

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
3	Area93ResDesig	Low Density, no greater than R-6 was promised in exchange for Area 93 Residents' support to move Area 93 into Washington County. No bait and switch, please!!
4	Area93ResDesig	We support low density.
5	Area93ResDesig	No "bait and switch!" Andy said, "Washington County can't support the high density Multnomah County planned." No high density! The community signed off on Andy Duyck's plan/presentation based on low density.
6	Area93ResDesig	Do not want proposed road to go through existing neighborhood.
7	Area93ResDesig	Are you extending the Urban Growth Boundary? What's Up?
8	Area93ResDesig	Should low density (R5 or 6) zoning to transition into surrounding rural area.
9	Area93ResDesig	Low density should be extended (more of it).
10	Area93ResDesig	Need lower density-max lot size of 5000 plus sq. ft.
11	Area93ResDesig	Lots are wrong - developers will put a 4000 sq. ft. house on these lots. That look out of place.
12	Area93ResDesig	Low density-like the surrounding neighborhoods?
13	Area93ResDesig	There should be a mix of density. Some multi-family, some low density, some in-between.
14	Area93ResDesig	Low density-yes!
15	Area93ResDesig	Need R5-even lower density.
16	Area93ResDesig	Low density only - developers ↑ density- too much demand on local community resources.

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
17	Area93ResDesig	I would support the ENTIRE Area 93 being low density only.
18	Area93ResDesig	Entire area low density is more congruous with neighboring sites.
19	Area93ResDesig	Low!
20	Area93ResDesig	Low density R6/R5.
21	Area93ResDesig	Low density only.
22	Area93ResDesig	Low.
23	Area93ResDesig	Keep it all low.
24	Area93ResDesig	Low density, please.
25	Area93ResDesig	Low density.
26	Area93ResDesig	Low density-keep the big old growth trees!
27	Area93ResDesig	R6-Low density-this was promised to Area 93 residents in exchange for our support to change from Multnomah County to Washington County.
28	Area93ResDesig	Please keep it all low density.
29	Area93ResDesig	Entire area except that fronting Thompson should be low density. No medium or high density along Laidlaw.
30	Area93ResDesig	No-entire area north of Ward Creek should be zoned with WA CO R 2-4 zoning.
31	Area93ResDesig	Low density please.
32	Area93ResDesig	Keep low density
33	Area93ResDesig	Agree!
34	Area93ResDesig	No multi-family!!! Please keep density low like other adjacent areas.
35	Area93ResDesig	Low density!
36	Area93ResDesig	Low low keep it low.
37	Area93ResDesig	LOW DENSITY!
38	Area93ResDesig	LOW Density!
39	Area93ResDesig	R4! and no more

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
40	Area93ResDesig	We all agreed to low density. NO BAIT and SWITCH!
41	Area93ResDesig	R 7 throughout is preferred.
42	Area93ResDesig	No-should be low density.
43	Area93ResDesig	No-med-high density makes sense if folks use public transportation, walk to retail centers, etc. Doesn't fit with WA County-seems a Multnomah Co. agenda.
44	Area93ResDesig	No density.
45	Area93ResDesig	Low density only.
46	Area93ResDesig	No-Row houses are ugly
47	Area93ResDesig	Med density should be the absolute max density within area where are the resources (i.e. schools) to support this number of homes??
48	Area93ResDesig	No! My property is zoned for med density-No!
49	Area93ResDesig	Agree (Re: Comment that med density should be the absolute max density within the area)
50	Area93ResDesig	No-should be low density.
51	Area93ResDesig	No-schools, library, law enforcement services-insufficient. Low Density- Preserve quality of life.
52	Area93ResDesig	No-the schools plus roads can't handle med density.
53	Area93ResDesig	Low-density!
54	Area93ResDesig	Keep R4 as max density.
55	Area93ResDesig	Keep plan "as is."
56	Area93ResDesig	No-Low density only!
57	Area93ResDesig	No
58	Area93ResDesig	No-too high of density. This high of density was not mentioned when Area 93 was being first discussed to become Washington County.

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
59	Area93ResDesig	Yes-It's needed.
60	Area93ResDesig	No-Low density needs extension.
61	Area93ResDesig	No-was not planned before.
62	Area93ResDesig	Yes, this should be a diverse community-economically as well as ethnically.
63	Area93ResDesig	No! Low density only! Don't let MAX/TriMet force adding high density.
64	Area93ResDesig	No!
65	Area93ResDesig	Please No!! Schools our roads can't handle Med/High density.
66	Area93ResDesig	No
67	Area93ResDesig	No-Low Density only!
68	Area93ResDesig	No-no townhouses/condos.
69	Area93ResDesig	Great need for nice homes on spacious lots.
70	Area93ResDesig	Overall density needs to be reduced.
71	Area93ResDesig	Low density only.
72	Area93ResDesig	Locating higher density near bus stops is a good idea.
73	Area93ResDesig	Yes! (Re: Comment that locating higher density near bus stops is a good idea)
74	Area93ResDesig	Less area designated as Open Space and more available for development.
75	Area93ResDesig	My house - it located in a "park" designation. I don't want to live in a park.
76	Area93ResDesig	More R6. Too many zones make it disjointed. It's not that big of an area.
77	Area93ResDesig	For the amount of useable land in Area 93 it should all be R5-R6 only.
78	Area93ResDesig	Density should match surrounding area.
79	Area93ResDesig	Agree! (Re: Comment that density should match surrounding area)
80	Area93ResDesig	R5 (low density) throughout the area.
81	Area93ResDesig	How about some R2-4?

