

Public comment report

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

August 2018

APPENDIX C: COMMENTS RECEIVED, SURVEY RESPONSES

Q2 Comment: General comments

Answered: 67 Skipped: 108

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	--For the ranking, which is higher, 1 or 5???? I don't know how to rank the questions without that information. --I attended CPO 6 meeting a few months ago in which the Beaverton UGB expansion project manager could not answer the question about how properties get annexed into Beaverton. But the expansion document stated that there was already an IGA between Washington County and Beaverton that would allow Beaverton to annex urban reserve areas that were pulled into the UGB. Why were the attendees not told that? --A followup question asked what additional services would be provided to current residents if Beaverton annexed the area. There was effectively no answer--except that current residents would have an additional \$4.50 or so per thousand added to their tax bill. Is a good part of the proposed annexation supposed to be funded on the backs of the current residents of that area? --Traffic is already bad; the proposal does not seem to be aligned with Washington County statements on traffic priorities. My observation is that different jurisdictions (city, county, state) don't play well together when it comes to roads (orphaned roads, for example) to the detriment of all citizens in the area. --It seems that Beaverton expects the Progress Ridge shopping area to serve the as yet to be built proposed new homes--but parking there at peak times is very limited. How will thousands of more shoppers even access those stores? Not everyone can bike or walk there. --A general comment on density. Although these plans address many complex issues and populations, one population that I don't see as being addressed is the elderly population. Is that not growing in this area? Those folks may or may not need less expensive housing, but one thing that they will need is single floor living in order to remain in their homes--a requirement that I've never seen addressed in any documentation--perhaps because it decreases density? Please address this issue in the metro guidelines. --I've read the proposals from the cities, and I've watched the houses spring up in Tigard around Scholls Ferry and Roy Rogers. Those homes are so dense that there is little room for kids to play and grow, much less room to plant a full-sized tree. Trading density for livability is a long-term losing proposition for this area. Ease up on the density and assure a more long-term, livable area.	7/9/2018 5:03 PM
2	Assuming 1 is highest	7/9/2018 4:39 PM
3	Since it's not explicitly stated for the above question, I'm assuming that the ranking is 1-poor ranking to 5-high ranking. For Beaverton in particular, recent expansions do not take into account a range of housing densities that meet a variety of expectations. Not all people want to live in high density apartments or on postage-stamp yards with out any way for our kids to play outside on our own property. In my mind it is much more desirable for adequate recreational space in in local yards than having to walk or drive to communal parks that may or may not be maintained safely. Recent development has also not taken into account the increased traffic congestion due to high density development. Don't expand development areas until the traffic issues are dealt with.	7/9/2018 3:31 PM
4	Roadways need to be expanded prior to or at least early in the development process. Drastic traffic improvements required for the current hills, so mtn Tigard expansion. Need to add the west side bypass	7/9/2018 2:51 PM
5	A large portion of the Cooper Mountain reserve area already has developed neighborhoods, introducing new high density neighborhoods will create a patchwork of developments in this area. how will the utilities & infrastructure be paid for in a scenario like this? We do not want to be a part of Beaverton as they have nothing to offer us except higher taxes & fees.	7/9/2018 2:43 PM
6	UGB expansion should NOT be done at the expense of quality of life. We do NOT need to become the next US metro area suffering from suburban sprawl and the traffic that comes with it.	7/9/2018 1:37 PM
7	The City of Beaverton is not looking @ the whole picture for their expansion ideas. They need to slow down & do the process properly.	7/9/2018 12:32 PM
8	Rediculous planning. zero consideration on roads. this dumb ass density with no road expansion or highway creation is flat out irresponsible!!! Metro has to be abolished! I am a native Oregonian! Sick of it!!!	7/9/2018 12:18 PM

Growth management for greater Portland

9	Other than Beaverton, the other 3 cities' proposals have done a good job at meeting the above goals. I propose: "Let's create specific evaluation metrics by which to objectively measure the expansion proposals against Metro goals. Let's truly plan for the future and look at creating welcoming family communities for all age groups and ethnicities in a very wide range of socio-economic situations. These new communities should be near rail line/mass transit routes which are expandable and where most of the absorption should be focused, not on the fringes where infrastructure is not able to support that kind of population pressure. We have a great resource of strategic planners in our communities who could partner with Metro to design and develop these communities of the future. There's still time. Lets create communities which truly reflect all 6 of the goals and objectives of Metro and what Oregon really is: a healthy, clean, green, welcoming place with growth opportunities for all. KEEP OREGON CLEAN & GREEN."	7/9/2018 12:12 PM
10	We need express roads built to connect to I-5 and US 26. Build a road from Cornelius Pass to Clark Hill Road in Beaverton.	7/9/2018 10:36 AM
11	Increased supply and reduced barriers will help everyone in the area regardless of color or income level.	7/9/2018 9:33 AM
12	Cooper mountain should not be annexed into Beaverton. Should be left alone	7/9/2018 7:09 AM
13	There are two other factors I think should be considered in deciding where to expand: 1) How will the expansion affect SNA (Significant Natural Areas, riparian areas and wildlife corridors. 2) How is the development likely to contribute to existing traffic congestion.	7/8/2018 11:25 PM
14	Cities that have significant undeveloped land previously added within the UGB should not add any more. Also, a proven ability to fund and develop the needed infrastructure should be shown by a city before adding more land.	7/8/2018 10:04 PM
15	The is very little infrastructure in the South Cooper mountain area. Tri met won't send busses upon that way because of the roads. There is not a good way to travel North to south	7/8/2018 9:29 PM
16	The problem I see with the expansion plan is that metro and the city of Beaverton have not coordinated on how the roads will be impacted. For those of us living on 175th, getting out of our driveways and down either side of the mountain will be GREATLY diminished by the number of new homes planned. Traffic will be a nightmare unless Tile Flat or another access road is put in or expanded to handle the huge increase in traffic.	7/8/2018 9:23 PM
17	The Beaverton proposal is to take the land on top of Cooper Mountain and turn half of it into homes eventually. I see several problems with building up there: 1. Only half the land is developable. Of the 1200 acres only 600 is buildable. It will create a patchwork of small neighborhoods with houses that will be worth a small fortune each, definitely not affordable. And there is no access to the types of services that would be required for low income residents anywhere near the site. 2. There are no stores or shops up there and no plans for any. So, the residents of the 3700 new homes would have to get in their cars to go somewhere else every time they needed to shop. With the steep grades and winter weather it is not feasible to add all this traffic. 3. The top of Cooper Mountain is a snow zone, and in the winter there there are about twice the snow and ice days and precipitation thickness that the valley floor sees. Every resident auto is required to carry and use traction devices in the winter, definitely a hardship for residents of affordable housing. 4. According to the Oregon Department of Geology Statewide Landslide Information there is a large landslide in the East Hills section of the site that crosses 175th Ave. Last year, Washington Co. had to fix the road due to the slippage cracking the pavement. 5. If extra land is needed in the UGB, please give it to King City and Wilsonville, where the land is not on top of a mountain. Beaverton will not be able to digest South Cooper Mountain in the next decade and they certainly will have difficulty incorporating the top of Cooper Mountain into their city.	7/8/2018 9:12 PM
18	These questions have no relevance to the issue of annexation of Cooper Mountain. There will be no multi-use affordable low income housing on Cooper Mountain. The only people of color in new houses on Cooper Mountain will be affluent people of color. The main road, 175th is already overburdened with commuters, not residents. The only reason to add this area to the UGB is to provide more tax revenue to the City of Beaverton. I say no.	7/8/2018 9:02 PM
19	Right now the city of beaverton cannot keep up with the current expansion with transportaion, access, affordability and livability... adding more housing without infrastructure ahead of time to meet the needs... not after is irresponsible!	7/8/2018 8:43 PM
20	I'm surprised at this survey since it's been clear for a long time that our governing bodies, especially METRO, don't actually consider 'public input' when making decisions and go ahead no matter what the people have to say. Please don't approve expansion of the UGB and ultimate annexation to Beaverton of the Urban Reserve Area on Cooper Mt. as the infra-structure is strained to the gills now with already approved building barely begun!	7/8/2018 8:26 PM
21	My ranking considers 1 high---5 low.	7/8/2018 7:17 PM

Growth management for greater Portland

22	I find there is very little consideration for flora, fauna or children. Talking to a developer at a meeting for Cooper mt area, he told me there was NO room for trees in his development. A metro council member told me in a meeting with several dozen people that children DON'T play in their back yards any more. Guess that is why housing developments in the Cooper mt area are five ft apart with no back yards. Nice future....good job council members. The deer that were so fun to watch passing thru our yards are having a tough time or are killed on 175th. Beaverton use to be a desired area as those of us who raised our kids there. Now, you are making it ugly with massive building developments and as I said earlier with no care for children, wildlife or plants. This is not what I saw for my grandchildren's future. Now just ugliness.	7/8/2018 6:55 PM
23	development feasibility and preservation of open and natural areas should be the first consideration	7/8/2018 4:38 PM
24	I live on Cooper Mt. where the city of Beaverton is proposing an expansion, and have seen the traffic increase tremendously. Because some of the property is not in the urban growth boundary, the roads cannot be improved. Beaverton has come up with a good plan to provide a diverse mix of housing, green spaces, improved transportation and a coherent plan for the entire area. Delaying the expansion would cause costs to increase even more, making affordable housing even further out of reach for many people. Because housing is so expensive, many people are moving further and further away from town, increasing the congestion on our roads and increasing transportation costs for many people.	7/8/2018 3:28 PM
25	None of these questions deal with concerns about viable transportation and preservation of natural areas. That is a critical deficiency in this survey process and shows bias in favor of expansion at the expense of proper transportation routes and natural resources and wildlife habitats.	7/8/2018 2:40 PM
26	Why should I care what the city has done in its downtown core when considering expansion? The question is how does the area under consideration outside the UGB currently lend itself to affordable housing, transportation, natural areas, etc. ... which the top of Cooper Mountain fails in all important aspects as far as development is concerned. It has lots of forest which would go away with expansion.	7/8/2018 10:51 AM
27	Our roads are overcrowded and we need new roads FIRST,, halt all developing until our roads in Beaverton can handle the increased traffic . We need more north south roads	7/7/2018 9:36 PM
28	One of the most important factors has been left out of the above. I would rank preservation of natural areas and wildlife habitat and ecological concerns (wetlands as an example) either number one or number two. It seem s that existing infrastructure such as roadways sewer water and other utilities should also be a major element in considering the appropriateness of adopting expanded urban growth areas	7/7/2018 2:32 PM
29	As president of the King City Highlands, I spearheaded annexation of the Highlands to the City of King City and my desire is to see the King City grow stronger.	7/7/2018 11:11 AM

