

## **Public comment report**

Public comments on city expansion proposals for the 2018 growth management decision

August 2018

### **APPENDIX A: COMMENTS RECEIVED, EMAIL**

From: **Tamara Cooper** <[tjcooper16@gmail.com](mailto:tjcooper16@gmail.com)>  
Date: Wed, May 30, 2018 at 6:08 PM  
Subject: ugb  
To: Tammy Cooper <[tjcooper16@gmail.com](mailto:tjcooper16@gmail.com)>

May 30, 2018

Ms. Martha Bennett  
Chief Operating Officer  
Metro  
600 Grand Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97232

**Subject: Support for inclusion of Cooper Mountain Urban Reserves in the UGB and City of Beaverton**

Dear Ms. Bennett:

We are writing to you regarding the issue of the expansion of the UGB. Combined we have lived in the Hiteon and Cooper Mtn. areas for over 34 years. After attending meetings and viewing Cooper Mtn. Development plans, it is clear that the city is prepared to develop the urban reserve. We are surrounded by condominiums and crowded neighborhoods. Our growing city needs a balance of high density and low density housing, i.e. Portland Heights/Forest Park areas. Expanding the UGB would provide for those types of neighborhoods. We hope you will consider expanding the UGB to include the Cooper Mtn area.

Tim & Tammy Cooper  
17690 SW Skyline Woods LN  
Beaverton, Oregon 97007  
South Slopes of Cooper Mountain near new Mountain View High School

CC: Denny Doyle, Mayor, City of Beaverton  
Brian Martin, Long Range Planning, City of Beaverton  
Members of Hawks Ridge Owners Association

**New feedback form submission:** submitted on Monday, June 11, 2018 - 5:30pm

First name: Francesca

Last name: Anton

[francescairena@gmail.com](mailto:francescairena@gmail.com)

**Subject: Portland Tribune "Four Cities..." article**

Comment or question:

Hello! Just finished reading this article and would like to make one comment. "WE NEED TO STOP BUILDING SINGLE FAMILY HOMES AS THE CITY SPREAD OUT!!!" I think it would be wise to start thinking about the 'woonerf' concept of neighborhood building, which includes dense housing on top of shops, small community centers, communal living, the new concept of 'dorm' living that is taking off all around the country, etc. ....all with big, canopy trees and habitat/garden/open spaces. Small manufacturing of things people can make and use right where they live. Like the French villages so popular to us visitors. Please, people who move into these new single family developments with teeny yards, no place for canopy trees, etc. are sterile environments that people want to LEAVE as soon as they can. I live in the McLoughlin Neighborhood in Oregon City and I can't tell you how many people who bought into our newest housing developments (which are far from anything) are now looking for a home in this neighborhood because they hate the social environment where they live! Beaverton, Sunnyside, Wilsonville....all a waste of good farming land because the developers want to build cheap and quick. Please INSIST any new development be sustainable, livable, dense without unnecessary cement and steel....and humanizing, for heaven's sake. It is a crime that we are covering up topsoil that is 100+ feet deep---this land should never, never be taken out of it's ability to provide food locally. When are we going to stop behaving like compromised do-gooders and get the right kind of job done? That photo in the newspaper tells it all, ugly green boxes (think Malvina Reynolds' "Little Boxes" song, an ugly fence separating the house from everything else, and a back hoe tearing up more precious farmland...please STOP! Thanks for lending your ear, Cheers, Francesca Anton

From: White, Melody J CIV USARMY CENWP (US) [<mailto:Melody.J.White@usace.army.mil>]

Sent: Friday, June 15, 2018 11:47 AM

To: 2040 <[2040@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:2040@oregonmetro.gov)>

Cc: Davis, Jaimee W CIV USARMY CENWP (US) <[Jaimee.W.Davis@usace.army.mil](mailto:Jaimee.W.Davis@usace.army.mil)>; White, Melody J CIV USARMY CENWP (US) <[Melody.J.White@usace.army.mil](mailto:Melody.J.White@usace.army.mil)>; Friesen, Kinsey M CIV USARMY CENWP (US) <[Kinsey.M.Friesen@usace.army.mil](mailto:Kinsey.M.Friesen@usace.army.mil)>; Bond, Carrie L CIV USARMY CENWP (US) <[Carrie.L.Bond@usace.army.mil](mailto:Carrie.L.Bond@usace.army.mil)>

Subject: USACE comments on 2018 growth management plan for Metro

Importance: High

To Whom it May Concern:

The US Army Corps of Engineers, Portland District Regulatory Branch would like to comment on the 2018 growth management plan for Metro, including the submitted proposals for Beaverton - Cooper Mountain, Hillsboro - Witch Hazel Village South, King City - Beef Bend South, and Wilsonville - Advance Road (Frog Pond).

The applicant should start conversations with the Corps prior to finalizing any plans for these areas if wetlands and waters of the US are located on the property. NWI and local inventory maps should not be the only resource used to identify wetlands on the sites, onsite wetland delineations should be used to confirm the presence or absence of wetlands prior to the formulation of master plans for these communities. The Corp uses wetland delineations to determine potential waters of the US, which only the agency can determine. Thus, all potential aquatic resources, including but not limited to waters, wetlands, drainage, roadside ditches, and/or swales should be included.

The Corps has jurisdiction over waters of the US, which includes wetlands. The Applicant must first look at avoidance and minimization of waters of the U.S. The Corps will then evaluate whether the Applicant has avoided and minimized impacts as much as possible and if so, what would be appropriate compensatory mitigation for unavoidable impacts. The Corps' decision to issue a permit for wetland or waterway impacts, issue with conditions, or deny the request will be based upon an evaluation of the probable impacts including cumulative impacts of the proposal and its intended use on the public interest. During this review, the benefits, which may reasonably be expected to accrue from the proposal, are balanced against its reasonably foreseeable detriments.

For activities involving 404 discharges, a permit will be denied if the associated discharge does not comply with the Environmental Protection Agency's 404(b) (1) guidelines (Guidelines). The Guidelines are binding regulations and provide the substantive environmental standards by which all Section 404 permit applications are evaluated. The Guidelines specifically require that:

"no discharge of dredged or fill material shall be permitted if there is a practicable alternative to the proposed discharge which would have less adverse impact on the aquatic ecosystem, so long as the alternative does not have other significant adverse effects." This would include different road routes and building/development locations.