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - updated Nov. 25,</b>	
2	Topic	Comment
82	Area93ResDesig	Yes! (Re: Comment on how about some R2-4)
83	Area93ResDesig	North dev density is different in south due to topography.
84	Area93ResDesig	No high density development-it does not match any of the neighborhoods around area 93. Also, there are not enough green areas as it is. Will negatively increase traffic on Thompson.
85	Area93ResDesig	Agree! (Re: Comment on no high density development)
86	Area93ResDesig	We would like 1/2 acre to 1 acre lots.
87	Area93ResDesig	Sidewalks to Findley would be nice.
88	Area93ResDesig	More parks and walking trails.
89	Area93ResDesig	To conform to existing new homes in Area 93. Lower density is better.
90	Area93ResDesig	Park!
91	Area93ResDesig	More space around creeks!
92	Area93ResDesig	Trails plus sidewalks.
93	Area93ResDesig	When land is developed, density and variety are needed.
94	Area93ResDesig	When County officials & Metro first talked about this they said it should be low density and that was appealing to residents.
95	Area93ResDesig	Low density, preserve green space, creatively add bike/walking trails. Enhance the area, don't degrade it by high density homes on a "postage stamp."
96	Area93ResDesig	Low density-keep high density downtown.
97	Area93ResDesig	Nike and Kaiser are expanding-lots of interest in \$500 plus single family homes.
98	Area93ResDesig	Green space, not ball park or other field (noise), use at THPRD Terpenning Center
99	Area93ResDesig	Lower density=Nicer houses=more taxes=more \$ to fix Thompson.
100	Area93ResDesig	Keep the creek buffered > 600 ft. / low density!
101	Area93ResDesig	Have 50-60 ft creek buffer 600 ft insane!
102	Area93ResDesig	Start with medium / low density.
103	Area93ResDesig	Live at corner NW 120th and Thompson. Eliminate high density - ↑ traffic and Quality of life
104	Area93ResDesig	Please re-do plan with no high density. This is not the plan that we were hoping for.

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
105	Area93ResDesig	LOW DENSITY
106	Area93ResDesig	North side is different than the South side. Keep density lower in North. It is due to the forest area North of Laidlaw.
107	Area93ResDesig	Low density only, please. No apartments, please.
108	Area93ResDesig	When the process started the enticement by the politicians to get neighbors to support the boundary change was for a lower density development and that's what most, if not all of us signed-up for. Ideally an R 5 or 6 zone over the entire area, with parks and trails mixed in (no commercial) would make this a beautiful neighborhood that we could all be proud of.
109	Area93ResDesig	Keep low density. Quality of life-keep it.
110	Area93ResDesig	R 5 or 6.
111	Area93ResDesig	We were promised the lowest density available at the public meeting to be brought into Washington County. Please live up to that.
112	Area93ResDesig	Density to match surrounding neighborhoods R-5 and R-6.
113	Area93ResDesig	Keep density-down! Six to eight units per acre.
114	Area93ResDesig	Community should be planned in keeping with density in Thompson. Park and Thompson Highlands. Too crowded to support high density. Roads and schools can't take it. Too far from light rail to support high density.
115	Area93ResDesig	Please preserve the lower density of Area 93. The public schools and roads cannot handle medium to m/high density. People live in Area 93 because we love the trees, creek our open space. Please don't ruin the beauty our livability of this area.
116	Area93ResDesig	No high density?
117	Area93ResDesig	I am disappointed by the high density proposals. I didn't move here 15 plus years ago to be next to apartments.
118	Area93ResDesig	Density - R 6 should be the predominant density/development pattern for the study area. It fits the surrounding area and site conditions. Too many densities would feel disjointed.
119	Area93ResDesig	I think all areas should be low-density and estate sized properties. Retain the "country" to the area.
120	Area93ResDesig	We have lived in Area 93 since 2009. During the meetings to bring us into Washington County, Commissioners Duyck and Malinowski gave us their word that we would have the lowest density possible. However, after talking with Commission Malinowski last night, he made it sound like there are competing interests. I would like to know what I can do to ensure that we have R-5 zoning. Can you give me some suggestions?

