding strategy document are found in the final Concept Plan document, called the *Concept Plan, King City Urban Reserve Area 6D, Public Review Draft*, dated February 2018. In a few instances, responses are also found in additional documents, as noted.

TAC Comments	Solutions and Responses
Transportation	
The preliminary infrastructure cost estimates used in the report are not based on a traffic study or similar impact analysis that would determine the infrastructure improvements needed to serve the proposed development.	Further studies are underway in coordination with Washington County and a more detailed transportation assessment will accompany the Final Concept Plan. King City will continue to work with Washington County on the creation of a more detailed funding plan during the master planning process.
The Beef Bend assumptions are not correct. Washington County does not have a "Capital Improvement Plan" and it is incorrect to say that the County is collecting funds to pay for Beef Bend improvements from 150th to Hwy 99W. The reality is that the Beef Bend project from 150th to Hwy 99W (the extent of the roadway within the UGB) is included in the Metro RTP project list, but is on the strategic improvement list, which means it is beyond the likely funding horizon. Being on the RTP project list alone does not imply a commitment to funding. Additionally, the RTP project would be for improvements up to the current TSP standard for a three-lane arterial, not taking into account any upsizing needed to accommodate development needs.	Clarification has been added to the Final Concept Plan.
The plan should assume that there will be improvements for the length of Beef Bend adjacent to the entire URA area (i.e. to 137th at a minimum)	The cost and allocation tables in the Final Concept Plan have been updated to include improvements Beef Bend improvements from Roy Rogers to 137 th .
The funding strategy assumes that Beef Bend will retain its 3-lane classification, which may not be the case. This is evident on page 6, with the discussion of removing ROW acquisition costs from the cost estimates. This should also be revisited for the green boulevard – developers typically are	New calculations have been incorporated into the Final Concept Plan regarding the cost of Beef Bend from Roy Rogers to 137 th . In keeping

TAC Comments	Solutions and Responses
required to dedicate and construct improvements up to a local street standard (unless their particular development requires the upsized roadway), meaning that cities typically give SDC credits for the additional capacity improvement (extra width over a local street standard, bike lane, etc) necessary for a collector road.	with the funding strategy methodology for the other street costs, ROW acquisition was not added in only for Beef Bend (cost assumptions were not changed). The five-lane version of Beef Bend has not been cost estimated at this time. Factors that would demand Beef Bend to become five lanes are being studied in a transportation assessment, which is a separate document being prepared by the consultant team in coordination with Washington County.
Development of the plan area will likely require upsizing Beef Bend to maintain capacity and mobility. It's possible that MSTIP would be available to cost share on the project, but cannot be counted on as the sole funding source.	Factors that would demand a five lane are described in the transportation assessment (separate document).
Improvements to Elsner Road (Washington County collector) Roy Rogers Road (Washington County arterial), and Fischer Road (Washington County collector) are not addressed.	Elsner Road and Fischer Road have been included within the cost of the green boulevard.
The overall funding package needs to assess all of the identified infrastructure needs. Many assumptions about transportation infrastructure assume that improvements are the responsibility of other parties; these commitments have not been made and are not a given. All project funding assumptions should be clearly articulated and documented.	Some funding assumptions and cost estimates in the Final Concept Plan have been revised in response to comments. The transportation assessment (separate document) is also being prepared in response to comments.
Any supplemental transportation fees should be coordinated with the existing Washington County TDT.	However, it should be noted that cost estimates and assumptions in the Concept Plan are preliminary, were used to determine feasibility at a concept-level of planning and are subject to change during the master planning phase. The City will work with Washington County and other agencies to refine the infrastructure funding plan during the master planning phase of the project.
Research whether it's appropriate to remove all of the right-of-way costs from the street estimates. It is our understanding that oversized portions of right-of-way are eligible for SDC credits (Page 6).	
Culverts	
Explain which roads need culverts and why culverts are listed as a separate project and not part of the associated road improvement project.	There are multiple possible street networks and multiple possible alignments for collectors and local streets. In addition, culverts vary in cost by location (generally higher in cost when located toward the southern portion of ravines). Given the degree of