Growth management for greater Portland

30	<p>Thank you for taking comments on this process and I hope you will consider my family's concerns in making your decision. I live in the proposed expansion area for Hillsboro and have absolutely no interest in coming into the expansion area. I know of a few others that also aren't interested in joining either. Beyond my personal lack of interest in joining, I have a few other concerns. The first is that Hillsboro has just started to build out South Hillsboro, which is supposed to have 8,000 homes and even though the city thinks people that people who live there will somehow not drive, it is going to make traffic on TV Hwy even more unbearable. If they were to look at increased housing in Hillsboro it would seem to make much more sense to put it closer to highway 26 which was recently expanded. TV Hwy has businesses, railroad tracks and housing on both sides and seems to have already been expanded as fully as possible. In looking at the housing needs analysis there is also a large margin of error that on the low side of the estimate doesn't justify the need for any more housing. Conveniently, the city left the housing needs analysis that they were basing the whole project on from the planning department meeting so that the community didn't have access until after the meeting was done and decision made. A member of the community pointed this out during the meeting and one of the commission members incorrectly cited the wrong document and then said the right one was available. Sometime later in the meeting, when he noticed the community member was going to correct him, he did admit to referencing the wrong document and said the other one had been removed from the website. If this is the level of attention to detail and review the planning commission took towards the project; metro should be concerned. This should be reflected in the meeting minutes of the planning commission. Additionally, this lack of available information prevents those in the community from commenting completely and seems a necessary due process step. At the very least because of this lack of necessary information, Metro should make the city submit in future rounds so the planning commission meeting includes the housing needs analysis and the communities impacted actually have the same data. An additional concern is that it seems the analysis is assuming that some of the housing will go to people with jobs in Portland; however, putting housing in Hillsboro for jobs in Portland seems like poor planning as well as putting unnecessary strain on roads that already can't handle the traffic. In looking at the other cities' proposals it would seem to make much more sense for the housing to be built closer to Portland. For example, the size of the proposal for Beaverton would also seem to go much further in addressing housing needs due to its size. As someone who looked for housing in Beaverton, due to a job and commute daily into Portland; there wasn't anything we could find so ended up back in Hillsboro. Thank you for considering our concerns.</p>	7/7/2018 8:01 AM
31	<p>Serious current transportation issues cannot support additional residents.</p>	7/6/2018 11:31 AM
32	<p>My name is Roger C. Henderson and I have lived at 17565 SW Cooper Mountain Lane for 26 years. I urge you to stand against the inclusion of our Urban Reserve into the Urban Growth Boundary. Please be reminded that not all of your constituents are human. For the past 26 years there has been a whittling away of what was once mixed farm country and wooded acreage. Our Urban Reserve stands as a remaining island of habitat for species that called this area home. What is to be gained by expanding the UGB into area? More high density housing, more traffic jams and accidents on what has now become the default Westside bypass? All in pursuit of the almighty dollar with no thought given to the native raccoons, owls, woodpeckers and many other varieties of birds. Other species that are counting on your mercy are squirrels, chipmunks, deer, and yes even the coyote. I pray that you will show compassion to these critters, and leave this sanctuary island of Urban Reserve outside of the UGB as a refuge from over development. Thank You.</p>	7/6/2018 9:44 AM
33	<p>The priority needs to be on improving density and connectivity; sprawl/expansion should be the last resort and we are not there yet. Everyone complains about worsening traffic; adding to the sprawl only exacerbates it. Some people who live in the suburbs say "I have no choice but to drive everywhere. I want other options but it's not possible where I live." Emphasize TOD and mixed use, build up and not out, reduce parking minimum requirements, and ensure that there is adequate infrastructure to support a car-light lifestyle in these communities FIRST.</p>	7/3/2018 3:15 PM
34	<p>The city of Beaverton and the UGB has missed identifying the integration what best identifies the natural qualities of the area and conserving them for future generations. Preservation of the green areas and incorporation of those into the living spaces is missing. We are beginning to look like another LA and are losing the urban reserves</p>	7/3/2018 1:16 PM
35	<p>Cooper Mountain exemplifies few of the factors above and would be a poor add to the UGB. Central Cooper Mountain is already used as a bypass for 217 and Murray Blvd with traffic backing up on 175th and others flying over Grabhorn. Moreover, those two streets specifically do not have any east/west exit points besides Kemmer/Scholls FY and Scholls/Gassner respectively. Blind hills, lack of sidewalks and no tri met service further complicate traffic patterns and the area currently has no walkable features. Furthermore, historical housing prices on Cooper Mountain are far above what supports a heterogeneous population.</p>	7/3/2018 1:03 PM
36	<p>Does Beaverton WANT to ruin the Cooper Mountain Nature Park and surrounding landscapes? Are they trying on purpose to create an island of habitat instead of a corridor?</p>	7/2/2018 12:14 PM

Growth management for greater Portland

37	The city is doing a horrible job with trying to maintain Cooper mountain in its Beaty. Our neighborhoods have lots of space to roam and we moved here not to be in a jam packed area. You are destroying the integrity of Cooper mountain with trying to expand up into a developed area instead of looking at other options such as doing down Roy Rogers or tile flat and not impose on existing neighborhoods and investments. Many love the peacefulness of Cooper mountain and the nature park and beautiful tall trees. Shame on the city for destroying all of the natural beauty! This area does not need anymore homes! If you annex off part of the natural areas and vineyards for building purposes you are destroying the area! Repurpose old neighborhoods and bring people into those existing homes. There is a way to have growth without destroying the area that we all love so much	7/1/2018 1:54 PM
38	If the housing needs assessment was done well, social equity and diversity should be part of that. If by breaking out the diversity and equity piece, it means they were not part of the housing needs assessment, then the assessment is inadequate.	7/1/2018 6:34 AM
39	The urban growth boundary is a boundary. To increase it to accommodate additional people only facilitates urban sprawl and rural degradation...the two conditions the boundary was created to prevent. These lands outside the boundary should be developed if, AND ONLY IF, all measures for densification within the existing boundary have already been undertaken and a housing need still exists. This is clearly not the case: for example: all the cities which have submitted proposals do not have any high rise housing structures like Portland does and have plenty of areas within their city limits which are substandard and should be developed to accommodate mixed-use, affordable and economical diverse housing and business near existing transportation.	6/30/2018 3:19 AM
40	Having land ready for development is imperative.	6/29/2018 4:47 PM
41	Please rezone SW Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway, SW Canyon Road, TV Highway, and other "auto row" eyesores. Many grocery stores have closed around West Slope and Raleigh Hills. Please make a road diet on SW Scholls Ferry Road between SW Raleighwood Lane and the very big retaining wall to the south of SW Humphrey Blvd. Please reroute bus 56 to give service to the West Hills and the Oregon Zoo.	6/27/2018 8:53 PM
42	Great for the future of King City...it is well thought and planned with input and considerations from and for the people and the City! Councilman, Dr. Smart Ocholi, City of King City, OR	6/27/2018 7:51 PM
43	Area is hilly and not suited for high density houses and of no ADEQUATE road structure . therefore you will end up with \$ 600,000 plus row houses homes	6/27/2018 4:19 PM
44	It would be significantly beneficial to describe the ranking - that I'm being asked to rank from 1 - 5 (1 being my highest priority) to 5. I'm going to assume that is what you want... The city, in this case King City has not done a sufficient job on any of the bottom four. Especially describing how funding will support the aspirations.	6/27/2018 3:42 PM
45	somewhat ambiguous factors...and none of these mention prohibitive transportation constraints over and/or around the Cooper Mountain area or protection of Natural Resources as important. I'm a native oregonian and live on Cooper mountain. I know there must be progress and things can't stay as they are...but why develop such a beautiful mountain that has already proven to have an abundant natural habitat and needs to be protected to some degree? Why not build directly on or closer to max lines and/or major highways? i really don't think that Beaverton has mine or for that matter any Metro area tax payer's interests in mind with their proposal. I believe it is entirely a "land grab" for increased taxes and fees (water/sewer, etc) in their jurisdiction. I was so pleased with what was developed in Progress Ridge area, but now this is already at peak capacity for retail,parking, etc and we are not seeing any expansion to this needed resource in the planning...just more homes/townhomes/apartments.	6/27/2018 1:49 PM
46	King City seems to have a plan that will serve the needs of a growing SW metro area responsibly and with consideration to what are Oregon values.	6/26/2018 8:33 PM
47	I feel the city or cities have not met the criteria of looking at transportation or natural areas needs already. They must address this first considering the additional growth that is occurring, before even thinking about expanding the urban growth boundary.	6/26/2018 8:07 PM
48	Need homes. Expand. If multi unit is built make sure it includes parking.	6/26/2018 7:35 PM
49	They need to have more housing in the city and not keep moving out to the farm land.	6/26/2018 12:58 PM
50	5=best King City is in an excellent position to provide land and infrastructure to ensure affordable, equitable and viable housing and business development. As a resident of King City I am strongly in favor of the proposal to expand the UGB and bring the UGR into King City's city limits. We have dedicated leadership who I entrust to properly manage the area.	6/26/2018 11:40 AM
51	The plans show great planning consideration for livability and forward planning of land use and needs of people.	6/26/2018 10:43 AM

