



LAND USE & TRANSPORTATION MEMORANDUM

Planning and Development Services

To: Marcy McInnelly and Erika Warhus, King City Consultants

From: Jessica Pelz, Senior Planner, Washington County
John Floyd, Associate Planner, Washington County

Date: January 26, 2018

Subject: King City URA 6D Draft Concept Plan and Funding Strategy

We appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on the January 2018 Preliminary Draft Concept Plan and Funding Strategy for King City Urban Reserve Area (URA) 6D. The County is a transportation service provider with both arterial and collector roadways within and bordering the concept plan area, and is currently the land use authority for the area within the plan study area. In addition, Metro Code Title 11 requires the County and city to coordinate on a concept plan for the urban reserve prior to its addition in the UGB. The King City concept plan project has been a large undertaking with many diverse elements to consider, and the city and consultant team have done a great job of responding to County and other stakeholder feedback along the way.

Staff's primary concern is that the draft funding strategy has fundamental flaws and should not be included in the concept plan. It is premature at this stage of the concept plan process to specify a preferred methodology and fee calculations for needed infrastructure. Metro Code Title 11 requires preliminary estimates for infrastructure improvements and proposed methods to finance the needed infrastructure. The draft funding strategy does a good job at identifying the various methods that could be used to fund infrastructure, and this part of the report should be retained and used for the concept plan. 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. For concept plan purposes, preliminary cost estimates for transportation infrastructure should assume that Beef Bend will need to be upsized along the entire adjacent frontage. The County will work with the city on a more detailed infrastructure funding plan during the comprehensive planning phase of the project after the area is added to the UGB, in accordance with Metro Code Title 11 (3.07.1120(c)(8)).

The County remains concerned about mobility within and around the concept plan study area. On page 27 of the concept plan, a north-south collector connection north of URA 6D (in URA 6C) provides mobility for early phase development, and says that "ultimately" an east-west collector will be built. However, the plan cannot rely upon a north-south collector connection for mobility when the area needed for the roadway north of Beef Bend is still within the urban reserve. The north-south collector within the plan area would connect to Beef Bend Road (and ultimately connect with River Terrace Boulevard), so while this will provide internal mobility, the trips will all go to Beef Bend. Local mobility should not rely upon a county arterial. The east-west collector is an important piece of this concept plan and should be addressed more strongly. The plan indicates that the Fischer Road extension will be the primary east-west collector through the plan area (as a "green boulevard"); however, Fischer Road goes through Rivermeade, which is the area expected to develop last. Given the need for an east-west collector to help with mobility so that all trips do not rely upon Beef Bend, the plan should develop a strategy for how and when the Fischer extension will be constructed.



LAND USE & TRANSPORTATION MEMORANDUM

Planning and Development Services

In addition to the primary concerns outlined above, the County offers the following comments on the draft concept plan and draft funding strategy.

Comments on the preliminary draft concept plan:

- General Comment – Use of the term “rural neighborhood” to describe future development inside the UGB is not advised. It is inconsistent with how the terms rural and urban are commonly applied within the Oregon land use system, and may result in future confusion and false expectations regarding the meaning and intent of the concept plan and future master planning. Recommend the word “rural” be reserved for the documentation of existing conditions within the URA, and/or lands within rural reserves outside of but adjacent to the URA.
- Pages 16 and 97 - Use of the term “County Zoning” is functionally clear but technically inaccurate. Please note that the County has adopted a one-map system with “land use districts” instead of zones. Suggest changing the term “County Zoning” to “County Land Use Districts.”
- Page 21 – The Spacing Standards section should say that Washington County only permits arterial or collector streets to intersect with arterial streets (add arterial).
- Page 27 – The Land Use section says that “...enough new dwelling units can be provided in a way that meets community vision and goals.” What does this mean? The concept plan should be more specific about needed density and community vision/goals.
- Page 35 – As noted, “rural neighborhood” is a misnomer within the urban area. We have concerns that a rural character street standard with gravel shoulders would not meet ADA and TPR requirements. In addition, Fischer Road is projected to go through the “rural neighborhood”, but will need to be fully improved to collector street standards to meet its intended function.
- Pages 35-39, 86-87 - Proposed land uses in the southwestern corner of the URA are not clearly identified, which makes it difficult to plan for development impacts. Recommend the refinement of the “Main Street/Town Center” Neighborhood map and description (Page 34), or the creation of a new neighborhood profile to address proposed land uses and land use patterns within this subarea.
- Pages 37-39 – Recommend the neighborhood descriptions include the approximate number of housing units and commercial square footages anticipated for these subareas.
- Page 46 – The Beef Bend Neighborhood is referenced as having a wide greenspace separating the neighborhood from the street – the concept plan should address how this greenspace will be provided? Is it envisioned as being right-of-way, a linear park, or a land use setback? How will maintenance of this greenspace be provided? These details will help guide the detailed planning and TSP/Code amendments necessary to implement the concept plan.
- Pages 85-87 – The concept plan should address how annexation will proceed if development begins on the western portion of the URA, which is presently noncontiguous with your existing city boundary. An annexation strategy will need to be developed in coordination with the County and applicable service districts during the comprehensive planning phase.



LAND USE & TRANSPORTATION MEMORANDUM

Planning and Development Services

- Page 87 – The second paragraph contains a misleading statement regarding County land use designations within the URA. When lands are brought into the UGB by Metro, the County assigns an interim land use designation of Future Development 20-Acre District (FD-20). The purpose of this district is to provide for limited and interim uses until such time as the land is annexed into the city, in compliance with Section 3.07.1130 of the Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan.

Comments on the draft Funding Strategy:

As stated above, the funding strategy is too detailed and premature for this stage of planning without more thorough impact analysis to determine the needed infrastructure improvements. The funding strategy should be revised to 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 comprehensive planning phase.

- 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.
- 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. 150th would not be considered off-site).
- 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 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.
- The funding strategy cannot assume that MSTIP will pay for the Beef Bend improvements from 150th to Hwy 99W. As noted above, 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.
- Improvements to Elsner Road (Washington County collector) Roy Rogers Road (Washington County arterial), and Fischer Road (Washington County collector) are not addressed.
- 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.
- Any supplemental transportation fees should be coordinated with the existing Washington County TDT.