

Attachment 3
Scenarios Written Public Comments

| Comment # | Name | District | Preferred Scenarios | Comment |
|-----------|----------------|----------|---------------------|--|
| 1 | Duncan Hwang | 6 | A1, A2, C | Scenario B2 greatly impacts 82nd Ave, Jade District, and AAPI community centers. It moves our communities to a brand new district 5 where we have minimal contact with electeds. We would prefer SE Portland remain intact. Our communities are concentrated along 82nd and into SE Portland along Division and in Lents. A and C keep those communities more intact. NW, N, SW Portland all in an apple core district does not make sense to me. |
| 2 | Michael Vest | 1 | A1 | All scenarios have their pluses and minuses. Everyone that weighs in has a bias for their choice. I would choose the one that is most efficient for Metro to deliver services to the communities, however that could be measured. |
| 3 | John Murphy | 3 | C | Scenario C seems to best represent the character and diversity in the 6 metro districts and will lead to better representation of the communities involved. |
| 4 | Brendan Brezic | 5 | A2 | District 1's connectivity to the Hazelwood, Mill Park, and Powellhurst-Gilbert Neighborhoods and other East Portland neighborhoods east of the 205 makes more sense than including Happy Valley. Additionally, the inclusion of Cedar Hills in District 6 makes sense to more seamlessly maintain connection along the main thoroughfare of Beaverton Hillsdale Highway. This proposal seems like it would still offer a diverse demographic in all districts. |
| 5 | Karen Buehrig | 2 | A2 | I think it has the best geographic distribution. I like having the rural part of Damascus in District 1, but not the more urban Happy Valley. |
| 6 | Teresa Lawler | 4 | C | I live in West Slope and Washington County. We have much more in common interests/issues with the Districts on the west side of the Metro Area, and less in common with Portland's. Therefore Option A-2 is least favored. Scenario C combines similar neighborhoods the best, although A1,B1&B2 are acceptable. |

| | | | | |
|----|--------------------|---|----|--|
| 7 | Bill Waring | 5 | B2 | It keeps my neighborhood in Washington County much more intact. |
| 8 | Marietta Matto | 5 | A1 | It looks like A1 is best for Unincorporated Washington Co. It seems we have similar problems. |
| 9 | Harrison Whitmarsh | 5 | A1 | As a Realtor, I have a wealth of information about these neighborhoods, and I think A1 properly segments the map into like-neighborhoods. The populations of this map have the most in common. |
| 10 | Lori Geres | 2 | B1 | Shift to encompass all of Clackamas County in one zone. |
| 11 | Michael Dahlstrom | 3 | C | Of the options, pulling Aloha into District 4 is reasonable. As the area is legislatively proposed to become part of both Hillsboro and Beaverton, there at least is some commonality. Putting the area east of I-5 to District 2 still crosses county boundaries between WashCo and ClackCo, there is still more commonality in River Grove to Lake Oswego/West Linn than Tualatin. And moving West Slope/Cedar Mills into the district with Beaverton makes sense for the commissioner. Realizing that unincorporated areas of Aloha, Reedville, Cedar Mill and West Slope remain unwilling to annex to their legislatively assigned adjacent cities (and the cities apparent unwillingness to try and annex), there are at least common services between those uninc areas service providers and the cities'. Washington County Plan 2000, ORS Urban Area Plans, and Metro's own 2040 Plan all identify city responsibilities and eventual assumption of services. Perhaps in Districts 2 and 4, those commissioners might be interested in promoting future annexations? |
| 12 | Sean McClintock | 6 | B2 | SE Portland has more in common with NE Portland than we do with the SW and S areas. I feel these boundaries better align shared interests and values. |
| 13 | Rachel Reynolds | 6 | B2 | Most accurately represents the "feel" of each district. Areas of town have a vibe, and this reflects the vibe boundaries. |
| 14 | Leslie Wu | 6 | B1 | This is the only scenario that blocks the area east of I205 outside the district for SE. The area east of I205 has very different needs |

| | | | | |
|----|---------------|---|-----------|---|
| | | | | than the rest of the area in SE and so should be grouped with the remaining area east of I-205. |
| 15 | Ray Young | 1 | A1, C | Scenarios B1 and B2 make no sense in how they treat Boring and Damascus. I have lived in the the SE corner of Metro over 50 years, and that area has much more in common with Gresham and east County than Lake Oswego and the Stafford area. Boring and Damascus should absolutely be included in District 1. |
| 16 | Rithy Khut | 6 | A1, B2, C | For simple changes (A1 and C), the rural areas outside of Gresham and Happy Valley should be represented as one block. Same as Aloha. For B2, it makes more sense that D5 should be a contiguous block and D6 includes all the areas of the West Hills/Tualatin Mountains. |
| 17 | Shaun Sullens | 5 | C | It removes west slopes and puts it in a different area. |
| 18 | Bryce Glenn | 6 | A2 | I prefer A2 because of the minimal changes. It also makes sense to simplify the boundary in Happy Valley. |
| 19 | Robin Ye | 5 | B1, C | B1 Merits: Makes I-205 the dividing boundary between District 1 and 6, keeping together East Portland. Clackamas County line makes sense as a southern border differentiating District 1 and 2. District 5 inner core/SW Portland preserves a better understanding of transportation, commerce, and community links between SW Portland corridors and adjacent cities running down Willamette and 99W. District 4 reflects housing development while still keeping communities in unincorporated Washington County together and using TV Highway as a corridor of interest. C merits: Very few changes applied, but the changes do make sense by using US-26 West as a northern border for District 3; maintaining TV highway as the important corridor that it is for District 4. |
| 20 | Dave Malcolm | 5 | B1 | Common sense, easily understood boundaries and common issues in the areas. |
| 21 | Jim Emerson | 5 | A1, C | In addition to the advantage of changing little, therefore not confusing the public further about Metro, these scenarios ensure that each Counselor must represent (and understand) a varied |