Growth management for greater Portland

52	While I recognize the need for affordable housing in our area, I strongly oppose sacrificing wetlands, nature reserves and forested areas.	6/26/2018 10:29 AM
53	I hate to see more green space taken away when there are areas within the city that could be converted to high-density housing. Maybe the city could look at grant projects to convert existing properties to high-density housing. Beaverton has done a terrible job of creating walkable neighborhoods. That needs to change.	6/25/2018 10:28 PM
54	Oregon needs to make these developers pay for the new schools and improved roads that are needed with all of this new development!	6/25/2018 5:22 PM
55	There needs to be funding for infrastructure development for areas already brought into the UGB. Gresham's annexed Pleasant Valley is still waiting for sewer service to start development. The development that has taken place is from a "temporary" pump system to reach existing sewer. One developer is responsible for almost all PV development based on the temporary pumping system. A revolving account that can be tapped into by cities and paid back with SDC fees that are collected with development would keep Metro from having to add land to the UGB now.	6/25/2018 1:28 PM
56	Wilsonville and Hillsboro are the only proposals that will actually work as planned. King City and Beaverton must be rejected.	6/22/2018 8:20 PM
57	Roads need to be improved before development. Farmington is becoming a parking lot and development has just begun. The roads cannot handle the proposed growth. The standard of living is decreasing every year due to traffic congestion. BUILD ROADS!	6/14/2018 6:40 PM
58	We need more housing in the metro area and the only two city's that are working hard and has proven them selfs are King City and Beaverton. The proposal by wilsonville is poorly done.	6/14/2018 12:38 PM
59	Urban growth boundary expansions should be contingent on ensuring existing built-up areas (particularly downtowns, main streets and other areas close to frequent transit, commercial areas and employment centers) are prioritized for mixed-use and walkable development first. Once those areas have been built-out, local cities should be allowed to consider growth boundary expansions (note that reducing barriers to high density, mixed-use, walkable development is not enough; the areas should be built-out with high density, mixed-use, walkable development first). If that condition is met, any UGB expansion should be prioritized in (1) areas with low-quality soils that cannot be used for farming; (2) areas with limited or no slopes to reduce development costs, minimize natural hazards, and reduce pedestrian and bicycle barriers; (3) areas where groundwater/soil contamination and/or runoff will not harm water quality to ensure the protection of our region's water supply (drinking and non-drinking water) and to preserve the health of streams (including the animals and plants that live within or alongside those streams); (4) areas that are contiguous and well connected to existing built-up areas so that infrastructure costs remain low and large new roadways are not required to accommodate the new growth areas; and (5) areas that can easily/efficiently be served by fixed-route transit that is well integrated to the rest of the TriMet/SMART/C-Tran network(s).	6/13/2018 8:08 PM
60	These cities should only be allowed to expand once a plan is in place to provide alternative means of transportation (not 18400 more cars on the road)	6/13/2018 8:03 AM
61	I see so many vacant lots and vacant commercial space in existing urban areas. I would like to see a much more concerted effort to make use of unused space within current cities before expanding to precious farmland and nature areas.	6/13/2018 7:50 AM
62	Please allow more land for homes. We need more housing options and I don't want to live in a small condo.	6/12/2018 6:19 PM
63	Rankings above given: 1 is lowest importance, 5 is highest importance.	6/11/2018 11:46 AM
64	Please ensure that existing urban areas have flexible zoning that allow for many types of infill development prior to considering UGB expansion. It is frustrating to see us consider expanding the UGB when our municipalities (including Portland) have large swaths of highly restrictive zoning that allow only for detached homes on relatively large lot sizes. Minimum parking requirements and disconnected suburban-style streets further restrict the ability of our existing urban areas to serve our housing and transportation needs. These zoning restrictions mandate auto-oriented sprawl and undercut the goals of the UGB. Thank you!	6/11/2018 9:27 AM
65	all should be considered, but my number 1 choice essential	6/11/2018 8:56 AM
66	I don't believe any of the cities are required to provide new housing for the people who are "projected" to move here, if the current residents don't believe that's a good idea. Growth, at any cost, is not a desirable goal.	6/11/2018 7:14 AM
67	This factors don't include protection of environmentally sensitive inside and outside the UGB. I would make this number 2 or 3.	6/8/2018 11:40 AM

Q4 Comment: Beaverton

Answered: 53 Skipped: 122

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	We live in the "Urban reserve area" and have NO interest in being annexed into the city of Beaverton OR the Urban Growth Boundary. Our property is NOT for sale for development.	7/9/2018 8:43 PM
2	See comments on previous survey page.	7/9/2018 5:04 PM
3	Beaverton has not adequately addressed traffic issues in this area. Ideas such as "straightening the kink" on 175th makes little sense when it just makes for a steeper grade on an already steep hill in an area prone to icing. Also increasing traffic due to development already underway is leading to increasing congestion. These are country roads on hilly terrain; it is not possible to fill them up with end-to-end traffic and expect any satisfied road user. I do not support including this area inside the Urban Growth Boundary until the long term traffic issues are addressed and any road improvements are completed and are proven to resolve congestion and flow problems.	7/9/2018 3:47 PM
4	Beaverton ignores the concerns of the local residents who are subject to their "empire building". No cooperation with the Save 175th ave .org neighborhood group...we need to be heard by Metro.	7/9/2018 2:51 PM
5	LOVE that this would be growth within the existing city limits and that it includes multi-family residential development.	7/9/2018 1:39 PM
6	A lot of this land is not buildable. Maybe only the south western part of the Urban Reserve area could be moved in to the UGB which is mostly flat.	7/9/2018 12:38 PM
7	NORTH COOPER: 1. Try and keep this area less dense than what is shown as "planned" in the Urban Reserve Area. 2. Forget the short-cut bypass from 185th to Kemmer Road. You are impacting too many established neighborhoods (SW Heightsview Ct.). Tax dollars wasted. The bypass will only save 1 minute off commute time. Consider just rounding off corners (Gassner > SW 190th & 190th > Kemmer). That scenario has less negative impact. 3. There is also a small wetland area on the bypass route. It would be nice to avoid that too 4. Long term plan should be to avoid any major arterial going over Cooper Mountain due to inclement weather during winter months (snow and ice buildup on steep roads (South on 185th over Cooper & South on 175th over Cooper). A Cooper Mountain Bypass plan has been popping around which seems like a good idea URBAN RESERVE AREA: 1. Please don't not put Compact & Urban Neighborhoods in. Cooper Mountain is not the place to try and get high density housing areas placed. There are better areas off of the mountain to do this. The Compact Neighborhood north of Winkelman Park doesn't make sense due to density and extra traffic load that will place on 175th (inclement weather issue again).	7/9/2018 12:26 PM
8	The Cooper Mountain Urban Reserve Area comprises a set of riparian areas around various streams stemming from the Cooper Mountain Nature Park and lands to the east of that. The area has also historically been part of the county Significant Natural Area (SNA) and a wildlife corridor. The SNA and the wildlife corridor was an extension of such areas that went over the top of Cooper Mountain to the NE down the Beaverton Johnson Creek's headwaters. That area was already significantly compromised with the development of Renaissance Pointe I&II 10-15 years ago. Further denigrating these SNA through developing the Urban Reserve Area may make Cooper Mountain Nature Park a Nature Park in name only. A second matter, there is already significant local concern on Cooper Mountain about the volume of traffic that will come across Cooper Mountain from the South Cooper Mountain and Tigard developments south of Scholls Ferry Road. Adding another 3760 units in an area with traffic constraints and no public transit (and in a snow zone) is only going to make the situation worse.	7/8/2018 11:42 PM
9	Beaverton has not shown the ability to develop the infrastructure needed for the North Cooper Mountain and South Cooper areas. More infrastructure and development work should be done for those areas before adding any more land within their UGB.	7/8/2018 10:07 PM
10	There is a need to address public transportation and access to safe sidewalks. Also consider natural resources and wildlife .	7/8/2018 9:39 PM
11	The roads do not support this level of development. Traffic is already horrendous.	7/8/2018 9:30 PM

