



Area 93

Technical Advisory Committee

8:30 a.m. - 10:30 a.m. Monday, June 9, 2014

Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue Station #60

8585 NW Johnson St., Portland, OR 97229

MEETING SUMMARY

Members and alternates present:

Damon Reische, Clean Water Services

Greg Weisgerber, TVF&R

Steve Kelley, Washington County LRP - Transportation

Tim O'Brien, Metro

Aisha Willits, THPRD

Deric Weiss, TVF&R

Jennifer Garland, Beaverton School District

Stu Davis, TVWD

Victoria Saager, Washington County DLUT Operations

Members absent:

Tom Armstrong, City of Portland

Lindsey Nesbitt, Multnomah County

Anne Debbaut, DLCD

Robert Saxton, Washington County DLUT Engineering

Public present:

Brian Nelson

Staff/Consultants present:

Joy Chang, Washington County LRP

Suzanne Savin, Washington County LRP

Traci Shirley, Washington County LRP

1. Meeting Purpose:

- Review timeline and TAC meeting schedule for Area 93 Community Planning
- Review background information on Area 93 (existing conditions, and Multnomah County's 2009 Concept Plan)
- Review public feedback received at first Open House
- Discuss topic areas where TAC feedback is needed

2. Welcome and introduction - Suzanne Savin

Introduction:

TAC members shared what interests their agencies/jurisdictions had in Area 93.

Review agenda:

Suzanne Savin reviewed the items on the Agenda and gave a brief overview of Area 93. She noted that Area 93 was brought into the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) in 2002. Multnomah County prepared a preferred Concept Plan for the area in 2009, but the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners did not adopt the plan. After the Urban and Rural Reserves planning process, there was concern that urban services could not be provided to Area 93 without going through a Rural Reserve. After discussions between Multnomah and Washington County, an agreement was reached and the State of Oregon passed legislation that allowed Area 93 to be transferred Washington County on January 1, 2014. Washington County is now responsible for the urban planning of Area 93. The Washington County Board of Commissioners (BCC) would like the planning to be complete by the end of 2015.

Ground Rules and Procedures:

The role, responsibility, and TAC meeting guidelines were included in the meeting packet.

3. Area 93 Planning Timeline - Suzanne Savin

Ms. Savin explained that the TAC was projected to meet three to five times by the end of the year. The next meeting was scheduled for June 23rd. Feedback received from the public at the Area 93 open house in April will be used to guide staff in creating a revised draft plan that would be taken back to the public in late July. Staff plans to share the revised plan with the TAC on July 14th for comment before it goes back out to the public. There will be two Public Plan Refinement Workshops later this summer.

The Washington County Planning Commission (PC) will have some advisory meetings in the fall and after the PC provides recommendations, the recommendations will be shared with the TAC, possibly the week of Thanksgiving. There will be a final open house at the end of the year. The public will also have an opportunity to submit testimony on the plan to the PC and the BCC.

4. Area 93 Existing Conditions and Surrounding Context – Suzanne Savin

Ms. Savin used the pointer to highlight on large maps some of the existing conditions in Area 93. The maps were also included in the TAC packets. She highlighted housing densities near Area 93, possible future Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District (THPRD) parks and trails, the Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue (TVF&R) fire station under construction on Evergreen/Thompson, and the tributaries of Bronson Creek. She pointed out that most of Area 93 is in the Beaverton School District, with one parcel in the NW corner being part of the Portland Public School District.

Ms. Savin reviewed the Landslide Inventory map with the TAC. She noted that historic or active movement areas are on the north side of the creek and ancient land movement is on the south side. The steep slopes are centered around Bronson Creek and the creek tributaries. She continued by reviewing the LIDAR map showing the land contours under the tree canopy and the DSL map noting the wetland and drainage hazard areas. Since it is not always known where the stream centerline is, the drainage hazard buffers assume a 150 foot wide buffer on each side of the stream centerline.

The TAC asked if there were any restrictions on development near a drainage hazard area. Ms. Savin responded that when there is proposed development on property with a stream, it would trigger a requirement that the property owner would need an engineer to provide a report to determine where the stream and flood plain are located on the property.

It was noted that Washington County has not categorized the Area 93 Goal 5 resources to county standards. Pacific Habitat Services has been contracted to evaluate the area. Multnomah County did not complete a Goal 5 inventory for Area 93 during the concept planning because it was assumed that information would be completed during their community planning of the area. Washington County transferred over the 600-foot buffer that Multnomah County put on the main stream corridor, but the width of the buffer area could change after Pacific Habitat has evaluated the area. Preliminary information is due later in the summer.

5. Multnomah County's 2009 Concept Plan for Area 93 - Suzanne Savin

Elements of the Multnomah County Concept Plan were developed in 2009 during a four day public Charette that developed three alternatives. The planning commission gave direction to staff on revisions to the plan, but the Concept Plan was never approved by Multnomah County's Board of Commissioners.

The plan placed green space around the creeks and tributaries. A street network was proposed, and parkway streets with development on only one side of the street were proposed along the creeks. Medium to high density was planned for the central portion of the southern part of Area 93 with a small commercial node at the south end of the high-density area near Thompson Road. The plan shows a boulevard running north through the high-density area with a pedestrian-bicycle creek crossing at the

north end of the boulevard. The creek crossing bisects a planned trail that runs parallel to the creek west to east through Area 93.