TAC Comments	Solutions and Responses
	variability in the concept plan phase, and the focus of the funding strategy, which was to identify a reasonable assumption for culvert “oversize cost,” the consultant team took an approach toward costing culverts which disassociates them from specific street alignments. The purpose of the funding strategy was to determine oversize costs that would be allocated to the district, not to each individual street.
Stormwater and Sanitary/Sewer	
Stormwater facilities costs will be paid by developers, not CWS.	Clarification has been added to the Final Concept Plan.
Table only shows sanitary fees (called “sewer”) in table, but need to add row for stormwater management costs, which is more than the WQ fee.	
Water	
Add water infrastructure as a standalone infrastructure project in the various project tables and text. This area will need more than just pipes in the right-of-way. The type of water infrastructure needed potentially falls into the Major Off-Site Infrastructure and Framework Infrastructure categories. Preliminary analysis indicates that a storage facility (reservoir) will be needed to serve this area for firefighting and emergency water supply purposes in addition to the construction of a distribution system (pipes and pumps). A new reservoir will require the purchase of property outside the URA 6D plan area that must meet specific size and elevation requirements.	Water infrastructure has been added to the Cost and Allocation tables in the Concept Plan.
Identify City of Tigard as a key service provider (Pages 2, 15, and 16).	Corrections have been added to the Final Concept Plan.
Parks	
Consider revising the approach to neighborhood parks. Leaving them out of the Funding Strategy may inhibit the city’s ability to build them (no funding source) or incentivize them (with SDC credits). Neighborhood parks are difficult to outright require as a condition of land use approval for many reasons.	Cost and Allocation tables as well as SDC calculations and tables have now incorporated neighborhood parks as an additional project.
Clarify whether the Community Park proposed in the area is included in the city’s existing SDC or CIP. There was some inconsistency in the document on this point.	Revisions to tables in the Concept plan clarify this.
Timing and Phasing of Development	
Clarify that the timing and phasing of development will also be affected by the timing and phasing of infrastructure (Page 2).	Text in Concept Plan has been revised to reflect this.

TAC Comments	Solutions and Responses
General	
<p>The funding strategy is too detailed and premature for this stage of planning without more thorough impact analysis to determine the needed infrastructure improvements. Remove the infrastructure cost allocation and supplemental fee estimates. The County will work with the City on a more detailed funding plan for needed infrastructure during the comprehensive planning phase once traffic analysis has been completed. The County's comments on the draft funding strategy should be considered and included in the funding strategy work to be done during the master planning phase.</p>	<p>The figures are preliminary and based on the best information available at this point. They are subject to change during the master planning phase of the project.</p> <p>After careful consideration, the project team felt it was beneficial to leave the funding strategy details in place.</p>
<p>Tigard reserves the right to conduct updates to its water system development charges (SDCs) and may impose "supplemental SDCs" on URA 6D or subareas. This is consistent with Tigard's practice that growth within certain areas of the Tigard Water Service Area fund its own water improvements serving that growth. A King City expansion was not included in the 2010 update and, therefore, was not part of any review or assessment of project capitalization necessary to serve such an expansion.</p>	<p>A note has been added to the concept plan regarding SDC charges.</p>
<p>Clarify what kind of fee is proposed for the "supplemental fee." This information is critical for understanding who will be paying for the infrastructure to serve future development in URA 6D (e.g. developers, existing residents, future residents, city, others) and when the money will be available for use.</p>	<p>The supplemental fee has been revised to show the individual areas of transportation, major sanitary sewer, water, and parks.</p>
<p>CWS reserves the right to conduct updates to its system development charges (SDCs) and may impose "supplemental SDCs" or "Regional Stormwater Management Charges" (RSMC) on URA 6D or subareas.</p>	<p>A note has been added to the concept plan regarding SDC charges.</p>
<p>Identify City of Tigard as a key service provider (Pages 2, 15, and 16).</p>	<p>Corrections have been added to the Final Concept Plan.</p>