Growth management for greater Portland

12	Too many homes for the existing roads! Even with the so called "improvements" to 175th Ave, traffic is going to be a nightmare for those of us already living on the mountain.	7/8/2018 9:26 PM
13	See my comments to first question. Same criticism applies.	7/8/2018 9:03 PM
14	The above is a bunch of bullshit! We live on cooper mountain... and have lived with 2 years of construction detours, roads paved, only to be ripped up again, no adequate water supply for the new housing. If \$500,000 is the price range you are looking for houses then you are in the right place. if not... the new houses are overpriced.... that even or your kids might not be able to afford it! check out the pricing. There is no buses to these areas. even the multi- housing is expensive. And look at the amount of houses planned. Traffic is horrible. Schools are overcrowded, even the new ones especially with more growth. Homelessness has increased due to rising rent. give some other area growth, and let south cooper mountain recover first.	7/8/2018 8:53 PM
15	By far the weakest of all of the plans submitted to metro. Current growth has already exceeded peak travel time capacity for roads in this area. The proposal keeps on mentioning 'puzzle piece' making it clear this is more of a land grab than anything. Realistically the surrounding area is not well served by Beaverton in the first place, and their 'concept plan' doesn't address the transportation needs of this area. Build the roads like the 'around the mountain' proposal, don't try to 'fix' 175th and make it into something it can't be. The funniest argument by far was the suggestion of mass septic system failures. Folks in this area are not interested in (eventually) becoming part of Beaverton, the benefits just aren't there.	7/8/2018 8:18 PM
16	Since I live in the massive building area and have for 40 yrs, I have been to many, many meetings and of developers. I have yet to see real affordable housing in the plans of the south Cooper mt area. I have also found that council members whether be county, metro or local school districts put out these surveys and generally don't care what the public thinks. They do what they want.	7/8/2018 7:03 PM
17	Including the central urban reserve area makes a lot of sense, as Beaverton has done a very nice plan to encompass north, south and central Cooper Mountain, and not expanding into this area makes it impossible to carry out their plan and create a more integrated neighborhood and transportation.	7/8/2018 3:31 PM
18	All of Cooper mountain should be in the urban area to all for proper planning of roadway between north and south cooper mountain.	7/8/2018 3:26 PM
19	STOP The growth until you built more roads. Sw 175th cannot handle all the north south traffic !!!!	7/7/2018 9:38 PM
20	The terrain in this area and existing urban reserve protected areas make it a poor candidate for development. Any plan to include this area should necessarily encompass a thorough review of not just available services but also the difficulties and challenges of providing the necessary sewer system (which is limited in this area with much of the proposed growth area not being serviced at all.) Additional transportation options must also be included, and in place before development occurs. The traffic increased over the last few years in large numbers and the new developments underway presently will do nothing more then add to an already exceedingly difficult situation.	7/7/2018 2:33 PM
21	No, I disagree with the UGB moved into this area as the "East Hills" already have established neighborhoods, this will create a patchwork of high density developments with no services or transportation infrastructure. Beaverton does not listen to the current residents including "Save 175th ave.org" who are trying to keep this area livable by moving the major arterial around the mountain. Beaverton's only interest is an increased tax base & this reeks like their attempted annexation of Nike property. WE WILL FIGHT ANNEXATION OF THIS AREA.	7/7/2018 10:33 AM
22	They	7/6/2018 2:53 PM
23	Utilize North Cooper Mountain first	7/6/2018 11:32 AM
24	Just what the area needs, more McMansions around Cooper Mountain Nature Park. Building yet more housing out there will seriously impact the way that the park is managed. I don't imagine these homeowners being too thrilled about controlled burns for instance...	7/2/2018 12:17 PM
25	We need to be careful about over expanding. Traffic and congestion is already getting heavy in these areas as noted at rush hour 4-6pm around Scholls and Roy Rogers as well as 175th and Weir.	7/2/2018 9:13 AM
26	People with million dollar properties do not want to be crammed in. We bought next to an urban reserve so it wouldn't be developed.	7/1/2018 1:56 PM

Growth management for greater Portland

27	It appears the area the City of Beaverton wishes to develop is forested/agricultural land, 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. * https://static1.squarespace.com/static/59c554e0f09ca40655ea6eb0/t/59dd4984a8b2b090a38f07a1/1507674513035/2017-OGWC-Legislative-Report.pdf	6/30/2018 4:31 AM
28	transportation nightmare.no new arterial roads, no new transit. horrific impact to natural resources. no fix to why North Cooper Mountain ALREADY inside UGB has NOT DEVELOPED yet	6/28/2018 10:57 AM
29	South Cooper Mountain would be a great area for Beaverton to grow. With our current housing crisis, especially for affordable homes, I support moving forward making more land available to relieve pressure.	6/28/2018 8:43 AM
30	Beaverton needs to ban the new construction of car dealerships, drive-thrus, car parts stores, and they need to severely limit the amount of car parking allowed for new development of any kind. The South Cooper Mountain neighborhood needs a rerouted bus 56 and bus 92.	6/27/2018 8:56 PM
31	I think this is the best proposal. It is close to schools, jobs, and is near parks.	6/27/2018 5:04 PM
32	I'm a native Oregonian (50 years) and live on Cooper mountain. I know there must be progress and things can't stay as they are...but why develop such a beautiful mountain that has already proven to have an abundant natural habitat and needs to be protected to some degree? Why not build directly on or closer to max lines and/or major highways? i really don't think that Beaverton has mine or for that matter any Metro area tax payer's interests in mind with their proposal. I believe it is entirely a "land grab" for increased taxes and fees (water/sewer, etc) in their jurisdiction. I was so pleased with what was developed in the Progress Ridge area within the last decade, but now this is already at peak capacity for retail,parking, etc and we are not seeing any expansion to this needed resource in the planning....just more homes/townhomes/apartments. Why can't washington county have "forest park" like setting/habitat as does multnomah county?	6/27/2018 1:54 PM
33	It has been stated in this article that Metro was incorrect with their 2015 projection and needs to be reevaluated - I then believe that Beaverton's Concept plan developed in 2014 is also outdated and needs to be re-evaluated.	6/26/2018 8:25 PM
34	The road improvements proposed are not adequate. 175th is the main arterial. With improvements it is still a two lane road that will have to carry far more vehicles.	6/26/2018 2:58 PM
35	We already have housing in the area on the map. The city doesn't need to include this area except to collect more taxes. So I am opposed to the city annexing the area in the map. It won't help us that already live in the area.	6/26/2018 1:00 PM
36	As a current resident of South Cooper Mountain, I am disheartened by this proposal and seriously considering relocating to a different part of the state because of it. We moved to the area specifically because we could be out of the city a bit, but still close enough to take advantage of its conveniences. We also very much appreciated the proximity to local farms and the produce/goods they have to offer. If farmland continues to be turned into developments, we lose a primary defining resource of the Portland area. Portland is rightfully known for and proud of its promotion of local, seasonal, sustainable foods. Over-developing is in direct contradiction to those amazing statutes we are known for.	6/26/2018 11:00 AM
37	The city of Beaverton doesn't care what the citizens have to say. This is just checking a box that says you asked for citizen input.	6/26/2018 8:23 AM
38	Please do not build here! Leave the land the way it is. Let those who do live here enjoy the scenery and parks.	6/26/2018 7:53 AM

Growth management for greater Portland

39	Need a north-south major thoroughfare west of 175th Ave and east of Cooper Mountain Nature Park connecting Kemmer Rd and Scholls Ferry Road. Also, need an east-west major thoroughfare in addition to Alvord Lane extension, and placed north of Alvord Lane and south of Cooper Mountain Nature Park. Lastly, there should be no Low Density or Single-Family along SW 175th Avenue as Fig. ES-3 shows. This will be a major thoroughfare ideal for transit and so in turn denser housing.	6/25/2018 10:36 PM
40	The issue with moving all of these people to major arterial roads and serving them with groceries should be considered. As it stands, 170th, Hart, and Farmington carry a tremendous load of traffic, and can get clogged easily during the commute times. Alternative transportation routes must be planned and encouraged.	6/25/2018 9:21 PM
41	Horrible idea. Not enough roads to support the proposed new housing.	6/25/2018 7:22 PM
42	Looks to me like Beaverton wants to annex all the expensive, rich neighborhoods and leave those less advantaged to hang out to dry.	6/25/2018 6:33 PM
43	I live in the North Cooper Mountain area. The traffic situation is already becoming completely ridiculous and all the scheduled development out this way isn't even done. There are just not enough roads to accommodate cars from another 12,000 homes if the UGB is extended to include South Cooper Mountain. Please help us maintain a reasonable quality of life out here by keeping the current UGB in place around Cooper Mountain.	6/25/2018 4:19 PM
44	I live on 175th and strongly oppose adding the Cooper Mountain Urban Reserve area to the UGB	6/24/2018 2:20 PM
45	How about redeveloping land already with infrastructure and transit access for those who already work in the area. Why build housing for millionaires only from out of state?	6/19/2018 3:31 PM
46	Wonderful plan on paper. It won't matter what development you do downtown if the people living on Cooper Mountain can't get to downtown Beaverton due to unbearable traffic congestion. Farmington and Scholls Ferry are too congested. Farmington needs to be 5 lanes all the way to 209th at minimum, to River Road would be forward thinking. Another large n/s corridor needs developed as well, like punching Cornelius Pass from TV Highway to Scholls Ferry. Road development needs to be planned BEFORE housing development, not after. BUILD ROADS!	6/14/2018 6:56 PM
47	We need more affordable housing in the metro area. Beaverton would like to add 3,760 homes. This is a good start. They also have current developable land in the city limits that they can work with.	6/14/2018 12:42 PM
48	I reviewed the Beaverton proposal, and I think it may be the most thorough of the four. I like that trails are included in the initial planning as well as wildlife corridors. This expansion is into precious natural areas and should be carefully thought out. I am concerned that there is no public transit to this area. What I don't like seeing is people moving farther & farther from their workplaces, commuting by car, and complaining about traffic. This behavior negatively impacts existing inner neighborhoods. I don't want to see street expansion and noise increase in my neighborhood because people are encouraged to move farther out. Also I saw the addition of affordable housing in this plan, but yet there is no access to public transit and little to no food access. Does this not perpetuate the divide between rich and poor?	6/13/2018 8:04 AM
49	This looks like a great and natural area for expanding more homes.	6/12/2018 6:19 PM
50	do not approve this expansion - don't believe this meets regional planning goals	6/11/2018 11:26 PM
51	Please reject this proposal unless Beaverton adjusts its zoning to allow for more housing types, including duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes across the city, with no minimum off-street parking requirements. If Beaverton follows through on this plan, it will create 6.3 homes per acre, which is typical for U.S. suburbs. This represents a tremendous waste of land and undercuts the UGB.	6/11/2018 9:32 AM
52	You need to ensure that some parcels inside this boundary are less expensive to develop (ie, have fewer parks/open space requirements and lower SDCs) so that affordable housing targeting homeowners AT median income (not below and therefore not subsidized) can be constructed by builders.	6/11/2018 8:53 AM
53	Stream and wetland protections are inadequate to preserve viable wildlife corridors. These lands should be protected before expansion occurs.	6/8/2018 11:41 AM