| | | | | |
|----|-----------------------|-----|-----------|---|
| | | | | District. The whole idea of Metro is to think Regionally and broadly, not just advocate for one type of community. |
| 22 | Mary Manseau | 4 | A1 | It keeps most of the urban unincorporated area in Washington County within one district. However, why is west bonny slope--a Washington county area--lumped with dissimilar areas in Multnomah County and City of Portland. A finer filter should be used when looking at where to draw the lines on a map! Just because an area has a Portland mailing address, doesn't mean that an area has any relationship or share any similarities with City of Portland. |
| 23 | Susan Andrews | N/A | B1 | I do not think the natural areas in the west hills should be consolidated into an urban area. The east and north areas of Bethany are closely linked ecologically to the west hills and decisions about watershed, wildlife, natural areas as well as transportation planning should group these areas together. |
| 24 | Alana Mongkhounsavath | 2 | B1, B2 | I live in unincorporated Clackamas county, for ease, sometimes I say Milwaukie sometimes Happy Valley. Most of my neighbors don't know what Metro is. Where is my community meant to go to ask for better services? There is so much growth that is happening east of where I live, my neighbors and I deserve one voice representing us. It makes sense to capture cities and unincorporated areas into a single district – don't keep my community divided (it doesn't make sense to have half of Happy Valley in one district and the other half in another). |
| 25 | Carol Hasenberg | 6 | A1, C | I like to have my slice of EPDX in District 6 because I think my interests and values are more in line with that area. |
| 26 | Monica Klau | N/A | C | Seems the most balanced. |
| 27 | Meng-Lun Chen-Pinkham | 3 | A1, A2, C | Population is closer to each other. And in district 6 population will increase pretty fast over time since it's closer to downtown area. |
| 28 | Catherine Nicewood | 1 | A1 | A1 is more aligned with physical boundaries that make sense. |
| 29 | Lin Pond | 1 | B1 | Concern for district 1 - Please do not make the border NE 122nd. By making 205 the boundary the district will have common needs and issues that Metro can address. Keeping NE 122nd as the boundary |

| | | | | |
|----|--------------|---|--------|--|
| | | | | <p>splinters Outer East Portland making it harder for an area that is in much need of attention from getting cohesive attention. NE 122nd already suffers a lack of business investment and an abundance of county/service providers which has severely impacted livability. The services have gone in as grocery stores have gone out. We need one representative to be speaking for this part of METRO. Please do not make NE 122nd the boundary for district 1. Please use 205 as the boundary.</p> |
| 30 | Sara Schmitt | 5 | B1, B2 | <p>I'm grateful for the opportunity to provide input during the redistricting process. I live in North Portland in Multnomah County, and I work as an educator in Beaverton, in Washington County.</p> <p>Over the last 10 years, the Metro region has grown and our communities have become increasingly diverse. As our communities become increasingly diverse, it's imperative that we adjust Metro boundaries to guarantee equitable representation. This will give voice and power to historically underrepresented communities when decisions are made about regional planning, access to natural spaces, transportation, sustainability, land use and development, etc.</p> <p>This is a once in a decade opportunity to ensure equitable representation, and I urge you to consider racial equity in this redistricting process. As mapped now, scenarios A1, A2, and C do not advance that value. On the other hand, scenarios B1 and B2 would keep communities of common interest intact and empowered.</p> <p>Decisions about ways that the Metro Council will improve the livability and health of our region will be improved with equitable representation of historically marginalized voices. Thank you for the important work you are doing to update the representation in the Metro districts.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|----------------------|---|-----------|---|
| 31 | Felicita Montebianco | 4 | B1, B2, C | <p>Greetings Metro President and Council! Thank you for all your hard work on this!</p> <p>I write as a long-time resident of Aloha. As you are likely aware, Aloha is unincorporated, which means politically we don't have a lot of power. It also happens to be extremely diverse and have a diversity of incomes. I am especially sensitive to my community after the redrawing of congressional maps that divide Aloha and Beaverton in half. While I have no doubt your job is very difficult I'm hoping you can be mindful that Aloha continues to receive "the short end of the stick" when it comes to building power and connecting to policy and policy makers - which ultimately ensures we can build community and advocate for needed change. Please keep Aloha entirely in one district.</p> <p>All the best, Felicita Montebianco</p> |
|----|----------------------|---|-----------|---|