This provision means that the destruction of an area of waters of the U.S., including special aquatic sites (e.g., wetlands), should be avoided. The Guidelines have been written to provide an added degree of discouragement for non-water dependent activities proposed to be located in special aquatic sites. An activity is non-water dependent if the activity does not require access or proximity to, or siting within a

special aquatic site to fulfill its basic project purpose. For non-water dependent activities, practicable alternatives that do not involve special aquatic sites are presumed to be available unless clearly demonstrated otherwise. In addition, practicable alternatives that do not involve discharges into special aquatic sites are presumed to have less adverse impact on the aquatic environment unless clearly demonstrated otherwise. The burden of proving no practicable alternative exists is the sole responsibility of the applicant.

If you have additional questions or would like to further coordinate, please contact us at the address below.

Melody White  
Project Manager, Regulatory Branch  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers - Portland District  
333 S.W. First Avenue, P.O. Box 2946  
Portland, OR 97208-2946  
Phone: 503-808-4385 | Cell: 503-201-0797 | Fax: 503-808-4375  
[Melody.J.White@usace.army.mil](mailto:Melody.J.White@usace.army.mil)

**From:** Cynthia Mooney [<mailto:katwmn1@mac.com>]  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 23, 2018 12:44 PM  
**To:** Clifford Higgins <[Clifford.Higgins@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:Clifford.Higgins@oregonmetro.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: Making SW Fischer Rd a thru street

No worries. Yes, SW Fischer Rd in King City. There is a proposed thoroughfare extending Fischer through the newly annexed area of farm land and homes.

Sent from my Smarty phone

On Jun 23, 2018, at 11:21 AM, Clifford Higgins <[Clifford.Higgins@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:Clifford.Higgins@oregonmetro.gov)> wrote:

Ms. Mooney:

Thank you for contacting Metro with your concerns. Unfortunately, I need to ask for a clarification, as I am not finding information about Fischer Road in any plans currently soliciting public comment, and I want to make sure the right people see your comment.

Am I right in thinking this is the SW Fischer Road in King City? Could you clarify where you found the information proposing the road as a thoroughfare?

I apologize for not being able to track this down myself.

Thank you,

Clifford

**Clifford Higgins**  
Communications manager  
Planning and development

Metro | [oregonmetro.gov](http://oregonmetro.gov)  
600 NE Grand Ave.  
Portland, OR 97232-2736  
503-797-1932

**From:** Mooney [<mailto:katwmn1@mac.com>] **On Behalf Of** Metro  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 21, 2018 2:47 PM  
**To:** feedback <[feedback@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:feedback@oregonmetro.gov)>  
**Subject:** Making SW Fischer Rd a thru street

**New feedback form submission:** submitted on Thursday, June 21, 2018 - 2:47pm

First name: Cindy

Last name: Mooney

[katwmn1@mac.com](mailto:katwmn1@mac.com)

**Subject: Making SW Fischer Rd a thru street**

Comment or question:

I own a home on Fischer Rd in the Edgewater development. Fischer is already the ONLY entrance and exit to this neighborhood as none of the other possibilities have been opened and are still gated. We already have an unusually high number of vehicles on this street unchecked. Making this a thoroughfare will cause so many issues and make the issues we already have worse.

Vehicles already go way above the posted limit. The number of vehicles going through will dump our property values and if the local pd can't take care of us now, how will adding hundreds of more cars a day without fixing the infrastructure help? Improving through streets we already have would be a better use of funds.

**New feedback form submission:** submitted on Sunday, June 24, 2018 - 12:10am

First name: Brenda

Last name: Moorman

[moorbj4@comcast.net](mailto:moorbj4@comcast.net)

**Subject: King City Urban Growth**

Comment or question:

I live in the King City Edgewater community & am voicing my opposition to the proposed urban growth plan submitted by the council. I am especially distressed over the plan to expand Fischer Rd to Roy Rogers. I live very close to Fischer Rd & feel it is reprehensible to allow this to happen. Not only will it destroy this quaint, quiet, friendly neighborhood but the entire community of Rivermeade. It will also decimate wildlife, trees, & surrounding countryside, & how can a road be built under powerlines?

The expense of this project will be astronomical which will eventually filter down to us, the taxpayers. I cannot afford any more taxes.

I pray you will do what is right & not allow this road expansion.

Thank you.

**From:** Dickoff, Diane J [<mailto:diane.j.dickoff@intel.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, June 27, 2018 11:12 AM

**To:** 2040

**Subject:** Urban Growth Boundary

Metro appears to be run by developers, cities, and Washington County. No input, care or concern for unincorporated Washington County citizens.

Regarding the growth in south cooper mountain everything I read and the people who were given information about plans, meetings, and input were all in the area planned for addition to Beaverton. Unincorporated areas to the north have been left in the dark...except for seeing the destruction of our area to improve the new areas.

All that new growth will severely impact the north side (the actual north side and not the north side the plan discussed). No one cares about the areas in unincorporated Washington County.

Unincorporated areas will be voting no on any measure that our input and livability is not included. How much you grow does not matter. The growth is already severely impacted our area with no concern from Washington County and Metro. We pay the taxes with no representation from either Washington County or Metro.

1. Waste of taxpayer money (example \$1.7million for 6 studio low-income apartments that is taxpayer money and does not follow the Fair Housing Act)
2. No-bid contracts and same developers every time building low-income housing
3. The ever changing "facts?" from Washington County
4. Disregard for the requirements to meet the Fair Housing Act especially in low-income housing and even more so when using taxpayer money
5. Businesses first, citizens last
6. No improvement to existing areas in fact harm them to improve new development areas. Infill destroys neighborhoods but no one cares. Just make sure the new developments have nice streets, parks, play areas, roads. And take away all the positives from the unincorporated areas.
7. No plans for the huge increase in traffic to the north of Cooper Mountain
8. The destruction of Aloha for the benefit of Tigard/Hillsboro
9. No low-income housing in all the new development. Instead put all the low-income in the Aloha area and unincorporated Washington County. The value of our homes decrease while you make sure the new areas are where people want to live.
10. Be innovative (look to other areas that are successful) that does not include bulldozing and destroying existing areas.
11. Road improvements first and not an afterthought. Asking Washington County what their plans are for all the cars heading north over Cooper Mountain...their plans stop at the top of the hill. No plans for the unincorporated areas of Cooper Mountain. We again have no input and we will feel on the pain.