Q5 Comment: Hillsboro

Answered: 21 Skipped: 154

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	This makes good planning sense. I approve!	7/9/2018 3:08 PM
2	Great Proposal - location, use of land, ease of providing services.	7/9/2018 2:30 PM
3	Hillsboro is contributing to suburban sprawl in our region - I do NOT need to see the Portland Metro area become the next sprawling metro area of the USA...we should learn from horrible decisions made in cities as far and wide as Minneapolis, Chicago, Dallas, Houston, LA, Seattle.	7/9/2018 1:40 PM
4	1. Consider punching SW 229th Ave; south to connect up with Clark Hill Road 2. Keep higher density areas nearer to TV Highway for better access to mass transit	7/9/2018 12:40 PM
5	Although the South Hillsboro area has many years of development still to do, Hillsboro is showing with that area that they are able to get infrastructure in place.	7/8/2018 10:09 PM
6	Strongest proposal, build homes where people work! Not where they have to travel from the other side of Portland or from Tualatin/Wilsonville.	7/8/2018 8:19 PM
7	Thank you for taking comments on this process and I hope you will consider my family's concerns in making your decision. I live in the proposed expansion area for Hillsboro and have absolutely no interest in coming into the expansion area. I know of a few others that also aren't interested in joining either. Beyond my personal lack of interest in joining, I have a few other concerns. The first is that Hillsboro has just started to build out South Hillsboro, which is supposed to have 8,000 homes and even though the city thinks people that people who live there will somehow not drive, it is going to make traffic on TV Hwy even more unbearable. If they were to look at increased housing in Hillsboro it would seem to make much more sense to put it closer to highway 26 which was recently expanded. TV Hwy has businesses, railroad tracks and housing on both sides and seems to have already been expanded as fully as possible. In looking at the housing needs analysis there is also a large margin of error that on the low side of the estimate doesn't justify the need for any more housing. Conveniently, the city left the housing needs analysis that they were basing the whole project on from the planning department meeting so that the community didn't have access until after the meeting was done and decision made. A member of the community pointed this out during the meeting and one of the commission members incorrectly cited the wrong document and then said the right one was available. Sometime later in the meeting, when he noticed the community member was going to correct him, he did admit to referencing the wrong document and said the other one had been removed from the website. If this is the level of attention to detail and review the planning commission took towards the project; metro should be concerned. This should be reflected in the meeting minutes of the planning commission. Additionally, this lack of available information prevents those in the community from commenting completely and seems a necessary due process step. At the very least because of this lack of necessary information, Metro should make the city submit in future rounds so the planning commission meeting includes the housing needs analysis and the communities impacted actually have the same data. An additional concern is that it seems the analysis is assuming that some of the housing will go to people with jobs in Portland; however, putting housing in Hillsboro for jobs in Portland seems like poor planning as well as putting unnecessary strain on roads that already can't handle the traffic. In looking at the other cities' proposals it would seem to make much more sense for the housing to be built closer to Portland. For example, the size of the proposal for Beaverton would also seem to go much further in addressing housing needs due to its size. As someone who looked for housing in Beaverton, due to a job and commute daily into Portland; there wasn't anything we could find so ended up back in Hillsboro. Thank you for considering our concerns.	7/7/2018 8:01 AM
8	It seems like Hillsboro is turning its back on the people that have long-lived there, in favor of wealthy workers in the tech industry. Regular people need and deserve places to live as well. Making decisions with only the thought of improving your income tax base is short-sited. What happens when Intel leaves?	7/2/2018 12:20 PM
9	This area is becoming overwhelmed with traffic. We don't need more homes. We need people to move out!	6/29/2018 9:11 AM

Growth management for greater Portland

10	The people of Hillsboro don't want more housing. We need better roads. No one wanted the 8000 homes that already got approved in South Hillsboro. Another 800 houses is not needed. We don't want this growth. The roads are all already too full. Homes should come with bigger lots; not stacked on top of each other. Hillsboro doesn't have enough houses with big lots. Hillsboro's needs more parks and recreation for the families who already live here. Not just parks that get built as part of this expansion. More parks now in the existing boundary. People are leaving Hillsboro because it has grown too much; too fast. This expansion is not wanted!!!!!! The only people who want it are the ones who are going profit off of it. The rest of us don't want more house and people here. Consider one of the other areas for growth. Hillsboro just got an expansion and doesn't deserve another one. Don't expand the boundary. I've gone to all of the city meetings on this issue. The city is pushing forward even though people don't want it. The city is pretending everyone wants this but we don't!!! The city has fudged their data to make it look like more homes are needed but they aren't. This area has protected wetlands and wildlife. Bald eagles that will be displaced.	6/29/2018 6:34 AM
11	South Hillsboro has already been a huge undertaking and the planning has become overwhelming. The impact on areas between TV hwy and 26 have been studied, but in reality are yet to be seen. Witch Hazel Village South is an unnecessary use of natural areas. It is clearly an after thought. Those that feel they missed out on a huge economic opportunity in South Hillsboro are capitalizing on the nearest small portion of land, not already managed by the golf course. Keep the urban growth boundary. Do not expand or further development Brookwood. The schools and homes along it are further endangered by too fast traffic trying to cut through, to an area it shall not reach. It would endanger the urban reserve and over flood river road with unnecessary extra traffic. The stretch marks on our community from greedy over expansion so fast will not be easy to heal. It is an action of greed, not intended for the improvement of Hillsboro.	6/28/2018 10:58 PM
12	Further collapses TV Highway, at least transit is in place now. Is this really needed with South Hillsboro developing?	6/28/2018 10:58 AM
13	Flip the Low Density and Medium Density Residential east-west from how concept plan Fig. 1 shows it. It makes sense to have the greater density closer to Portland than Beaverton and along the existing major thoroughfare (SW Brookwood Pkwy) that connects due north towards the MAX and OR Hwy 8. Also, having the lower density meeting SW River Road, a rural road that borders a rural reserve, makes much more sense.	6/25/2018 10:42 PM
14	I live within the 150 acres and do NOT support this expansion plan. I do not want to be part of the city limits. I think it is completely unnecessary. I enjoy the quiet county setting and the abundant wildlife and wetlands. This expansion will negatively affect our neighborhood. The expansion is unwanted!!!!!!! The roads (TV highway, Cornelius pass and Brookwood) are already overfilled and backed up too much. Traffic is a major problem. The south Hillsboro expansion is going to make the traffic situation much worse and I don't think more homes in this area is a good idea. Plus Hillsboro just got an expansion so I don't think another one is needed this soon. Choose a different city to expand the boundary in instead.	6/23/2018 12:51 PM
15	How about redeveloping land already with infrastructure and transit access for those who already work in the area. Why build housing for millionaires only from out of state?	6/19/2018 3:31 PM
16	TV Hwy and Farmington are too congested to support the proposed development. Farmington needs to be expanded to a 5 lane hwy out to River Rd. Rosedale needs to be improved as well. Cornelius Pass needs to go at least to Farmington, but forward thinking would take it to Scholls Ferry. Build the roads BEFORE development. The standard of living is being compromised due to unbearable traffic congestion. BUILD ROADS!	6/14/2018 7:17 PM
17	The thought to trails seemed very minimal in this plan. I did not see much about public transit in this plan. We need to make an effort to encourage alternate transportation in the future so that having people moving farther from urban centers and workplaces does not just add to traffic load on interior streets.	6/13/2018 8:08 AM
18	This area looks very good to add more homes.	6/12/2018 6:20 PM
19	absolutely do NOT approve! Hillsboro has plenty of new land they are developing with no jobs in the area and promises that people will commute via bike. South Hillsboro should never have be approved, don't make the same mistake again!	6/11/2018 11:27 PM
20	Please reject this proposal unless Hillsboro adjusts its zoning to allow for more housing types, including duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes across the city with no minimum off-street parking requirements.	6/11/2018 9:33 AM
21	Stream and wetland protections are inadequate to preserve and enhance wildlife corridors. These functions, values and sensitive areas should be protected before expansion occurs and enhanced and restored as part of urban development.	6/8/2018 11:42 AM