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
121	Area93ResDesig	I live on Hibbard Drive just off of Thompson Road across from the area 93 future development. I would like you to two things when developing area 93. First, this area is where many high paid high tech employees want to live and there is a lack of new homes with larger lot sizes. Findley elementary gets rated one of the highest schools in the state, but the lot sizes are so small in this area it turns many families away. So many Arbor homes in the community are on small lots, and there is a great demand for more space for homes in this area. A summary, please consider a lower density for housing, larger lot sizes are in high demand.
122	Area93ResDesig	Prefer low-density housing - otherwise conflicts with what else is built around there. Where are these kids going to go to school as it is? Findley, Stoller, and Jacob Wismer are already overfilled. More sidewalks and greenway space, less housing!
123	Area93ResDesig	Our parcel is south of Thompson Road next to the water tank by wooded lots with restrictive easements of two adjacent homes. The 2009 Multnomah County plan shows it as open space but they never discussed this with us. We intend the develop the property once zoning is decided.
124	Area93ResDesig	The property across Thompson Road is being considered for Medium High and Medium Residential zoning. Our property is buffered from the existing two houses to the east by deep wood lots/slope easements and the water tank to the south. We'd like our property at a minimum consistent with the zoning proposed across the street. Because our lot is isolated and the traffic on Thompson Road, it could lend itself for even higher density such as attached or multifamily housing. We object to an open space designation and propose at least medium/medium high density zoning similar to those in the Forest Heights neighborhoods. This could be an opportunity for Washington County to replace some density lost to natural resource areas in the greater part of Area 93.
125	Area93ResDesig	There are lots of high density Arbor Neighborhoods already in the area. People want larger lots, in this area, not more homes on top of each other.
126	Area93ResDesig	We live in the adjacent neighborhood and are concerned about the increased impact to the neighborhood schools and also the traffic impact to our neighborhoods.
127	Area93ResDesig	A commercial center in this area will be too small to support the needs of high density housing -- there is not room for another Bethany Village. Because of this, high density housing is a bad idea. It will just contribute to road congestion and add to safety concerns for the children who walk to the nearby elementary school.
128	Area93ResDesig	The infrastructure in the area cannot withstand higher density housing. Our schools are already overcrowded and roads are too busy.
129	Area93ResDesig	I am a resident of the Bethany area and am seriously concerned with the unchecked development that is occurring in the area particularly without regard to the impact on the area schools or infrastructure (roads)

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
130	Area93ResDesig	Apartments do not blend with other low density areas in the vicinity and increased traffic on roads not designed for it. There are not sidewalks or turn lanes on Thompson.
131	Area93ResDesig	This area needs to be developed and improved in a responsible way. High density housing is not what will benefit this community with the hilly terrain, winding roads, and crowded schools. Early in the process, political advocates for developing this area (Andy Duyck and Mitch Greenlick) gained support for the improvements based on low density development. No bait and switch!
132	Area93ResDesig	Area 93 needs to conform to adjacent neighborhoods. And roads and schools aren't made for high density.
133	Area93ResDesig	Because our schools are crowded and limited growth will increase property values. Too much traffic requiring changes in current infrastructure.
134	Area93ResDesig	Development of Area 93 needs to be in line with surrounding neighborhoods in terms of density, and with consideration (as others have noted) for already severely overcrowded schools.
135	Area93ResDesig	We feel it is a profoundly bad idea to develop a high density housing area in Area 93. Surrounding services can't accommodate it, surrounding roads can't handle the traffic, and it is vastly out of character with the neighborhood Area 93 is supposed to become a part of.
136	Area93ResDesig	As a parent of young children and an established member of this community, I am very concerned about the Area 93 Development Proposal, primarily due to the lack of planning that has gone into the proposals for apartment buildings and housing that will disrupt the safety and traffic congestion of our established neighborhoods with schools that are already overcrowded. Apartment buildings and high density housing developments are absolutely not appropriate for this area of our community. Please reconsider Area 93 instead be zoned only for low overall housing density, with careful planning to address economic, school, and traffic related impacts of this large development on our community. Thank you for your consideration of my request for more careful planning in this area.
137	Area93ResDesig	When the process to transfer the land from Multnomah to Washington County began, land owners were consulted and the majority agreed that this could be a good plan as long as density was kept to a reasonable level. At that time, the planners/politicians were promoting single family homes on approximately 7,000 - 8,000 square foot lots. The community of landowners has been adamantly against high density development and commercial development in Area 93. The infrastructure simply will not support it. The roads are narrow and winding.
138	Area93ResDesig	I expect no apartment complexes nor townhomes in Area 93. All of the surrounding neighborhoods are medium to high-end real estate. New development should be consistent to maintain property values.

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
139	Area93ResDesig	We were on the edge of the urban growth boundary when we bought this house and were told that development would not happen beyond us. What a joke! It wasn't more than a couple years when the huge developers were grabbing up the land and building as many homes as they could fit on the postage stamp lots. The next thing we will hear is that we need to pay MORE taxes to build schools for all these new people.
140	Area93ResDesig	Please reconsider adding thousands MORE people to this very small parcel of land and keep our area a pleasant place to live.
141	Area93ResDesig	Because I live in Area 93 and I want to preserve the low density environment we already have
142	Area93ResDesig	The planned apartment complex will put many more children into the system whose parents will not be contributing anything back via property taxes to support the system or help it sustain the children being added. I have not seen any information online or in print that addresses this problem.
143	Area93ResDesig	Keep the housing density low, consistent with other neighborhoods. Nearby Findley Elementary and Stoller Middle School are 122% above capacity, and are already using onsite portable buildings to try and meet the needs of existing residents. This cannot support medium or high density housing. We strongly prefer low density, single family detached homes, with 7-9 homes per acre, similar to surrounding neighborhoods
144	Area93ResDesig	Please consider the lowest possible density for Area 93. There is a HUGE need for larger lots in our area! Families get burned out by the small Arbor lots after a few years and there is lots of turnover of families moving to other areas for more space. In summary, option 2 and LOW density is what we'd like in our community.
145	Area93ResDesig	High density should be offsite nearer to commercial.
146	Area93ResDesig	Clarify density per buildable/gross acre
147	Area93ResDesig	How to have input
148	Area93ResDesig	Who decides where R-9 goes - concentrated? Separated?
149	Area93ResDesig	Zoning on entire site?
150	Area93ResDesig	Buildable vs. gross - density expected throughout or just buildable area?
151	Area93ResDesig	Apartments allowed?
152	Area93ResDesig	Why aren't we talking all R-5?
153	Area93ResDesig	Whatever's determined by County (land use designation) requires developer to meet?
154	Area93ResDesig	Why is higher density in center? Put closer to offsite R-9
155	Area93ResDesig	Concern about density transfers
156	Area93ResDesig	Attached units allowed?
157	Area93ResDesig	How many houses anticipated?