I think we need to vote out all the Washington County Commissioners and do away with Metro.

**From:** marsha wahl [<mailto:mlwahl@hotmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 28, 2018 6:13 PM  
**To:** 2040 <[2040@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:2040@oregonmetro.gov)>  
**Subject:** Sw brook wood and urban growth.

I have visited our son in law and daughter over the years, they have two homes on and at the end of brookwood. The growth plan to in large for more homes is ambitious!! Taking your beautiful farmland to expand is the Wrong way to go! Once you give up this valuable ground, it's lost forever. And won't build up any of the existing Nieghborhoods. Perhaps you should address the whole cities picture. Some of the older Nieghbor hoods can be improved upon, and vacant lots filled in.

**From:** Karl S [<mailto:kfshl12@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 04, 2018 11:36 AM  
**To:** Tom Hughes; Shirley Craddick; Betty Dominguez; Craig Dirksen; Kathryn Harrington; Sam Chase; Bob Stacey  
**Cc:** 2040  
**Subject:** Your "fact sheet" is not factual. Metro spreads fake news:

<https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2018/06/08/growth-decision-2018-factsheet-cityproposals-060818.pdf>

Under the King City proposal, you report "The mayor and city council have led an outreach effort to ensure its residents have had the chance to weigh in on planning the new urban area."

This is not factual. Actually the mayor and city council fought to keep King City residents from recording their nearly 90-percent opposition to expansion by going to court to block our citizen petition.

I want to go on record as opposing expansion of King City. If the planned area is to be expanded it should be by the City of Tigard.

Sheila Kirkwood

12085 S.W. King Richard Drive

King City, Oregon 97224

**From:** Sheila Kirkwood <[shi1king@aol.com](mailto:shi1king@aol.com)>

**Date:** July 4, 2018 at 12:26:05 PM PDT

**To:** [tom.hughes@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:tom.hughes@oregonmetro.gov),  
[shirley.craddick@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:shirley.craddick@oregonmetro.gov), [betty.dominguez@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:betty.dominguez@oregonmetro.gov),  
[craig.dirksen@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:craig.dirksen@oregonmetro.gov), [kathryn.harrington@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:kathryn.harrington@oregonmetro.gov),  
[sam.chase@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:sam.chase@oregonmetro.gov), [bob.stacey@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:bob.stacey@oregonmetro.gov)

**Subject:** As a 20-year resident I beg you to please reject King City proposal to expand

Councilors:

As a 20-year resident I beg you to please reject King City proposal to expand for several reasons, three of which I list below:

CITY COUNCIL DOES NOT WANT PUBLIC SURVEY NOR PUBLIC VOTE ON IT. Since December of 2016, the City Council was asked or urged multiple times to conduct a complete survey of its citizens regarding its efforts to expand. They ignored or refused the requests each time and finally fought us in court. That's right, they actually fought us in court! King City governmental actions do not represent its citizens. The King City manager is hostile to citizens who object to the plan and knows his plan will not stand up under public scrutiny.

FISCHER ROAD EXPANSION WILL MORE THAN DOUBLE TRAFFIC NEAR MY HOME, AND NEGATIVELY IMPACT SAFETY OF ALL OUR SENIOR AGE DRIVERS. The King City planned expansion calls for extension of SW Fischer Road from SW 131st Avenue all the way to Roy Rogers Road. The proposed expansion area estimates 7,300 to 18,800 new residents. The quiet King City and recently UGB addition of the Edgewater area, can not accommodate this increased traffic.

LOSS OF ACCESS TO CITY GOVERNMENT AND BUILDINGS. We are a quiet senior age community and use our golf carts on the roads for accessing services. Besides the safety issue of added traffic, the plan calls for moving the City Center to Roy Rogers Road. That will essentially make it unreachable for almost all the senior age residents of King City.

Sheila Kirkwood

12085 S.W. King Richard Drive

King City, Oregon 97224

**From:** "Yvonne Johnson" <[ylh1972@gmail.com](mailto:ylh1972@gmail.com)>

**Date:** July 6, 2018 at 12:10:22 PM PDT

**To:** <[tom.hughes@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:tom.hughes@oregonmetro.gov)>

**Subject:** Urban Reserve Area 6D Concept Plan

Dear Mr. Hughes,

Thank you for taking the time to read this message I have prepared for your consideration. Your service on the Metro Counsel is appreciated and I hope you make your decisions with an open mind, listening to all of the input before making careful decisions. To that objective, I present the following:

I respectfully request your consideration of my concerns outlined here when studying King City's Urban Reserve Area 6D Concept Plan to extending its current boundary of 137<sup>th</sup> Avenue west to Roy Rogers Road.

I am not currently a resident of King City but I'm passionate about honesty in government and assistance to the elderly. I will be affected by the Concept Plan as I presently live within the area being proposed. It is to this end I present the following concerns about the King City expansion plan.

Although the current residents of King City will not be allowed to vote on the proposal there has been no attempt to ensure all current residents are properly aware of this plan which affects their livability. Open House meetings have been organized and newspaper articles written; however, individual mailings have not been done nor has any attempt been made to speak with residents who are unable to easily leave their home. Many residents are unable to get out to attend the meetings. Maybe it's just me, but I believe every avenue possible should have been taken to ensure all residents were notified and their opinions considered regarding this gigantic undertaking by such a small city. King City was incorporated in 1966 and finished the 263-acre development in 1978. Since that time the residents have enjoyed the quaint neighborhoods and convenient shopping which served this older population well. It was comfortable. Another area of non-age-restricted homes was added much later not affecting the original core area. The newest plan includes establishing a Town Center with open areas, shops and, most alarming, a new City Hall and Police Department located approximately 5 miles from the current city core. Many current residents are senior citizens and don't drive as much as younger people, especially on 5 lane divided avenues as proposed in the plan. Many depend on golf carts as their means of transportation within the city.