Q6 Comment: King City

Answered: 18 Skipped: 157

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	King City has a fantastic proposal. Nice planning.	7/9/2018 3:08 PM
2	Best proposal of all, this city knows how to provide good housing choices at reasonable prices.	7/9/2018 2:30 PM
3	Better this than Hillsboro expansion	7/9/2018 1:41 PM
4	Very compelling that King City has largely developed its existing land inventory. Supply of adequate land is essential to meet Metro's other goals for these urban expansions: mix and diversity of affordable housing, higher density in downtown areas, and access to residents at all income levels and communities of color. City residents support the expansion. For a small community, the commitment to its planning effort is significant and commendable. The community gives every indication of being ready to accommodate the desired growth while maintaining its livability and small-town culture.	7/9/2018 9:43 AM
5	This looks like a reasonable addition to the UGB, in an area that currently has little developable land within the UGB.	7/8/2018 10:11 PM
6	Love that the plan includes modular homes and other ideas for single-family homes that others leave out. Supporting other home-grown businesses can help get housing built faster than stick-built with the current builders wrapped up with so many other projects. Also, getting affordable housing built for seniors where there is already infrastructure is ideal.	7/8/2018 8:24 PM
7	King City has big dreams but no means. King City's public works department is a joke. It consists of one employee with a pickup truck. Even simple tasks such as replacing a damaged street sign requires negotiating with the city of Tigard to perform the repairs. ALL maintenance of city-owned property and public property is contracted to outside agencies. King City is dependent upon the city of Tigard for its water source (including projected water needs for development within URA-6D). Tigard has neither budgeted for nor made plans to extend water service to URA-6D development. King City has big dreams but no means.	7/4/2018 11:08 AM
8	Missing is FREEWAY access.	6/28/2018 10:58 AM
9	Great plans to accommodate the growth and development of the City!	6/27/2018 7:52 PM
10	My biggest beef with Beef Bend is avoiding yet another southwest metro Portland gigantic superblock. Do revise the plan to either -- or both -- bridge SW 137th Avenue over the Tualatin River to U.S. 99W at Cipole Road and bridge SW 150th Avenue over the river to the highway. Otherwise, the only north-south connections will be U.S. 99W over the river at the east or Roy Rogers Rd at the west, miles apart from each other. I favor this even if it means shaving off an eastern slice of the Heritage Pines Natural Area.	6/25/2018 10:46 PM
11	I live in Washington County outside of Sherwood. Driving through King City to and from work I encourage King city to build out and improve its infrastructure. I am so disappointed the Sherwood is not joining this growth and hope Metro overrides their decision.	6/25/2018 11:16 AM
12	How about redeveloping land already with infrastructure and transit access for those who already work in the area. Why build housing for millionaires only from out of state?	6/19/2018 3:32 PM
13	King city is in need of positive growth and I believe that they have proven them selfs to be able to grow and develop affordable housing for the regional needs. King city is also out of developable land with in the city limits. This is why I am asking you to approve the King City - Beef Bend South expansion.	6/14/2018 12:48 PM
14	This is a beautiful area along the river. The level of expansion surprised me. I hope that every effort is taken to preserve a good barrier for natural areas. We now have more scientific knowledge about what is needed for healthy wetlands and waterways. Let's make sure we preserve that. Water is our most precious resource.	6/13/2018 8:09 AM

Growth management for greater Portland

15	How does King City propose these new residents get around? Highway 99 is already at full capacity 12 hours out of each day.	6/13/2018 8:04 AM
16	I think king city could use more homes but this looks very difficult to get going in this location.	6/12/2018 6:20 PM
17	this proposal deserves further study and best option presented	6/11/2018 11:28 PM
18	Please reject this proposal unless King City adjusts its zoning to allow for more housing types, including duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes across the city with no minimum off-street parking requirements. While King City claims it is amenable to many types of housing types, the fact that they expect the new area to provide only 8 homes per acre indicates that an expansion is not warranted.	6/11/2018 9:40 AM

Q7 Comment: Wilsonville

Answered: 12 Skipped: 163

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Meh. At least it appears to be better than So Hillsboro development.	7/9/2018 1:42 PM
2	Wilsonville has demonstrated its ability to complete a years-long collaborative effort reaching among its citizens, businesses, development community and other stakeholders in adopting the Frog Pond Area Plan, and more recently, the Frog Pond West Master Plan. Adopted less than a year ago, it is already experiencing multiple subdivision applications that will lead to new homes within the next year. The new Frog Pond expansion under consideration is already Area Planned, with an infrastructure finance plan model already conceived and approved for Frog Pond West. The City has long demonstrated its commitment to support of multiple housing types and densities, as well as live-work space, and housing developments affordable to a variety of owners and renters in a range of income levels. Metro can expect to meet all of its expansion goals with approval of the Frog Pond East and South reserves.	7/9/2018 10:04 AM
3	Wilsonville has done an excellent job of managing growth, particularly with the Villebois development. This proposed addition to the UGB looks well thought out.	7/8/2018 10:13 PM
4	Great place to in-fill and get some more housing close to existing freeways to minimize stress on surface streets.	7/8/2018 8:26 PM
5	Best of proposals, actually has transit and service housing for mental health support.	6/28/2018 10:59 AM
6	First, 1,325 homes across 192 buildable acres is 6.9 homes per acre. That's too low for even a bus to pass every half hour, or 7 or 8 units per acre. I fear 6.9 would too easily fall lower as construction happens over the decades. Second, some areas are so sprawling as to make the plan the galling one among the four concept plans. There simply must not be any R-10 Large Lot SF or Future R-8 Single-Family zoning anywhere as Fig. 12 shows. Lot sizes of 8,000-12,000 and 7,000-9,000 s.f. are sprawling, a waste of land to be in the UGB, and only encourages suburban mischievous development at the expense of Portland and suburbs building starter houses, townhouses, and duplexes. We need more housing like Villebois, not the Stafford area! More personally, Wilsonville is one of the few areas where I might be reasonably able to buy a decent, new construction house in a nice area in a few years. How is that supposed to remain likely for me, priced out of Portland, when Wilsonville is allowed de facto rural estate housing in the UGB? Screw that market; those buyers can buy in Stafford or Dunthorpe. I don't need a rural McMansion to swallow what would've been four starter houses of which one could've been mine. Third, Fig. 12 shows street connections non-existent west to Canyon Creek Road and too few south to Boeckman Road. There's a difference between environmental conversation and stream fetishization. Regional street connections trump streams. And, a connection can be a narrow bridge with 20 feet of pavement, not a giant major thoroughfare, for those concerned about wetlands along streams. How is anyone, including myself, supposed to drive calmly when the damn street system is so sparse that there is basically one, maybe two routes from point A to B? It's already bad enough for Wilsonville. The city already grafted itself to I-5 and yet bisected a growing city into two. Aggravating the sparse connections on the east side will only make it more difficult to get to the few roads that get to the freeway and create more double-back driving. I expect better from Wilsonville, especially with the whining about traffic, traffic, traffic. Yet they want rural estates?! Make 'em walk the talk about compact development. Say no to UGB inclusion until Wilsonville gets serious and revises and adopts a serious concept plan.	6/25/2018 11:04 PM
7	How about redeveloping land already with infrastructure and transit access for those who already work in the area. Why build housing for millionaires only from out of state?	6/19/2018 3:32 PM
8	Please preserve barriers for natural areas and wildlife. It would be nice to see incentives to keep farmland in production as well.	6/13/2018 8:10 AM
9	This too looks like a great and natural location to expand housing.	6/12/2018 6:20 PM
10	don't believe this expansion is truly warranted	6/11/2018 11:29 PM

Growth management for greater Portland

11	We have way more people commuting to Wilsonville, than live here. We need to provide more housing, but in the form of single-family dwelling units, or duplexes that are affordable. It seems we have plenty of apartments available. Our family (residents of Wilsonville) see Apartment Vacancy signs around town, very frequently!	6/11/2018 11:49 AM
12	Please reject this proposal unless Wilsonville adjusts its zoning to allow for more housing types, including duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes across the city with no minimum off-street parking requirements. If Wilsonville follows through on this plan, it will create 7 homes per acre. This indicates that an expansion of the UGB is not warranted.	6/11/2018 9:42 AM

Q13: Additional comments about this issue or this survey

Answered: 78 Skipped: 97

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Please do not extend the Urban Growth Boundary just hoping residents will sell out to big developers with deep pockets! We are not interested in paying higher city property taxes or being forced out of our home.	7/9/2018 8:45 PM
2	We have a housing crisis. All of the proposals should be accepted to help alleviate the need for more housing of all types.	7/9/2018 2:31 PM
3	Please do not let the City of Beaverton do what they did with North Cooper Mtn - getting it in the UGB. They have done nothing with it & will only look for a zoning change.	7/9/2018 12:42 PM
4	Thank you!	7/9/2018 12:42 PM
5	The first (ranking) question is very confusing - I had at least 5 people ask me what it meant and others who didn't fill in the survey because they couldn't figure it out. The question seems stilted in the direction toward someone who knows specifically what they are looking for - to me, this seemed an unnecessary question and assumes that everyone has read all proposals as well as the Metro Urban Growth Report (which only came out on 03 July!). At the very least, a better explanation of this question was needed (such as only one #1, one #2 - and that these goals are only as they apply to the proposals - not to the responder's own personal priorities). The items to be ranked were rephrased & combined in such a way so they did not match directly to Metro Expansion Goals & Objectives and 2 Goals were missing from this list - which is why I mention that the question was then biased.	7/9/2018 12:24 PM
6	Your considerations in this planning is worthless of my input. This agency cares nothing about planning just regulate and pack people in with ZERO consideration of quality of life.	7/9/2018 12:20 PM
7	King City has worked very hard to come up with a thoughtful and comprehensive plan for the future. We need more housing options and this is the only way to do that.	7/9/2018 11:47 AM
8	Do NOT add all 1,232 acres that Beaverton wants to develop in the Cooper Mtn. Urban Reserve. 3,760 homes in addition to the planned communities around Mountainside High School and King City's growth will inundate the intersection at Scholls Ferry Road and Roy Rogers Road. Traffic pushes north up 800-foot Cooper Mountain where dangerous winter weather patterns exist above 500 feet and steeply-sloped terrain. A connector road from Scholls Ferry Rd. toward Orenco Station and on to US 26 is needed around Cooper Mtn. NOW as traffic is overloading existing commuter roads. Don't compound the misery of overloaded roads. The June 7, 2018, CPO6 meeting had these two Q and A questions: Q: "How is it that there are no freeways to get people into Portland faster; where is traffic going from Roy Rogers Road into Beaverton/Hillsboro; and why is there [already] too much traffic on SW 175th, SW 170th, SW 185th, Farmington, and TV Hwy?" A: "A survey is coming out Winter 2018 to answer this question." AND Q: "What about using a route from Cornelius Pass to Clark Hill Rd.?" A: "We can't touch the GREEN highlighted areas or TAN or PURPLE without getting an exception approved." Answers were given from Wash. Co. Transportation planners. See how the new communities around Mountainside H.S. impact the roads and infrastructure first. Then look at new land for housing. You are moving too fast on housing in Beaverton to realize the impact you are going to have on transportation. King City's 538 acres, Hillsboro's 150 acres, and Wilsonvilles' 271 acres will all have difficult transportation issues. So, don't allow all the 1,232 acres that Beaverton wants to add in the Urban Reserve. So, obviously, residents at CPO6 meeting are very frustrated at the overuse of roads as it is. NO MORE HOMES WITHOUT HIGHWAYS to accommodate such growth! Widening existing arterials is not good enough. Wildlife corridors are shrinking and wildlife is leaving as land is cleared and housing goes up. Where is the accountability for wildlife habitat? Why is there such a small 50-foot allowance of buildings to greenspace and so little emphasis on edge habitat? Greenspace is needed for our quality of life because it soaks up air pollution and wildlife corridors encourage animals and birds to remain.	7/9/2018 11:23 AM