Multnomah County estimated that 485 to 842 units could be built in Area 93. For the low estimate, Multnomah County assumed any lot with a house would not be redeveloped. The high-end number assumed that all of the lots with existing development would be redeveloped. When constrained lands such as stream corridors and steep slopes are subtracted out of the overall land area, the unit range proposed by Multnomah County averages at least 10 units per acre.

6. Public Feedback Received at Kick-off Open House - Suzanne Savin

The public attending the open house was asked what aspects of the Multnomah County Concept Plan they supported/did not support and why? More than 400 comments were received at the open house. The largest number of comments, approximately one-fourth, were related to density and land use designations proposed in the Concept Plan. Most of the comments supported lower density and single-family housing and opposed high density and multi-family housing. The second largest number of comments were in opposition to the proposed commercial node. Many comments noted that the businesses in the nearby small commercial node at Saltzman Road/Thompson Road have struggled. There was support for a community center in place of the commercial node in the concept plan.

There was support for a bicycle/pedestrian crossing over Bronson Creek. There was also support for a trail parallel to the creek, with suggestions for placement of the trail on the north side of the creek where slopes are less steep. Comments also supported a park in the north, but thought a park planned for the southern area should be closer to the creek.

Attendee comments for a creek crossing to link Marcotte Avenue to Laidlaw Road were mixed, with concern that the cost was not worth the benefit. Parkway streets also had mixed reviews. Many thought it was too costly for developers to offset the costs of development on only one-half of the street. On this topic, the Area 93 TAC representative for THPRD noted that parkway streets are also expensive for THPRD and there are issues working out deals with developers for parkway streets. THPRD does not build half-streets and does not pay for right-of-ways.

7. Topic Areas for TAC Feedback - Suzanne Savin

The TAC was asked if the agencies/jurisdictions they represent had a minimum density that would be needed to provide services to Area 93. THPRD, Beaverton School District, and TVF&R did not state the need for a minimum density. Tualatin Valley Water District (TVWD) noted that expansion was developer driven. Work currently being done on the waterline on the north side of Area 93 to upgrade current pressure and ensure adequate infrastructure for expansion. TVWD Infrastructure on Thompson Road, on the south side of Area 93, is adequate for the future.

The TAC discussed density requirements for Area 93, the State of Oregon Metropolitan Housing Rule, and Title 11 requirements for affordable housing. The State's Metro Housing Rule requires the urban unincorporated part of Washington County to average at least 8 units per acre countywide. The Multnomah County Concept Plan reflects some proposed densities that differ from the current nearby neighborhoods. There was also discussion on how density was calculated (net versus gross land area) and what lands were and were not included in Multnomah County's calculations. It was noted that lands to the north and east of Area 93 are Rural Reserves. It was suggested that property lines be used when revising the plan.

Several TAC members noted that a financial plan for projected costs would be useful, but added that developers will pay many of the infrastructure costs. The costs must pencil out for developers. The

THPRD representative stated that as the price of land increases, they can buy less land for the same amount of money. TAC members noted that it would be important to know how much it will cost to fix Thompson Road and Laidlaw Road. A transportation analysis by location/cost may not be available until the fall. The location of development can also affect infrastructure costs for stormwater. The Clean Water Services representative noted that new hydromodification requirements may apply to Area 93. These requirements call for larger retention facilities, which may also affect costs for Clean Water Services.

There was discussion on the impact of Area 93 development on the capacity of the Beaverton School District and future needs for schools. The Beaverton School District representative stated according to a 2012 PSU Population Data Center report, there is enough capacity in the system for grade school and middle school levels for the next few years. In 2014 the voters passed a construction and improvement bond for the school district and a new high school will be built in the southwestern portion of the school district. Enrollment projections show that additional capacity will be needed at the elementary and high school levels by 2025. The Beaverton School District representative noted the school district would like to see if there is a suitable site for a future high school in this area.

The THPRD representative noted that park sites should be at least 3.5 acres, be walkable and not located near arterials. THPRD is currently evaluating what parks currently exist south of Area 93 to determine park needs for Area 93.

Transportation issues centered on connectivity and how the road system will affect TVF&R. TVF&R would like to have good connectivity between the north and south halves of Area 93 and access for the fire equipment, but as long as there is access to the northern and southern parts of Area 93, they could work with alternatives. A crossing over the creek would be beneficial. Two access points would be needed in addition to a water supply. A new fire station servicing the area will be open by late August. TVF&R did not discuss how the new station would affect distance and response times for Area 93.

8. Public Comment - Suzanne Savin

Area 93 property owner Brian Nelson asked what happens if there is a park on the concept plan and the area around the park does not develop. Ms. Savin answered that the parks would be placed where they make sense. Parks in Area 93 will likely be treated similarly as North Bethany, with underlying land use designations and the park designation as an overlay.

Ms. Savin asked the TAC to provide any additional information or concerns that staff should be aware of as the concept plan is revised. An email will be sent out to determine if TAC members would be available if a meeting was scheduled on November 24, 2014.

The TAC voted that the scheduled June 23rd meeting did not need to be held. The next scheduled meeting would be on July 14, 2014

No	Action Item	Responsible	Due date	Closed
1	Provide feedback to project team regarding potential TAC meeting on November 24, 2014	TAC	06/30/14	√
2	Provide additional information to staff by phone or email lutplanning@co.washington.or.us.	TAC	06/30/14	√

Summary prepared by Traci Shirley