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
158	Area93ResDesig	Any chance of part being R-5? May make sense to do R-5 near UGB
159	Area93ResDesig	R-9 along Thompson potentially
160	Area93ResDesig	Put "high density" somewhere else offsite
161	Area93ResDesig	50% "attached" requirement
162	Area93ResDesig	R-6 better supported by infrastructure
163	Area93ResDesig	R-5 planned originally?
164	Area93ResDesig	Why put the R-9 in the center of the southern half? It seems to make more sense to put it on the old county line.
165	Area93ResDesig	I'm concerned about density especially in consideration of significant areas of wetland/riparian areas. The density required by the Metro housing rule shouldn't include the non-buildable lands in the calculus.
166	Area93ResDesig	Please consider lower density overall - including R-5 zoning.
167	Area93ResDesig	Is the Metropolitan Housing Rule voluntary or mandatory?
168	Area93ResDesig	The majority of people don't want high density clusters like Virginia Bruce wants. The R-9 clusters are fine but not extreme density clusters.
169	Area93ResDesig	I had not realized that we could remark about housing density. My family supports very low density housing.
170	Area93ResDesig	LOW Density PLEASE! Move higher density (orange bubble) to the west. Orange bubble to adjoin existing high density.
171	Area93ResDesig	Against R6 and R9 Density. Prefer R1 and R4 at most. This is in the midst of R-1 neighborhoods.
172	Area93ResDesig	I prefer minimum possible density so as to minimize further overcrowding at local schools.
173	Area93ResDesig	Lower the Density of Area 93 (at least try the best)
174	Area93ResDesig	Density: Go as low as the state and county will allow. Area school capacities do not support this growth and need to be a major factor in the decision. I would like to see no higher than R6.
175	Area93ResDesig	I would prefer R-6 be the maximum housing density allowed. Please convince the state to allow this area to be under their guidelines of 8 units per acre.
176	Area93ResDesig	If R-9 is required I would ask that it be moved to be adjacent to the existing R-9 development in Remington.
177	Area93ResDesig	I would like R-9 on my property 12305 NW Thompson Rd
178	Area93ResDesig	Need to stay to low density community for Area 93

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
179	Area93ResDesig	No R-6 or above. If any, R-2 maximum.
180	Area93ResDesig	Please do <u>NOT</u> allow any areas of zoning other than R-6. Our Thompson Highlands and Thompson Park neighborhoods have 8,000-12,000 square foot lots on average and we <u>MUST</u> maintain the spacing and aesthetic appeal of the area. <u>Any R-9 zoning will jeopardize our collective property values, and place extra pressure on our already congested roads</u> (Thompson) making conditions even <u>more unsafe</u> . Dense zoning will also put additional pressure on our overcrowded schools.
181	Area93ResDesig	There is a great need for newer homes with <u>larger</u> lots. The Arbor homes are right on top of each other-too close. Straighten out Thompson-by the fire station.
182	Area93Traffic	Old Laidlaw Road is unbuildable. Please remove right of way.
183	Area93Traffic	Please don't put a road between us and our neighbors.
184	Area93Traffic	Millford Street <u>should not</u> be extended across all of Area 93!!
185	Area93Traffic	Thompson Road should be the main street and if you extend Millford that far it has a big potential to be a through street - impacts safety and visibility.
186	Area93Traffic	Side street access such as Millford extension will only encourage unsafe driving to avoid Thompson, which should be the main artery.
187	Area93Traffic	Millford St should not be extended throughout the entire Development.
188	Area93Traffic	Is Millford St designed for more traffic.
189	Area93Traffic	Millford St. should not be extended throughout the entire development.
190	Area93Traffic	In no way should Millford St be a straight shot through the development, this would be very dangerous traffic for existing plus new homes.
191	Area93Traffic	No reason for this connecting road to exist!! (Re: Proposed extension of Millford Road on Multnomah County plan)
192	Area93Traffic	No need for this connecting segment of road!! (Re: Proposed extension of Millford Road on the Multnomah County plan.)
193	Area93Traffic	On Thompson - problematic curve - unsafe!

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
194	Area93Traffic	Do not extend Millford beyond 120th Avenue (Road G).
195	Area93Traffic	No Road "G!"
196	Area93Traffic	Please do not build all of little roads. It chops up the beautiful land.
197	Area93Traffic	Don't put Millford through.
198	Area93Traffic	Millford not to punch through as main arterial.
199	Area93Traffic	Impact on Millford Road family/residential street unfair. Plan should not "sandwich" homes on Millford will have Thompson as a major road behind and Millford will become a major traffic arterial into Area 93
200	Area93Traffic	Streets - the block pattern needs to be adjusted to an approximate 200 ft x whatever grid works well.
201	Area93Traffic	Also, the citing of the entrance at Hibbard would be too close to the curve and making turns onto the road would be dangerous.
202	Area93Traffic	The curve near Hibbard on Thompson is dangerous to cyclists now and dangerous for everyone during icy weather. This is a particularly bad place to add more cars onto the roadway or have them stopping to turn.
203	Area93Traffic	If a street is added which would enter Area 93 from NW Thompson Road near NW Hibbard Drive, we ask that it be placed west of NW Hibbard Drive to try to discourage non-neighborhood traffic "cut-throughs" via NW Hibbard Drive.
204	Area93Traffic	We ask that traffic not be encouraged to travel north and south over NW Thompson Road via NW 120th Avenue/NW 120th Terrace, as this would seem to create similar opportunities for cut-through traffic.
205	Area93Traffic	Furthermore the proposed street extensions/connections at Brimpton and Miller will clearly be an invitation for commuters to "short cut" around the substantial traffic backups at Saltzman and Thompson, speeding down currently quiet residential streets, particularly in the morning when many children are walking to Findley, or in the evening when they are out playing and riding bicycles.