Growth management for greater Portland

9	I'd like to express my support for King City's proposed UGB expansion for the following reasons: 1. The City is expected to grow significantly in coming decades but has only 3 acres of buildable land available for new housing and commercial development. King City's Concept Plan provides a long-term vision for growth in this part of the Metro region by providing a mix of new residential and commercial development. 2. King City's plan accommodates a range of housing types that are suitable to a diverse range of age and income groups. 3. Finally, King City has demonstrated it's commitment to inclusiveness and equity through this plan and through past actions and their plan best represents the needs of the Metro region in future decades.	7/9/2018 8:32 AM
10	With current development have seen little expansion to main roadways or alternatives. Concern with Cooper Mtn. Expansion Scholls Ferry is the only way out. Very high density development. Huge loss of trees, wetlands, no new parks planned is very disappointing. Also Beaverton has a history of over crowding schools in relation to new development (Bethany). Would like to see better planning and funding than current taxpayers having to support another bond to alleviate over crowding at neighborhood schools. Seems development should support new schools and infrastructure.	7/9/2018 8:24 AM
11	Please consider movements in roads first before houses are built . Travel times are ridiculous	7/9/2018 7:11 AM
12	Please make sure that your plans are not monopolized by those that would directly profit from UGB additions. That has certainly been true often in the past.	7/8/2018 10:15 PM
13	Concerned about where all these people will fit with one main thoroughfare up and over the mountain. How will some access the outside world when hemmed in by traffic. What about emergencies?	7/8/2018 9:43 PM
14	This survey was a waste of time because it was biased in favor of annexing Cooper Mountain into the UGB and Beaverton to increase Beaverton number of residents and tax revenue.	7/8/2018 9:05 PM
15	letting cooper mountain recover and regain its livability for the next 5 years will not hurt anything and only help. Stop the ugb from moving as the City of Beaverton as requested.	7/8/2018 8:58 PM
16	I believe that extending the UGB on Cooper Mountain would allow way too much development of an area which now includes many beautiful natural spaces. It is a common opinion among current residents that the City of Beaverton is 'tax greedy' and infrastructure poor! Let them deal with what is already being built out before adding more prospective mass development to their plan!! Cooper Mt roads are inherently dangerous and often impassable in winter. Adding more traffic and congestion will severely negatively impact the safety and livability of the area for the current residents and any future residents as well.	7/8/2018 8:46 PM
17	Beaverton proposal the weakest of those submitted, Hillsboro the strongest.	7/8/2018 8:28 PM
18	I am strongly opposed to the expansion of the UGB to include any more area of Cooper Mountain at this time. We need to assess the impact of the thousands of new homes to be built in So. Cooper Mountain area, River Terrace, etc. before allowing more high density housing in an area still being used for farming and timber growth, and possessing abundant wild life. To date, no governing body has shown any effective plan to deal with the impact of increased traffic and congestion to the livability of the area that will surely occur when all the now approved homes are built and occupied.	7/8/2018 7:38 PM
19	Very disappointed that money is more important than teaching our children about the wildlife, importance of plants and playing outside. guess they can look at pictures of animals and plants in books or on their computers as no play to play either. Great future for our children.	7/8/2018 7:10 PM
20	Consider the build ability of the area. Consider the value and benefit of natural areas. Make sure that transportation projects are feasible and practical for the area.	7/8/2018 4:43 PM
21	Transportation remains a huge issue, as well as affordable housing. By not integrating the entire Cooper Mountain neighborhood, it delays any improvements in transportation that Beaverton is attempting to provide. Please consider transportation as well as housing when considering the urban growth boundary expansion. Our area is growing so quickly, any delay will only cause increased costs and make our traffic problems worse because they cannot be addressed while areas are outside the boundary	7/8/2018 3:34 PM
22	Question #1 is really poor. 3 of the 5 items to be rated have little or no bearing on expansion.	7/8/2018 10:54 AM
23	Stop the growth on cooper mtn until there is a north south route built! Sw 175th is dangerously over trafficked already! Add new roads first	7/7/2018 9:40 PM

Growth management for greater Portland

24	My final comment would be that the Cooper mountain area has been proposed by the city of Beaverton. This will mean annexation into Beaverton for all residents and property owners in the affected area. I personally am opposed to such an excision and thereby would be opposed to the addition of the area into the urban growth boundary. I know that many of my friends and neighbors are of the same feelings, and hope that they will express these thoughts to you in the same way that I have. Thank you for the opportunity to have my opinions recorded. I hope they help	7/7/2018 2:35 PM
25	I believe expansion of the UGB is essential to the continuing development of King City and the plan has been meticulously thought out.	7/7/2018 11:46 AM
26	Beaverton's land grab is not required or justified. They have shown total disregard for the opinions of residents that live here. Total disregard for what funds are required to develop an area that already has established neighborhoods & no large parcels of land left. We do not want to be a part of the UGB & subsequent annexation in to Beaverton!	7/7/2018 10:46 AM
27	Thank you for taking comments on this process and I hope you will consider my family's concerns in making your decision. I live in the proposed expansion area for Hillsboro and have absolutely no interest in coming into the expansion area. I know of a few others that also aren't interested in joining either. Beyond my personal lack of interest in joining, I have a few other concerns. The first is that Hillsboro has just started to build out South Hillsboro, which is supposed to have 8,000 homes and even though the city thinks people that people who live there will somehow not drive, it is going to make traffic on TV Hwy even more unbearable. If they were to look at increased housing in Hillsboro it would seem to make much more sense to put it closer to highway 26 which was recently expanded. TV Hwy has businesses, railroad tracks and housing on both sides and seems to have already been expanded as fully as possible. In looking at the housing needs analysis there is also a large margin of error that on the low side of the estimate doesn't justify the need for any more housing. Conveniently, the city left the housing needs analysis that they were basing the whole project on from the planning department meeting so that the community didn't have access until after the meeting was done and decision made. A member of the community pointed this out during the meeting and one of the commission members incorrectly cited the wrong document and then said the right one was available. Sometime later in the meeting, when he noticed the community member was going to correct him, he did admit to referencing the wrong document and said the other one had been removed from the website. If this is the level of attention to detail and review the planning commission took towards the project; metro should be concerned. This should be reflected in the meeting minutes of the planning commission. Additionally, this lack of available information prevents those in the community from commenting completely and seems a necessary due process step. At the very least because of this lack of necessary information, Metro should make the city submit in future rounds so the planning commission meeting includes the housing needs analysis and the communities impacted actually have the same data. An additional concern is that it seems the analysis is assuming that some of the housing will go to people with jobs in Portland; however, putting housing in Hillsboro for jobs in Portland seems like poor planning as well as putting unnecessary strain on roads that already can't handle the traffic. In looking at the other cities' proposals it would seem to make much more sense for the housing to be built closer to Portland. For example, the size of the proposal for Beaverton would also seem to go much further in addressing housing needs due to its size. As someone who looked for housing in Beaverton, due to a job and commute daily into Portland; there wasn't anything we could find so ended up back in Hillsboro. Thank you for considering our concerns.	7/7/2018 8:01 AM
28	Don't expand the UGB!	7/6/2018 11:33 AM
29	We should leave islands of less dense development for other creatures as we expand our footprint across the land, don't you think. Thank You.	7/6/2018 9:47 AM
30	I believe that development in the Cooper Mountain Urban Reserve has property owners who are interested in being added to the urban growth boundary to allow development of great new neighborhoods. These neighborhoods would provide housing to meet the demand in the Beaverton area and the region.	7/5/2018 2:48 PM
31	As a resident of King City I am with the majority of current residents that do NOT want to expand. King City fought our petition that showed almost 90-percent of residents are against the plan of our current (soon to be replaced) City Manger and volunteer mayor. King City has big dreams but no means. Please reject their proposal.	7/4/2018 11:11 AM
32	We need to focus on maintaining what is the most important quality of the region, conservation of our natural resources, waterways and green spaces for future generations	7/3/2018 1:18 PM
33	You area already destroying the area enough. Annexing the natural reserve would not be an ok answer to the city's growth needs	7/1/2018 1:58 PM
34	In this conversation about density and growth management I would like to see more information about and proposals involving Trimet and other public transit	6/30/2018 6:25 PM
35	Please respect the existing UGB. Thank you.	6/30/2018 4:32 AM