The existing population of the original King City are for the most part senior citizens living on fixed incomes. They are conscious of all expenses. I believe the City council has presented their concept plan in a very deceptive manner. They assert that residents will not see one dime of increased property tax, as State law prevents them from raising taxes. State law says the tax rate may not change. However, the assessed value may increase up to 3% per year. The improvements included in the concept plan will most certainly cause an increase in current assessed values, thus an increase in property tax. This has not been explained above the answer of "it will not cost residents a dime..." The proposed community center will require funds for purchase of the property as well as construction of the buildings. This will require a Bond Measure to be presented for a vote. Considering the number of families planned for in this development, it appears that a new school would also be necessary, which would again require a bond measure for building and operation and become another tax increase. After completion of this project, the population of the original King City will be a small percent of the population of the new King

City, thus it is quite possible the project will be approved even if the original residents object. The increased assessed value of the properties and bond measures costs will also cause an increase in their taxes. This is far beyond the "will not cost you a dime" message they are receiving. The estimated cost of the project has more than doubled since it was first presented, and no detailed plan has been proposed or presented yet. I fear the eventual cost of development will be astronomical. We are told the funding will come from new development, but, developers have not been secured.

If for no other reason than the deception, I believe this plan should not be approved by Metro Council.

King City does not have the necessary experienced staff to properly manage the negotiations required for execution of this concept plan. A project of the magnitude of the King City Concept Plan requires an experienced and knowledgeable staff in management of development. Through my interaction with the King City staff, I don't believe they have the required expertise. King City already relies on surrounding cities as Tigard and Sherwood for the most basic services. Their plan indicates an even further reliance on outside cities and agencies. Outside talent could be used, but the funds are not available to secure this assistance.

After completion of the project I question the ability of the current King City leadership to properly manage the new "King City". They recently purchased an older model pickup and hired one individual to become the Public Works Department. The Highlands neighborhood was annexed into King City approximately 2 years ago with the promise their streets would be repaired. No repair has occurred yet because of funding. A large beaver dam at the south end of King City Park caused Tualatin River water to run into the park. They simply removed the dam, triggering a large portion of the bank to collapse into the river. A better solution would have been to secure the services ODF&W and Tualatin Riverkeepers, or someone familiar with ecology and hydraulic engineering for advice on how to mitigate the issue.

For these reasons, I believe another city might be better equipped to properly develop and manage any expansion plan.

With the Riverview Terrace development in full swing, the traffic situation in the area is approaching overwhelming. The expansion of Roy Rogers and Beef Bend to 5 lanes will further aggravate the existing bottleneck intersections at Beef Bend and Roy Rogers, Beef Bend and Hwy 99, and Fischer Road and Hwy 99.

The people moving into the new developments will need to work. Where will that be? At a CPO meeting I asked if there had been any thought to mass transit and the answer was that is up to Tri Met. Currently Tri Met does not run on Roy Rogers or Beef Bend. Tri Met only runs on Hwy 99. Consequently, all the residents of River Terrace, Current King City and the new King City Concept Plan will all need to take personal autos to and from their destination.

Because things like traffic projections are only guesses (and often grossly inaccurate guesses, at that), I believe any further development should be postponed until the near completion of River Terrace.

I am a resident of a unique bedroom community just west of the current King City limits. Rivermeade was created in July 1948 when Herrel C. Throop and his wife, Myrtle filed with the Washington County Clerk, a sub-division map consisting of some 58 parcels, bounded to the north by Beef Bend Road, to the south by the Tualatin River, to the east by Watson Road (now SW 137<sup>th</sup> Avenue), and to the west by

Myrtle Road (now SW Myrtle Ave.). In October 1953, the Rivermeade Community Club, Inc. was founded as an Oregon Nonprofit Corporation by some of Rivermeade's early residents.

This community still thrives today. We have a Board of Directors steering the success of the community as well as a park providing space for gathering of neighbors and entertainment of the children. As a non-profit organization we provide donations to several other non-profit organizations each year.

I spent 32 years as a single parent raising 2 wonderful boys in this neighborhood. I felt safe here because of the close-knit neighborhood. My ex-husband commented he would not pressure me to pay him his half of the property value quickly because he also realized the safety of this neighborhood for his boys.

I asked City Manager, Mike Weston, if this plan is approved do all the properties become annexed to King City. He said that the properties would be annexed as each property owner requests annexation. To me this would create a patchwork city that would be very difficult to manage. Policing, fire protection, and public works projects would become more challenging.

This has been my home for 49 years, and many residents have been here even longer. Many now living here are the children and grandchildren of the original property owners. The reason is they saw the benefit of this neighborhood as children and want to provide their children the same security. There are not many neighborhoods in the Portland area where 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> generation families still live.

I respectfully request you deny the application for the Urban Reserve Area 6D Concept Plan.

I realize it's likely that this area will eventually be developed. I'm not opposed to progress if organized by an entity capable of undertaking the project from a proficient and skilled position, but I am opposed to development that is nothing short of a revenue-based land grab.

The current concept plan includes extending Fischer Road to Roy Rogers which would carve Rivermeade in half, taking with it several old growth trees, as well as many carefully maintained front yards of the residents. When Fischer Road reaches the end of River Lane it extends through a documented conservation reserve area created on land owned by a lovely family. This area contains natural wetlands and run off into the Tualatin River. I asked City Manager Mike Weston how they could extend the road through this property. His reply took me back a bit. He replied, "we'll just use eminent domain". This was said without any feeling or caring.

If you would like to discuss any of these concerns, please don't hesitate to contact me at any of the following addresses.

Respectfully,

Yvonne Johnson

13880 SW River Lane

Tigard, OR 97224R

(503) 720-1823

ylh1972@gmail

**From:** Yvonne Johnson <[ylh1972@gmail.com](mailto:ylh1972@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Friday, July 6, 2018 12:12 PM

**To:** Shirley Craddick

**Subject:** Urban Reserve Area 6D Concept Plan

Dear Ms. Craddick,

Thank you for taking the time to read this message I have prepared for your consideration. Your service on the Metro Council is appreciated and I hope you make your decisions with an open mind, listening to all of the input before making careful decisions. To that objective, I present the following:

I respectfully request your consideration of my concerns outlined here when studying King City's Urban Reserve Area 6D Concept Plan to extending its current boundary of 137<sup>th</sup> Avenue west to Roy Rogers Road.