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
206	Area93Traffic	This proposed intersection totally affects the quality of how we will get in and out of our neighborhood. My teenagers will be using this entry and it will be a dangerous one for them... in our own neighborhood! My house abuts Thompson at the jig in the road and I have seen and hear many car crashes there from icy roads to fatalities. This truly is a horrible location to place such a heavily traveled intersection!
207	Area93Traffic	Thompson is a heavily traveled road already, as is Laidlaw. The road infrastructure is also not up to par for dealing with this growth. I moved into this neighborhood because it was not right next to a huge development that did not have adequate school or traffic infrastructure to support it. I would like to understand - and have readily available online how the county plans to address these issues.
208	Area93Traffic	We oppose the siting of a main entrance of this new area at Thompson and Hibbard. This would unnecessarily burden the Thompson Highlands neighborhood with traffic that their roads were not intended to handle
209	Area93Traffic	Don't want road to end at Swafford site
210	Area93Traffic	120th vs. Hiller for going through?
211	Area93Traffic	Cut roads into developable vacant areas vs. existing homes / yards
212	Area93Traffic	Thompson Road curve realignment
213	Area93Traffic	Will Thompson Road curve realignment occur before development? How to get community voice heard re: existing concern about curve?
214	Area93Traffic	Connectivity between neighborhoods - what will it look like?
215	Area93Traffic	Proposed connections to Thompson problematic (one is private, narrow; one is by a curve)
216	Area93Traffic	Don't pretend this is a greenfield site where roads go anywhere
217	Area93Traffic	Cut roads into through vacant lots - not existing yards of homeowners who are not selling to developers.
218	Area93Traffic	How do the roads and ped-bike facilities relate to public transit?

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
219	Area93Traffic	Need a n/s road connection in BS west. Without access through BS West, too much impact of traffic generated from BS West will be placed on underimproved / unsafe Saltzman Road between Laidlaw & Thompson Roads.
220	Area93Traffic	Does county have money to develop roads before building subdivision.
221	Area93Traffic	Unnecessary and Detrimental Connectivity. Very concerned about extension of NW Millford Street to a long road running thru Area 93. It clearly isn't needed given NW Thompson Rd providing ingress/egress for new development. Steve Kelley suggested it won't happen, but no plan or map shows otherwise yet. Many other residents in the Remington Development and I shared this feedback before at the last feedback session in the Spring, but don't see it reflected yet in the latest plan proposals. It was explained to me by one staff that the developers like the Millford St connection, and that my feedback was small compared to support for "connectivity."
222	Area93Traffic	One concern that was not addressed was the extension of Millford along the entire length parallel to Thompson. I'm all for protecting the creek but what about the neighborhoods. No where else is there a long street that cuts through multiple neighborhoods. Neighborhood community <u>needs</u> to be considered. A street like that will promote its use rather than Thompson. Several people I spoke with said that it would be unlikely to be used as a thoroughfare so then why build it that way because if you build it that way it will be used that way.
223	BldvSt	Good concept, needs further refinement
224	BldvSt	No-center median would be a waste of space, a lot of extra money for no good reason.
225	BldvSt	No need for center median
226	BldvSt	Yes
227	BldvSt	Yes, with appropriate space for bicycles as well as cars.
228	BldvSt	Just do wider sidewalks and planting strips w/ trees. No center median. Do a trail head park where it meets the Bronson Creek Corridor
229	BldvSt	Yes, I agree, but don't over do it. The entry to Arbor Heights a good example-no parking on normal size streets.
230	BldvSt	No! To expensive, unneeded, environmentally irresponsible.

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
231	BlvdSt	Developers want small lots to up \$\$\$ → their pockets
232	BlvdSt	No-too much traffic on Thompson already. People use it as shortcut thru Forest Park to Lovejoy. Consider Laidlaw entrance.
233	BlvdSt	No
234	BlvdSt	No!!! I support this!
235	BlvdSt	Yes
236	BlvdSt	We don't need more "Arbor" Crap! No!
237	BlvdSt	No center median-stupid waste of our land.
238	BlvdSt	The entry/exit point to Thompson looks too close to a curve. Suggest moving it east.
239	BlvdSt	Putting it by the curve might be safer (make curve safer) with addition of traffic light.
240	BlvdSt	Agree seems too close to a curve in Thompson.
241	BlvdSt	It destroys two lots which I own. I will not agree to any Boulevard on my property!
242	BlvdSt	Bad design on a curve - Mult Co can and should do better!
243	BronsnCrPedBkXing	No creek crossing into road except at Marcotte.
244	BronsnCrPedBkXing	The pedestrian bridge/trail linking South to North neighborhoods works well.
245	BronsnCrPedBkXing	Multiple creek crossings good - allows for walkers the make a loop
246	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Yes
247	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Definitely