Growth management for greater Portland

36	I grew up in Hillsboro and I was born in Tuality hospital. Hillsboro is becoming overly populated and the expansion, in my mind, is a terrible idea! Traffic is absolutely horrible now and what happened to going for a drive on the "back roads" to enjoy this amazing and beautiful city we used to live in? Now those same roads are just as bad as hw 217. There is a thread on FB in the Hillsboro Free classifieds from a lady who is a realtor trying to get her name out here so she can sell homes in the new development by tv highway and Cornelius pass. You should take a moment, find that, and read all of the comments and see hiw many people can't wait to move out of Hillsboro because of what it's becoming. So many native locals are disgusted with this area and the future plans for Hillsboro. We want our smaller town, tight knit community back. Not thousands of more homes over the next 20 + years. I have a family to raise and this is not the Hillsboro I grew up in and I don't want to raise my kids here. We are looking to purchase around a 400k to 500k home in a small community with less than 35k people. Maybe even smaller. I wish we could stay in this area and raise my family where my family has been for a few generations. My grandparents had 40 acres up off pumpkin ridge and another plot off skyline and keiser. My other grandma grew up in Roy and my family has been in this surrounding area for a very long time. I would love to stick around show my kids our family heritage and where we are from but I'm afraid the time has come to find another small town to raise my family in a smaller community that we have always known and appreciated. I'm not the only local true native who feels this way. Open your eyes and see what this has done to the families who have lived here for generations! Please.	6/29/2018 9:36 AM
37	Don't expand in Hillsboro!	6/29/2018 6:35 AM
38	The other development plans listed- Cooper mtn, bull run... They add more housing and are in areas that are not as clearly tacked on to the South Hillsboro expansion. There is no need yet to expand this huge project when it is in this early stage.	6/28/2018 11:00 PM
39	We are not in favor of the witch hazel expansion.	6/28/2018 10:37 PM
40	Beaverton failed miserably with Goal 1 compliance in South Cooper Mountain, and as that was the planning vehicle for the Urban Reserve Area, upset neighbors were managed, and not integrated in the planning process. Mis-set expectations are plentiful as the modifications to the comp plan further stretch the promises implied by the community plan. Example: Community Plan suggested minimum lot density would be 3,500 sq ft, and now we see 3k sq ft lots without ANY NEW ROAD CAPACITY.	6/28/2018 11:04 AM
41	Washington County needs to ban the new construction of car dealerships, drive-thrus, car parts stores, and they need to severely limit the amount of car parking allowed for new development of any kind.	6/27/2018 8:57 PM
42	Great progress for the City of King City, OR and future generations to come! Councilman Dr. Smart Ocholi, City of King City, OR	6/27/2018 7:54 PM
43	I'm disappointed to see that Beaverton is willing to sacrifice the Cooper Mountain Nature Park in this proposal. While I assume the actual Park would not be given up, developing the land around this area would dramatically affect the wildlife (flora and fauna) that thrive in and around this area.	6/27/2018 6:53 PM
44	The only way you really solve the affordable housing is thru urban sprawl. where you can building low cost housing. This is not politically possible in Oregon so all these surveys are useless nonsense.. keep the apartment building and the traffic grid lock look at schools ferry and roy rogers rd. and you call it planning. All those row houses and only one road in and out.	6/27/2018 4:28 PM
45	Poorly explained survey objective and methodology. I think the ranking system being used is inappropriate and individual topics should be ranked - not comparatively. The process being used could lead to mis-informed support (like having to rank something #2 that is as poorly done as #5) and incomplete data findings.	6/27/2018 3:45 PM
46	I support King City's proposal to expand.	6/27/2018 2:09 PM
47	thanks for the opportunity to give my opinion. ;-)	6/27/2018 2:06 PM
48	At this time I feel it is too soon to add any more land inside the city of Beaverton until more thought is put into how it can handle transportation needs like "Around the Mountain" which would help keep people off the mountain during winter and provide a safer route to Hillsboro, Tigard, and Sherwood then the blind hills and curves that exist. Also the need to protect more of the mountains nature and all the ecosystems that live here which are already highly impacted by the development occurring. It does not need to be a Mountain full of houses!	6/26/2018 8:35 PM
49	Pass all the proposals. We need homes	6/26/2018 7:37 PM

Growth management for greater Portland

50	We are not looking forward to the heavy traffic on the roads on and around Cooper Mt.	6/26/2018 3:01 PM
51	We already have housing in the area on the map. The city doesn't need to include this area except to collect more taxes. So I am opposed to the city annexing the area in the map. It won't help us that already live in the area.	6/26/2018 1:01 PM
52	This is an excellent opportunity for King City.	6/26/2018 11:41 AM
53	King City should move forward with the speed possible without being pressured.	6/26/2018 10:44 AM
54	I like the idea of going 'back' to smaller homes on smaller parcels. If we can do that well, affordability will follow and with affordable homes (not apartments and condos), integrated communities that foster mutual respect and support can happen. I like the King City plan for its honest acknowledgement of where it's been and how it wants to evolve. Location by the river and proximity to the wildlife preserve is a wonderful bonus for future residents.	6/26/2018 10:18 AM
55	None other than thanks for having it particularly for the UGB expansion review and the four candidate urban reserves. I'm glad to be able to comment on development in areas I visit, drive through, shop in, and visit friends in -- when I don't live there and so can't nag a city council for a suburb about shirking its duty and expecting most everyone (other than those who want and can buy a rural estate) to move to Portland. Second, I'm interested in Metro publishing aggregate responses and publicizing when that happens. Third, I want to see how the results actually influence what Metro and the four suburbs do -- and don't do.	6/25/2018 11:09 PM
56	Please stop building in the Cooper Mountain area, there is too much traffic on Scholls Ferry. I would prefer to see growth in Wilsonville or King City.	6/25/2018 9:49 PM
57	Would love to see the forest remain as a forest.	6/25/2018 9:21 PM
58	Do not move the UGB and stop building houses on top of each other!	6/25/2018 5:23 PM
59	Please leave the current UGB in place around Cooper Mountain until someone figures out what to do about the traffic problems in this area. We need more roads before more housing is built.	6/25/2018 4:21 PM
60	We need to plan for roads ahead of development. Study other areas around the country that do a good job of moving people using cars. Parking is also needed in planning, even along transit corridors.	6/25/2018 1:32 PM
61	The city and county have the power to determine the methodology for accommodating change, without available land traffic will get worse. There is a tremendous support for growth and change and bring revenue into these cities.	6/25/2018 11:22 AM
62	Big surprise: How about redeveloping land already with infrastructure and transit access for those who already work in the area. Why build housing for millionaires only from out of state? We are 20,000 units short of housing for folks who make less than 60K in family income. new land homes start about \$500,000 ea	6/19/2018 3:34 PM
63	Our jurisdictions are so fouled up in the Portland Metro areas. We need development to support our growing communities. I just don't understand how city council approves expansions only to be shot down by a few anti-development neighbors.	6/18/2018 10:47 AM
64	BUILD ROADS!	6/14/2018 7:18 PM
65	Please put personal issues aside and plan for the Metro region.	6/14/2018 12:50 PM
66	Based on the amount of single-family and under-developed properties already in built-up parts of the Portland metro area, I don't think any of these UGB expansions are necessary. Many corridors, even in denser parts of Portland, are still under-developed. The only place we should be expanding the UGB is internally: on parking lots, built-up areas that are prime for development and re-development, in close-in low-density neighborhoods, and on street corners of low-density neighborhoods in areas further from the core and in suburban areas.	6/13/2018 8:12 PM
67	I'm strongly in favor of the King City expansion. I believe it will add walkability for our community and provide assistance for the ever-growing housing crisis	6/13/2018 3:31 PM

Growth management for greater Portland

68	Overall my concerns are for the environment and for equity. We need to preserve natural areas, wildlife corridors, and waterways. We need to make sure they have an appropriate barrier to be healthy. We need to make the co-habitation between wildlife and humans is as good as it can be as we expand into their territory. Wildlife provides many benefits to us. And water is our most precious resource, so keep that clean and open, not covering it up, and having natural ways for water to remain in the environment should be a high priority. I'm also concerned that as expansion goes out, it perpetuates the divide between rich/poor and white/PoC. A progressive look towards the future to include all and to move transportation away from one car/one person is vital. The suburban model that we've been living for decades needs to be tossed out. We should not keep embracing the drive everywhere concept.	6/13/2018 8:22 AM
69	These cities should provide public transportation improvements before building more houses.	6/13/2018 8:05 AM
70	Please open up suburban areas for more homes. I dont want to live in a crowded downtown environment. thank you	6/12/2018 6:22 PM
71	Please Stop building houses	6/12/2018 8:02 AM
72	I'm unconvinced that another expansion of the UGB is needed and will do anything but line the pockets of developers and people selling their land.	6/11/2018 11:31 PM
73	When selecting which communities are given the opportunity to expand, do what you can to see that each community that's applied gets included, at least partially, in their expansion proposals. I'm sure we all have room and needs to expand!	6/11/2018 11:52 AM
74	Thanks for all you do!	6/11/2018 9:42 AM
75	our rapid population growth requires we are more savvy in our land use. Old models of how we slowly expanded need to be discarded and thoughtful and quicker approaches to address need for industrial land, as well as housing, needs to occur. If cities are willing to add the infrastructure, let's move faster.	6/11/2018 8:59 AM
76	I would have liked to comment on all the proposals.	6/11/2018 8:54 AM
77	Growth almost never pays for itself, but imposes costs, both fiscal & physical, on the current population. All these cities, plus Portland, should have to improve their social and physical infrastructure to a point where it adequately serves the existing population, before they start planning for future residents. And they clearly have not done that. Adding more housing only exacerbates every current urban problem, and solves none for the people who live here NOW.	6/11/2018 7:20 AM
78	There needs to be a greater focus on protection and enhancement of environmentally sensitive lands for people, wildlife, water quality and overall watershed health. They are part of a complete community and the tools and mechanisms for their preservation and provision are inadequate and inadequately represented in this survey.	6/8/2018 11:44 AM