I am not currently a resident of King City but I'm passionate about honesty in government and assistance to the elderly. I will be affected by the Concept Plan as I presently live within the area being proposed. It is to this end I present the following concerns about the King City expansion plan.

Although the current residents of King City will not be allowed to vote on the proposal there has been no attempt to ensure all current residents are properly aware of this plan which affects their livability. Open House meetings have been organized and newspaper articles written; however, individual mailings have not been done nor has any attempt been made to speak with residents who are unable to easily leave their home. Many residents are unable to get out to attend the meetings. Maybe it's just me, but I believe every avenue possible should have been taken to ensure all residents were notified and their opinions considered regarding this gigantic undertaking by such a small city. King City was incorporated in 1966 and finished the 263-acre development in 1978. Since that time the residents have enjoyed the quaint neighborhoods and convenient shopping which served this older population well. It was comfortable. Another area of non-age-restricted homes was added much later not affecting the original core area. The newest plan includes establishing a Town Center with open areas, shops and, most alarming, a new City Hall and Police Department located approximately 5 miles from the current city core. Many current residents are senior citizens and don't drive as much as younger people, especially on 5 lane divided avenues as proposed in the plan. Many depend on golf carts as their means of transportation within the city.

The existing population of the original King City are for the most part senior citizens living on fixed incomes. They are conscious of all expenses. I believe the City council has presented their concept plan in a very deceptive manner. They assert that residents will not see one dime of increased property tax, as State law prevents them from raising taxes. State law says the tax rate may not change. However, the assessed value may increase up to 3% per year. The improvements included in the concept plan will most certainly cause an increase in current assessed values, thus an increase in property tax. This has not been explained above the answer of "it will not cost residents a dime..." The proposed community center will require funds for purchase of the property as well as construction of the buildings. This will require a Bond Measure to be presented for a vote. Considering the number of families planned for in this development, it appears that a new school would also be necessary, which would again require a bond measure for building and operation and become another tax increase. After completion of this project, the population of the original King City will be a small percent of the population of the new King

City, thus it is quite possible the project will be approved even if the original residents object. The increased assessed value of the properties and bond measures costs will also cause an increase in their taxes. This is far beyond the "will not cost you a dime" message they are receiving. The estimated cost of the project has more than doubled since it was first presented, and no detailed plan has been proposed or presented yet. I fear the eventual cost of development will be astronomical. We are told the funding will come from new development, but, developers have not been secured.

If for no other reason than the deception, I believe this plan should not be approved by Metro Council.

King City does not have the necessary experienced staff to properly manage the negotiations required for execution of this concept plan. A project of the magnitude of the King City Concept Plan requires an experienced and knowledgeable staff in management of development. Through my interaction with the King City staff, I don't believe they have the required expertise. King City already relies on surrounding cities as Tigard and Sherwood for the most basic services. Their plan indicates an even further reliance on outside cities and agencies. Outside talent could be used, but the funds are not available to secure this assistance.

After completion of the project I question the ability of the current King City leadership to properly manage the new "King City". They recently purchased an older model pickup and hired one individual to become the Public Works Department. The Highlands neighborhood was annexed into King City approximately 2 years ago with the promise their streets would be repaired. No repair has occurred yet because of funding. A large beaver dam at the south end of King City Park caused Tualatin River water to run into the park. They simply removed the dam, triggering a large portion of the bank to collapse into the river. A better solution would have been to secure the services ODF&W and Tualatin Riverkeepers, or someone familiar with ecology and hydraulic engineering for advice on how to mitigate the issue.

For these reasons, I believe another city might be better equipped to properly develop and manage any expansion plan.

With the Riverview Terrace development in full swing, the traffic situation in the area is approaching overwhelming. The expansion of Roy Rogers and Beef Bend to 5 lanes will further aggravate the existing bottleneck intersections at Beef Bend and Roy Rogers, Beef Bend and Hwy 99, and Fischer Road and Hwy 99.

The people moving into the new developments will need to work. Where will that be? At a CPO meeting I asked if there had been any thought to mass transit and the answer was that is up to Tri Met. Currently Tri Met does not run on Roy Rogers or Beef Bend. Tri Met only runs on Hwy 99. Consequently, all the residents of River Terrace, Current King City and the new King City Concept Plan will all need to take personal autos to and from their destination.

Because things like traffic projections are only guesses (and often grossly inaccurate guesses, at that), I believe any further development should be postponed until the near completion of River Terrace.

I am a resident of a unique bedroom community just west of the current King City limits. Rivermeade was created in July 1948 when Herrel C. Throop and his wife, Myrtle filed with the Washington County Clerk, a sub-division map consisting of some 58 parcels, bounded to the north by Beef Bend Road, to the south by the Tualatin River, to the east by Watson Road (now SW 137<sup>th</sup> Avenue), and to the west by

Myrtle Road (now SW Myrtle Ave.). In October 1953, the Rivermeade Community Club, Inc. was founded as an Oregon Nonprofit Corporation by some of Rivermeade's early residents.

This community still thrives today. We have a Board of Directors steering the success of the community as well as a park providing space for gathering of neighbors and entertainment of the children. As a non-profit organization we provide donations to several other non-profit organizations each year.

I spent 32 years as a single parent raising 2 wonderful boys in this neighborhood. I felt safe here because of the close-knit neighborhood. My ex-husband commented he would not pressure me to pay him his half of the property value quickly because he also realized the safety of this neighborhood for his boys.

I asked City Manager, Mike Weston, if this plan is approved do all the properties become annexed to King City. He said that the properties would be annexed as each property owner requests annexation. To me this would create a patchwork city that would be very difficult to manage. Policing, fire protection, and public works projects would become more challenging.

This has been my home for 49 years, and many residents have been here even longer. Many now living here are the children and grandchildren of the original property owners. The reason is they saw the benefit of this neighborhood as children and want to provide their children the same security. There are not many neighborhoods in the Portland area where 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> generation families still live.