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
248	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Yes
249	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Yes
250	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Great connectivity and recreation asset, great for kids visiting kids.
251	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Yes-will \$ from joining the park district cover all the park costs propose?
252	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Yes - pedestrian/bike - no for cars
253	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Yes-three crossings!
254	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Love it!
255	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Yes
256	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Ok if farther west.
257	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Yes!
258	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Yes!
259	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Yes-connect to other off road bike routes.
260	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Yes
261	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Yes
262	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Yes
263	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Yes
264	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Yes

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
265	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Yes
266	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Farther west
267	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Yes
268	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Yes
269	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Yes!
270	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Not sure-it goes over my land. Will THPRD buy it?
271	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Need three pedestrian/bike crossing-see my marks.
272	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Why three? One will suffice.
273	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Location is good, it's central to the neighborhoods, both south and north.
274	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Yes
275	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Yes
276	BronsnCrPedBkXng	We need safe streets before we build more creek crossings.
277	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Great use of the existing creek!
278	BronsnCrPedBkXng	No car crossings, please - Ditto!
279	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Amen, except at Marcotte
280	BronsnCrPedBkXng	Should be one car crossing
281	BronsnCrVis/Acc	Yes
282	BronsnCrVis/Acc	Yes - But be much more strategic about where. Do less frontage but add a nice linear park / trail improvement.
283	BronsnCrVis/Acc	Yes
284	BronsnCrVis/Acc	No - It is a waste of valuable land to owners.

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
285	BronsnCrVis/Acc	No - Too expensive to build roads traversing on relatively steep side slopes with houses on only one side. Houses along creek enable more privacy and natural area ambiance. Have frequent gaps between houses to enable public access.
286	BronsnCrVis/Acc	I like the idea - not sure about the expense.
287	BronsnCrVis/Acc	Yes - I like the Drake Park idea. It need not be continuous, however.
288	BronsnCrVis/Acc	No. Too Expensive
289	BronsnCrVis/Acc	No.
290	BronsnCrVis/Acc	No -The idea is too expensive. The roads there will also be environmentally unfriendly to the creek, and aren't needed for traffic.
291	BronsnCrVis/Acc	No - Too expensive.
292	BronsnCrVis/Acc	Road in Corridor will be difficult to build. Leave some access between houses for park (open space owned by Tualatin Hills Parks & Recreation).
293	BronsnCrVis/Acc	Add trails and access to the creek.
294	BronsnCrVis/Acc	Keep park idea.
295	BronsnCrVis/Acc	No creekside boulevards, too expensive, environmentally and geotechnically irresponsible.
296	BronsnCrVis/Acc	There's too much road fronting the open space corridor. I would do less and develop a linear park/trail along the edge. I would not eliminate it just a more strategic moderate amount. It's an asset.
297	BronsnCrVis/Acc	Positive - parkway streets & pocket parks. Negative - double loaded street
298	BronsnCrVis/Acc	Creek riparian area is steep. Don't put trail / street along creeks, unless land is more level & accessible. Homes would enjoy creek more.

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - updated Nov. 25,</b>	
2	Topic	Comment
299	BronsonCrVis/Acc	My family attended the Bonny Slope planning review at PCC last week and we'd like to voice that we'd like Option #2 for the planning development. We live on Hibbard Drive across the street in Thompson Highlands neighborhood and we have a creek/wet land area in our neighborhood and no access to it. It is very frustrating for our kids who would like to see the natural area not to have access to it, and only a few neighbors who back to the creek have access. The only way we can access the creek is by crossing into their property. It's not fair, and open space to wetlands should be open for the public to enjoy- not just a few.
300	BronsonCrVis/Acc	I'd like to vote for option #2 (Maximize creek open space & visibility - only single houses on one side of the street with the other side being fully open to the creek/wetlands).
301	BronsonCrVis/Acc	I just wanted to let you know how great I thought the last meeting went. I really learned a lot! My preference would be to plan Option #2 which maximizes the views of the green space. I think we need to preserve as many views of the green space as possible as we won't ever get those views back if we build on them.
302	BronsonCrVis/Acc	Positive response for Option 2 & 3 (parkway & pocket parks) - Negative (double - loaded street)
303	BronsonCrVis/Acc	Safety - pocket parks allow for more eyes on the trails and green space.
304	BronsonCrVis/Acc	I support the parkway plan.
305	BronsonCrVis/Acc	Creekside Boulevard 34' right-of-way @ 25 % Slope = 8 <sup>1/2</sup> foot elevation change - Big Cut & Fill Expensive-Environmentally Irresponsible
306	BronsonCrVis/Acc	Option 3: balance creek visibility and development potential is what you should do. The maximized visibility idea is pretty ridiculous.
307	BronsonCrVis/Acc	The <u>PARKWAY STREET</u> Concept is spot on!!! It allows required density to be achieved while capturing the unique natural assets of the planning area.
308	BronsonCrVis/Acc	Maximize the Public Access and visibility to greenland and wetland and creek.
309	BronsonCrVis/Acc	Go with OPTION C for creek visibility. Pocket parks connected by trails. No to creek side Blvds.
310	BronsonCrVis/Acc	Please maximize creek open space plus visibility-single loaded streets. Option 2
311	BronsonCrVis/Acc	My preference is the Pocket/View Parks Option. I would be ok with limited trails to save money; however, connecting two parks would be nice.
312	CommNam	Bonny Slope
313	CommNam	Bonny Slope
314	CommNam	Bonny Slope

