

Date March 16, 2018

Subject King City URA 6D Concept Plan

From Urbsworks, Inc.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Response to Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Comments on Preliminary Draft Concept Plan

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 Memo*, (Leland Consulting Group, December 2017). The table below describes the comments received and lists the project team's response. Comments related to the Funding Strategy are attached as a cover sheet to the Funding Strategy Memo.

TAC Comments	Responses
Natural Systems	
Use a range for the natural area constraints.	Revised. Discussion of developable land is now described as a range on page 29.
There are several factors that may have caused erosion, including soil type, climate change, agricultural practices, property owner land-use practices, as well as development.	Text has been revised.
Add to the assessment list: Complete the local wetland Inventory (LWI) and significant natural resources Inventory (SNR). City may want to consider a tree protection plan and the DOGAMI hazard map study for area.	Revised. New text has been added to page 29.
Land Use	
"Rural neighborhood" name is inappropriate for urban area.	Revised to "rural <i>character</i> neighborhood" and "rural <i>character</i> street".
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."	Revised.
The concept plan should be more specific about needed density and community vision/goals.	Language has been revised.
Proposed land uses in the southwestern corner of the URA are not clearly identified, which makes it difficult to plan for development impacts.	Maps and text have been revised to describe land use of southwest corner of the study area, including medium density residential and campus-style employment or institutional uses.
Include the approximate number of housing units and commercial square footages anticipated for neighborhood subareas.	New table on page 40 shows a summary of dwelling unit type and density by neighborhood.

TAC Comments	Responses
Include more detail about Beef Bend greenspace, how it is provided and maintained.	New text has been added to page 48, clarifying a mix of right-of-way, linear park and setback.
Consider adding tree protection plan language in park section.	Tree protection is discussed as a potential next step on page 29.
Transportation	
The County remains concerned about mobility within and around the concept plan study area. Local mobility should not rely on county arterial. Plan should develop strategy for how and when Fischer extension will be constructed.	Anne Sylvester (SCJ Alliance) is coordinating with Washington County to develop King City URA 6D Traffic Analysis package. This will be submitted as an accompaniment to the Concept Plan and should address these concerns.
Gravel shoulder design of rural character street wouldn't meet ADA and TPR requirements.	Clarification provided.
The Spacing Standards should specify that Washington County only permits arterial or collector streets to intersect with arterial streets.	Clarification provided.
Show map that includes OR 99W and major streets that connect to study area.	King City URA 6D Traffic Analysis package will show this map in greater detail.
Public Utilities and Services	
Clarify water service challenges and timeline. Include information about the need for a storage facility (reservoir). A significant amount of water infrastructure is needed.	Additional narrative has been provided to "planned system improvements" in the Base Conditions section on page 24 and "future service needs" in the Public Utilities Framework section on page 77.
The provision of water service to URA 6D, including funding and construction, needs to be carefully evaluated and realistically integrated into the development phasing timeline proposed by the Concept Plan.	Additional narrative has been provided to "planned system improvements" on page 24 and "future service needs" section on page 77.
Service providers, such as Tigard and CWS, may impose supplemental SDCs on plan area or subareas.	New text has been added to page 85.
High-flow bypass pipe in south River Terrace down to the Tualatin River is no longer a recommended project.	Corrected.
Sanitary and storm conveyance needs to be developed with the transportation projects	Text has been revised.
Update narrative in Sanitary Constraints section. Small developer pump stations are unlikely. Other than the currently planned Roy Rogers Rd PS, CWS has not completed the analysis for the pipe conveyance nor future PS layout.	Revised. Gravity-fed nodes with occasional pump stations are described as the preferred option.

TAC Comments	Responses
Update language for storm drainage planned improvements. CWS stormwater management approaches optimize upland controls and enhance the natural resources to protect the water quality of the Tualatin River basin through a variety of tools, including grey infrastructure, green infrastructure and natural resource enhancements.	Text has been revised.
Update language in Storm Constraints section – Incorporate description of stormwater management approaches. DSL/ACE (not CWS) regulate impacts to wetlands and waterways.	Revised.
Remove photo of Bethany Creek Falls (center). That facility is using active control, not passive control (update caption). Second call-out could be re-worded to “Stormwater Management Approaches” and don’t use “regional stormwater retention pond” Update 3 rd call out to “stormwater facility adjacent to a protected wetland”	Partially revised. Captions have been updated on page 30. The project team chose to keep photo because the section is showing examples of nature protected from development and incorporated into development. New text is intended to clarify.
Show more flexibility in sanitary/sewer maps and graphics. CWS has not completed the analysis for the pipe conveyance nor future pump station (PS) layout. In order to be flexible, the sanitary conveyance will be planned and constructed with the transportation projects. Remove graphic showing pump stations (option 2).	Section has been revised. Option 2 graphic has been removed. New language clarifies that designs are preliminary and will need to be coordinated with CWS, transportation projects and others.
Update language – don’t use “detention” or “retention” and clarify what Low Impact Development Approaches (LIDA) are.	“Stormwater management” text (formerly “stormwater detention”) has been revised on page 79.
Individual pump stations are unlikely. Pump stations as well as pipe layout and configuration will be determined later.	Text clarifies that gravity option is preferred and Option 2 map has been removed.
Remove pump station and sanitary/sewer icons on the Infrastructure Projects graphic. Too detailed and not known at this point.	Revised. Infrastructure projects map has been removed entirely.
Planning for development of the area should consider transportation and water infrastructure to support emergency response needs. Update topography, water infrastructure and emergency response sections.	Text has been revised per TVF&R recommendations.
Timing and Phasing of Development	
Address how annexation will proceed if development begins on the western portion of the URA. An annexation strategy will need to be developed in coordination with the County.	See new and revised text on pages 87-88 as part of the development phasing section.
Revise text regarding County land use designations within the URA (phase 2 section). 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).	Text has been revised.