I respectfully request you deny the application for the Urban Reserve Area 6D Concept Plan.

I realize it's likely that this area will eventually be developed. I'm not opposed to progress if organized by an entity capable of undertaking the project from a proficient and skilled position, but I am opposed to development that is nothing short of a revenue-based land grab.

The current concept plan includes extending Fischer Road to Roy Rogers which would carve Rivermeade in half, taking with it several old growth trees, as well as many carefully maintained front yards of the residents. When Fischer Road reaches the end of River Lane it extends through a documented conservation reserve area created on land owned by a lovely family. This area contains natural wetlands and run off into the Tualatin River. I asked City Manager Mike Weston how they could extend the road through this property. His reply took me back a bit. He replied, "we'll just use eminent domain". This was said without any feeling or caring.

If you would like to discuss any of these concerns, please don't hesitate to contact me at any of the following addresses.

Respectfully,

Yvonne Johnson

13880 SW River Lane

Tigard, OR 97224

(503) 720-1823

ylh1972@gmail

**From:** "Yvonne Johnson" <[ylh1972@gmail.com](mailto:yjh1972@gmail.com)>

**Date:** July 6, 2018 at 12:26:09 PM PDT

**To:** <[bob.stacey@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:bob.stacey@oregonmetro.gov)>

**Subject:** Urban Reserve Area 6D Concept Plan

Dear Mr. Stacey,

Thank you for taking the time to read this message I have prepared for your consideration. Your service on the Metro Council is appreciated and I hope you make your decisions with an open mind, listening to all of the input before making careful decisions. To that objective, I present the following:

I respectfully request your consideration of my concerns outlined here when studying King City's Urban Reserve Area 6D Concept Plan to extending its current boundary of 137<sup>th</sup> Avenue west to Roy Rogers Road.

I am not currently a resident of King City but I'm passionate about honesty in government and assistance to the elderly. I will be affected by the Concept Plan as I presently live within the area being proposed. It is to this end I present the following concerns about the King City expansion plan.

Although the current residents of King City will not be allowed to vote on the proposal there has been no attempt to ensure all current residents are properly aware of this plan which affects their livability. Open House meetings have been organized and newspaper articles written; however, individual mailings have not been done nor has any attempt been made to speak with residents who are unable to easily leave their home. Many residents are unable to get out to attend the meetings. Maybe it's just me, but I believe every avenue possible should have been taken to ensure all residents were notified and their opinions considered regarding this gigantic undertaking by such a small city. King City was incorporated in 1966 and finished the 263-acre development in 1978. Since that time the residents have enjoyed the quaint neighborhoods and convenient shopping which served this older population well. It was comfortable. Another area of non-age-restricted homes was added much later not affecting the original core area. The newest plan includes establishing a Town Center with open areas, shops and, most alarming, a new City Hall and Police Department located approximately 5 miles from the current city core. Many current residents are senior citizens and don't drive as much as younger people, especially on 5 lane divided avenues as proposed in the plan. Many depend on golf carts as their means of transportation within the city.

The existing population of the original King City are for the most part senior citizens living on fixed incomes. They are conscious of all expenses. I believe the City council has presented their concept plan in a very deceptive manner. They assert that residents will not see one dime of increased property tax, as State law prevents them from raising taxes. State law says the tax rate may not change. However, the assessed value may increase up to 3% per year. The improvements included in the concept plan will most certainly cause an increase in current assessed values, thus an increase in property tax. This has not been explained above the answer of "it will not cost residents a dime..." The proposed community center will require funds for purchase of the property as well as construction of the buildings. This will require a Bond Measure to be presented for a vote. Considering the number of families planned for in this development, it appears that a new school would also be necessary, which would again require a bond measure for building and operation and become another tax increase. After completion of this project, the population of the original King City will be a small percent of the population of the new King

City, thus it is quite possible the project will be approved even if the original residents object. The increased assessed value of the properties and bond measures costs will also cause an increase in their taxes. This is far beyond the “will not cost you a dime” message they are receiving. The estimated cost of the project has more than doubled since it was first presented, and no detailed plan has been proposed or presented yet. I fear the eventual cost of development will be astronomical. We are told the funding will come from new development, but, developers have not been secured.

If for no other reason than the deception, I believe this plan should not be approved by Metro Council.

King City does not have the necessary experienced staff to properly manage the negotiations required for execution of this concept plan. A project of the magnitude of the King City Concept Plan requires an experienced and knowledgeable staff in management of development. Through my interaction with the King City staff, I don't believe they have the required expertise. King City already relies on surrounding cities as Tigard and Sherwood for the most basic services. Their plan indicates an even further reliance on outside cities and agencies. Outside talent could be used, but the funds are not available to secure this assistance.

After completion of the project I question the ability of the current King City leadership to properly manage the new “King City”. They recently purchased an older model pickup and hired one individual to become the Public Works Department. The Highlands neighborhood was annexed into King City approximately 2 years ago with the promise their streets would be repaired. No repair has occurred yet because of funding. A large beaver dam at the south end of King City Park caused Tualatin River water to run into the park. They simply removed the dam, triggering a large portion of the bank to collapse into the river. A better solution would have been to secure the services ODF&W and Tualatin Riverkeepers, or someone familiar with ecology and hydraulic engineering for advice on how to mitigate the issue.

For these reasons, I believe another city might be better equipped to properly develop and manage any expansion plan.

With the Riverview Terrace development in full swing, the traffic situation in the area is approaching overwhelming. The expansion of Roy Rogers and Beef Bend to 5 lanes will further aggravate the existing bottleneck intersections at Beef Bend and Roy Rogers, Beef Bend and Hwy 99, and Fischer Road and Hwy 99.

The people moving into the new developments will need to work. Where will that be? At a CPO meeting I asked if there had been any thought to mass transit and the answer was that is up to Tri Met. Currently Tri Met does not run on Roy Rogers or Beef Bend. Tri Met only runs on Hwy 99. Consequently, all the residents of River Terrace, Current King City and the new King City Concept Plan will all need to take personal autos to and from their destination.

Because things like traffic projections are only guesses (and often grossly inaccurate guesses, at that), I believe any further development should be postponed until the near completion of River Terrace.