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG</b> - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i>	
2	Topic	Comment
315	CommNam	Bonny Slope
316	CommNam	Bonny Slope
317	CommNam	Bonny Slope
318	CommNam	Whiskey Gulch
319	CommNam	Whiskey Gulch - YES! I own it.
320	CommNam	Thompson Law
321	CommNam	Bronson Creek Community
322	CommNam	Hamel Estates or Hiller Estates
323	CommName	Bonny Slope West
324	CommName	Bonny Slope West
325	CommName	Bonny Slope
326	Marccte/LaidlwRds	Bridge at Marcotte Rd seems unwarranted. Should be further west, say, Multnomah County proposed road west of Marcotte Rd.
327	Marccte/LaidlwRds	Yes
328	Marccte/LaidlwRds	No
329	Marccte/LaidlwRds	No
330	Marccte/LaidlwRds	No
331	Marccte/LaidlwRds	Yes
332	Marccte/LaidlwRds	No
333	Marccte/LaidlwRds	Yes

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
334	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	Yes, best way to eliminate curves east end of Laidlaw
335	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	Yes. ↓ Traffic →Thompson
336	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	No because I live there
337	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	No-the extra cost would be difficult to justify-if fire and police need it, it should
338	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	No. Too expensive and impactful. It's not essential infrastructure. Keeping it similar to its existing state provides good traffic calming.
339	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	Yes, There is no current plan to reduce traffic impact to Saltzman so some Area 93 should be diverted more directly to Thompson.
340	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	No. Too expensive.
341	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	Yes-needed for traffic
342	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	Yes! New connection needed.
343	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	Yes - community will otherwise be divided by creek.
344	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	Yes
345	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	Yes-otherwise it's a long way around.
346	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	NO
347	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	No-too impactful on existing homes on Marcotte.
348	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	No
349	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	We would support provided the road would be (limited?) in width and volume.
350	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	Yes
351	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	Yes
352	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	Yes
353	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	Maybe
354	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	No
355	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	Yes, but no road
356	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	Yes
357	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	Yes
358	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	No

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
359	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	No
360	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	No-I don't think it will be utilized by the population.
361	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	Yes
362	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	Yes
363	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	In the far off-if the THPRD can afford it with funds at hand or developers in the future want to pay for it themselves.
364	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	Yes, our property is right at the location where it would be built.
365	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	We talked at the open house for Area 93 last week. We are in the process of purchasing the land between Marcotte and Laidlaw (tax ID 1N122DC02300 and 1N122DC02200). Currently there is a 30 ft setback from the right of way for a theoretical future connection of Marcotte. During the open house though the connection was shown to the west of the property. If you decide to not make this connection or to move it to the west would you consider selling this right of way area? Because of the creek it would make the buildable area much greater.
366	Marcotte/LaidlawRds	Crossing of Ward Creek & Marcotte Road appears it will have minimal creek impacts and could help minimize traffic impacts on Saltzman Road.
367	MultCoVis	This is the first time I've seen the plan. I don't support the plan.
368	MultCoVis	For planning purposes, extend the plan down to Thompson
369	MultCoVis	Absolutely! (Agreed)
370	MultCoVis	Scrap the Mult. County plan!!!
371	MultCoVis	I agree. (Re: Scrap the Multnomah County plan)
372	MultCoVis	Yes. (Re: Scrap the Multnomah County plan)
373	MultCoVis	Yes! I agree on Laidlaw - in 93. (Re: Scrap the Multnomah County plan)
374	MultCoVis	Scrap Mult. Co plan make it all low density.
375	MultCoVis	What land has already been sold to Arbor? What is their influence on this process. Please protect those of us who do <u>not</u> want the Multnomah County plan.

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - updated Nov. 25,</b>	
2	Topic	Comment
376	MultCoVis	As nearby neighbors to Area 93 (126th Ave, Bauer Highlands) my wife and I feel compelled to weigh in on the current planning process. We have been made aware of the Multnomah County Concept plan, however we and many in our neighborhood have deep reservations about several elements of that plan, which do not seem to gel at all with the surrounding housing densities, neighborhoods, and certainly not services as they currently exist, such as schools- Findley/Bonny Slope, for instance, being already severely overcrowded. We're not sure how this plan got put forth, but we sincerely hope it is not still the baseline upon which actual development for this parcel will seriously be based. Many people who have supported the Area 93 annexation are coming to feel local government has misrepresented the implications of this deal, and are not terribly happy about it.
377	NatResArea93	I would think Goal 5 includes concern about pileated woodpeckers. These live in large old fir trees - if too many are removed this part of the wildlife will leave.
378	NatResArea93	Scrap the Mult Co. Plan totally. Forget the 300' set back from creek please. Makes no sense.
379	NatResArea93	My Mom's house is at 11522 NW Laidlaw. I see a large swath of green space on the North side. This is fairly flat land which now supports two houses. I disagree with the Concept Plan designating it as Green space. We are losing our families investment in the property if it cannot be better developed.
380	NatResArea93	I own two acres on Hiller Lane. If the property is developed according to plan. The street will cut my hand in half and the North half will be open space. Not for building, so I'd only get paid for half of my two acres from the realtor.
381	NatResArea93	Keep large trees and natural areas around creeks.
382	NatResArea93	Please protect the creek.
383	NatResArea93	Make this a model for sustainable development. This area is too special to clear out and make into a treeless, 5' side setback neighborhood.
384	NatResArea93	The environment and wildlife are another concern as this is an active wildlife corridor. We support responsible development in a way that honors the original spirit of the plan that was proposed and agreed to when the County land transfer was first discussed. We do not support a development plan that excessively burdens the infrastructure, destroys wildlife habitats, and negatively impacts land values and quality of life for those remaining residents who have not profited by selling large parcels of land to developers.
385	NatResArea93	We would also like to request that you not make the riparian areas smaller. We strongly believe that the riparian areas are key to the ecology and environmental management of the new area.
386	NatResArea93	Do not make the riparian areas smaller than the original projection for Area 93!
387	NatResArea93	Concern with habitat for existing wildlife