I am a resident of a unique bedroom community just west of the current King City limits. Rivermeade was created in July 1948 when Herrel C. Throop and his wife, Myrtle filed with the Washington County Clerk, a sub-division map consisting of some 58 parcels, bounded to the north by Beef Bend Road, to the south by the Tualatin River, to the east by Watson Road (now SW 137<sup>th</sup> Avenue), and to the west by

Myrtle Road (now SW Myrtle Ave.). In October 1953, the Rivermeade Community Club, Inc. was founded as an Oregon Nonprofit Corporation by some of Rivermeade's early residents.

This community still thrives today. We have a Board of Directors steering the success of the community as well as a park providing space for gathering of neighbors and entertainment of the children. As a non-profit organization we provide donations to several other non-profit organizations each year.

I spent 32 years as a single parent raising 2 wonderful boys in this neighborhood. I felt safe here because of the close-knit neighborhood. My ex-husband commented he would not pressure me to pay him his half of the property value quickly because he also realized the safety of this neighborhood for his boys.

I asked City Manager, Mike Weston, if this plan is approved do all the properties become annexed to King City. He said that the properties would be annexed as each property owner requests annexation. To me this would create a patchwork city that would be very difficult to manage. Policing, fire protection, and public works projects would become more challenging.

This has been my home for 49 years, and many residents have been here even longer. Many now living here are the children and grandchildren of the original property owners. The reason is they saw the benefit of this neighborhood as children and want to provide their children the same security. There are not many neighborhoods in the Portland area where 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> generation families still live.

I respectfully request you deny the application for the Urban Reserve Area 6D Concept Plan.

I realize it's likely that this area will eventually be developed. I'm not opposed to progress if organized by an entity capable of undertaking the project from a proficient and skilled position, but I am opposed to development that is nothing short of a revenue-based land grab.

The current concept plan includes extending Fischer Road to Roy Rogers which would carve Rivermeade in half, taking with it several old growth trees, as well as many carefully maintained front yards of the residents. When Fischer Road reaches the end of River Lane it extends through a documented conservation reserve area created on land owned by a lovely family. This area contains natural wetlands and run off into the Tualatin River. I asked City Manager Mike Weston how they could extend the road through this property. His reply took me back a bit. He replied, "we'll just use eminent domain". This was said without any feeling or caring.

If you would like to discuss any of these concerns, please don't hesitate to contact me at any of the following addresses.

Respectfully,

Yvonne Johnson

13880 SW River Lane

Tigard, OR 97224

(503) 720-1823

ylh1972@gmail

**From:** Lian Jewell [<mailto:lian.h.jewell@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Saturday, July 07, 2018 12:20 AM

**To:** 2040 <[2040@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:2040@oregonmetro.gov)>

**Subject:** COMMENTS REGARDING PROPOSED UGB EXPANSION TO ANNEX SOUTH COOPER MTN

Metro Council,

It appears the area the City of Beaverton wishes to develop is forested, near a nature preserve, not at all walkable to the city center or necessary amenities, and would add 3760 housing units with no access to efficient mass transit. In light of the Oregon Warming Commission's report\* detailing the State's complete projected failure to achieve it's near term 2020, mid term 2035, and longer term 2050 carbon reduction goals...largely due to transportation emissions and the current management of forested lands...then shouldn't Oregon be doing everything it can to increase housing/business development near transportation centers and preserve its existing tree cover?

The city of Beaverton is nothing but an example of single story, urban sprawl with plenty of opportunities for densification within its existing city boundaries. Further, couldn't the City annex already [poorly] developed areas with the UGB in unincorporated Washington County (in the Aloha area for instance), and improve them rather than cut down trees and build more mega HOA complexes? Where in Beaverton are all the green-built, high-performance, mixed-use high rises IAW Governor Brown's BEEWG mandates which could easily provide 12,300 housing units? The only building Beaverton has built is The Rise which is a paltry 3.5 stories high with only 78 market-rate apartments, nine live/work units, and 2,300 square feet of ground floor commercial space. And, it still has several vacant units for residents and businesses.

If the City of Beaverton looked at all like the City of Portland in terms of inner city housing and business infrastructure and still had a demonstrated need for additional housing, then incorporating additional land for development would make sense. Even then, however, there are additional semi-developed/developed lands closer to transportation infrastructure which are not pristine/rural/forested areas which could be annexed and improved for everyone's mutual benefit.

Please respect the existing UGB and densify housing within current City limits.

Thank you for considering my comments,

Lian Jewell

Resident, City of Beaverton

\*<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/59c554e0f09ca40655ea6eb0/t/59dd4984a8b2b090a38f07a1/1507674513035/2017-OGWC-Legislative-Report.pdf>

**From:** Lloyd Meyer <[mlmeyer888@comcast.net](mailto:mlmeyer888@comcast.net)>

**Date:** July 8, 2018 at 5:56:11 PM PDT

**To:** [craig.dirksen@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:craig.dirksen@oregonmetro.gov)

**Subject: Re: Request meeting**

Dear Councilor Dirksen and Metro Staff:

Thank you for meeting with me earlier in the year to discuss King City's plans to expand. My major concern is that such an expansion will take farmland out of commission forever (and, btw, my own farmland off of 147th and Beef Bend Road.

Sincerely,

Lloyd Meyer

On Apr 19, 2018, at 10:00 PM, Lloyd Meyer <[mlmeyer888@comcast.net](mailto:mlmeyer888@comcast.net)> wrote:

Hello ,

I would like to chat with you, if possible, about King City's expansion plans and the potential effect it will have on my property.

Sincerely,

Lloyd Meyer

**From:** Cherry Amabisca [<mailto:cherryamabisca@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 09, 2018 11:04 AM  
**To:** 2040 <[2040@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:2040@oregonmetro.gov)>  
**Subject:** UGB comments - Witch Hazel Village South (Hillsboro)

Hello Metro Counselors,

My comments concern City of Hillsboro's request for 150 acres in the Witch Hazel area.

I could only access the link to their concept plan once - after that it would not come up. I will keep trying but since the deadline for comments is today, I will submit what I have now.

1. Hillsboro has not even come close to building out the 1400 acres of South Hillsboro.. Colin Cooper says there is a 6-year lead time but I believe there will undoubtedly be another UGB expansion discussion in the next 6 years. Hillsboro needs to "swallow" what they have "bit off" in South Hillsboro and finish it before being given more land.
2. Hillsboro has never been serious about building affordable housing. South Hillsboro, for example, has NO affordable housing, according to what Colin Cooper told us (Save Helvetia) in January 2018. According to Mr. Cooper, the developers find Hillsboro's SDC's high and they can't make money on affordable housing. Hillsboro is very supportive of their developers and as a consequence Hillsboro doesn't want to see developer profits suffer by requiring them to build affordable housing. Will Hillsboro really provide affordable housing in Witch Hazel Village South?
3. At an Intel Citizen Advisory meeting a few months ago, realtors and Mr. Cooper presented an analysis that showed the average entry-level price of housing in Hillsboro was \$300,000. They agree that this is not affordable. Hillsboro had an opportunity to require some affordable housing in South Hillsboro but they chose not to do this.
4. If Metro believes that affordable housing is a good goal, then you must make it a requirement for any proposed concept plan and require a minimum percentage of affordable housing.
- 5 Hillsboro has as its main legislative goal to convert 1,700 acres of farmland in Northwest Hillsboro from rural reserves to urban reserves. They supported a bill in the 2018 legislature to do this but it did not go forward. They will continue to support bills every year until they get it. They should not be rewarded with the Witch Hazel Village South project while they are pursuing another 1,700 acres outside of the UGB and not honoring the 2014 Court of Appeals ruling and the 2014 Grand Bargain.

Thank you for your consideration,

Cherry Amabisca

13260 NW Bishop Road

Hillsboro, OR 97124

From: Robert Bailey [<mailto:email@rpbailey.com>]  
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2018 11:44 AM  
To: 2040 <[2040@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:2040@oregonmetro.gov)>  
Subject: Hillsboro UGB expansion proposals

The City of Hillsboro entered into the Grand Bargain of 2014, H.B. 4078. This legislation intervention settled the Urban and Rural Reserves plan for Washington County and allowed development to move forward without Washington County having to re-do their plan that had been invalidated by the State Court of Appeals. This settlement required the City of Hillsboro and other governments to testify before the Senate that they would abide by the one time legislative land use action and NOT return to the legislature for future intervention into local land use planning. In exchange, the City of Hillsboro got certain acreage as urban reserves and also got lands added to the UGB.

In 2018, the City of Hillsboro broke out of its pledge and approached the legislature through H.B. 4075, seeking nearly 1800 acres of rural reserve land be added to the urban reserves lands in Washington County. Mayor Calloway admitted under oath that this broke their testimony to the legislature, but....they "needed it". Several Metro council members witnessed this testimony. Metro opposed H.B. 4075.

On May 1st, 2018, the City of Hillsboro held a work session on "North Hillsboro". No public comment was taken. During the work session, councilors were told by staff that Hillsboro's original request for urban reserves "had been remanded due to inconsistencies and some errors" (2014). Staff identified the nearly 1800 acres of rural reserve north of Hillsboro, south of Highway 26, and west of current industrial lands as needed industrial lands and "an issue that will rise with importance with the passage of time". Michael Brown told the councilors that while the city did agree to the legislation (Grand Bargain of 2014), "this did not preclude them from asserting at a later time for more industrial acreage". He said that some "might disparage Hillsboro as having broken its promise but this is not true, in this context". Michael Brown asserted that "Hillsboro is a city that honors its commitments".

The City of Hillsboro is re-writing history or simply does not understand the import of the State Court of Appeals ruling. Washington County's Urban and Rural Reserves plan was thrown out in its entirety because it violated the law, not because of minor "inconsistencies and some errors". Guiding new council members to think otherwise might mollify the recent failure of H.B. 4075, but it also stokes the city's hubris and aspirations for a return to the legislature for more rural land.

The City of Hillsboro is employing a conflicted situational ethic to describe how they can testify under oath at one legislative assembly, then quickly approach another legislative assembly with a request that violates their earlier testimony.

It is apparent that the City of Hillsboro does not embrace the S.B. 100 process of local land use planning that is citizen involving, and that goes from city and county and to the region and state, while respecting the rights of standing and appeal.

The plans before Metro from the City of Hillsboro involve lands that were subject of the negotiations and trade-offs in the Grand Bargain of 2014. In another leap of conflicted situational ethic, Hillsboro wants to proceed with their inclusion and development while not honoring the other side of the negotiated settlement, respecting the rural reserves and not seeking legislative land use.

The City of Hillsboro contributed to the legislation that created the Urban and Rural Reserves law. The City of Hillsboro had a representative on the rules committee that created the urban and rural reserves "factors" that was to guide selection of reserves. Nonetheless, the City of Hillsboro sought high value farmlands and supporting the pseudo-factors analysis conjured by Washington County. The City of Hillsboro appears poised for yet another return to the legislature, by-passing citizen involvement, by-passing regional collaboration and over-site, and by-passing any use of any "factors" in an effort to achieve their sense of manifest destiny. They want what they want when they want it. Is this the proper balance of housing and industry for the region? Continued growth here exacerbates already identified transportation conflicts that will seriously tax local residents.

Hillsboro works against the certainty promised by the urban and rural reserves planning process. Before Metro passes on Hillsboro's request, the City of Hillsboro should re-commit to its Grand Bargain pledge. If they are unable to do so, Metro should disallow their use of Grand Bargain gained lands. A "time out" would prompt reflection.

Respectfully,

Robert Bailey  
201 N.E. Hillwood Drive  
Hillsboro, Oregon 97124

From: Mike O'Halloran [<mailto:mikeohallo@gmail.com>]

Sent: Monday, July 09, 2018 11:58 PM

To: 2040

Subject: UBG comment

Since 1998 space for 67,000 new residence has been brought into UBG ( at 2 to 4 residence per home = roughly 20,000 homes). The sites are not well used which means Metro needs to fix the issue and bring in sites that are developable and in locations where new residence want to live. There is no question about the need and the impact on home prices due to a shortage of "desirable" sites in the UBG. The 4 new city sites are all much better than many of the previous choices. I appreciate the new strategy.

Michael O'Halloran