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
388	NatResArea93	Riparian area and CWS vegetative corridor can be different widths for buffer
389	NatResArea93	CWS has a vegetative corridor tract - can have different owners
390	NatResArea93	Tree protection outside wetlands
391	NatResArea93	Concern for wildlife
392	NatResArea93	The riparian are is not high quality - lots of English Ivy
393	NatResArea93	Its important to have natural stuff - not just park stuff
394	NatResArea93	Concern about development on existing wildlife
395	NatResArea93	Maximize riparian areas - don't chop up
396	NatResArea93	The riparian area is a keepsake for the whole area
397	NatResArea93	I'd also like to see public access to the riparian area.
398	NatResArea93	Please save the trees along the boundary with existing communities
399	NatResArea93	Don't take away our wetlands-make the Riparian areas bigger!
400	NatResArea93	With the added homes, the slope and natural habitats where are the deer and all animals that reside in the area going to migrate???
401	NatResArea93	Needs of existing residents and wildlife and the environment should be prioritized over profits, tax income and development.
402	NbrhdCtr	No, not needed
403	NbrhdCtr	No - already an area near Saltzman/Thompson that is not widely supported. Not sure how a second area would do.
404	NbrhdCtr	Also agree.
405	NbrhdCtr	Agreed NOT needed.
406	NbrhdCtr	No-not really needed.
407	NbrhdCtr	No-not really needed.

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
408	NbrhdCtr	Yes
409	NbrhdCtr	No-this already exists @ Saltzman and Thompson. Not needed!!!
410	NbrhdCtr	Not needed: Ditto to no comment!
411	NbrhdCtr	Location is good. If its marketable. Keep it small (1/2 ac max).
412	NbrhdCtr	Already exists at Saltzman plus Thompson will increase traffic flow!
413	NbrhdCtr	No
414	NbrhdCtr	No, no!
415	NbrhdCtr	No, not needed
416	NbrhdCtr	No
417	NbrhdCtr	Agree, community center no commercial center.
418	NbrhdCtr	No! I don't agree its shown on my property.
419	NbrhdCtr	Yes, We need a THPRD community recreation center, not a commercial center!!!!
420	NbrhdCtr	Yes
421	NbrhdCtr	Ditto

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG</b> - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i>	
2	Topic	Comment
422	NbrhdCtr	Yes! Agree
423	NbrhdCtr	No
424	NbrhdCtr	No
425	NbrhdCtr	Yes
426	NbrhdCtr	How about your own back yard??
427	NbrhdCtr	Off of Thompson by the park so it is within the community.
428	NbrhdCtr	No - not needed.
429	NbrhdCtr	Not needed!!!!
430	NbrhdCtr	Not really needed there is one right down Thompson.
431	NbrhdCtr	No, there is already a center at Saltzman/Thompson.
432	NbrhdCtr	At West road.
433	NbrhdCtr	If it happens the location shown is best. Its in the busiest place with the most market appeal and accessibility for the neighborhood to south of Area 93.
434	NbrhdCtr	No

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
435	NbrhdCtr	Not needed at this time there exists one at Thompson plus Saltzman.
436	NbrhdCtr	Neighborhood Center by Bonny Slope Park or convert Terra Nova HS (it is an under-utilized space!) to a THRPD rec center.
437	NbrhdCtr	Yes-agree! (Re: Comment about locating center by Bonny Slope Park or
438	NbrhdCtr	Yes! (Re: Comment about locating center by Bonny Slope Park or converting
439	NbrhdCtr	Great idea! (Re: Comment about locating center by Bonny Slope Park or
440	NbrhdCtr	Question whether a neighborhood center would be supported.
441	NbrhdCtr	Why is it needed?
442	NbrhdCtr	Agreed! (Re: Comment "Why is it needed?")
443	NbrhdCtr	No community center.
444	NbrhdCtr	Agreed!
445	NbrhdCtr	What's the purpose?
446	NbrhdCtr	Walk/Bike access to existing commercial area at Saltzman and Thompson.
447	NbrhdCtr	Neighborhood Center 1/4 mile west is struggling to keep a café open-three owners in four years-don't need it, not enough demand.
448	NbrhdCtr	Not needed!!!!
449	NbrhdCtr	Please do not build a business center. There already is one at Saltzman and Thompson.
450	NbrhdCtr	No com. property.
451	NbrhdCtr	No Commercial land.
452	NbrhdCtr	The mixed use node at the entry on Thompson is a good idea. Don't oversize it. A smaller scale facility would work best.

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
453	NbrhdCtr	I am a homeowner in Thompson Highlands, across Thompson Rd. from the proposed Area 93 site. I wish no development would happen, but realize that is not realistic. Responsible development of this area will include the following: I expect no commercial businesses in Area 93. Current businesses at intersection of Thompson and Saltzman have been hit or miss. Laundry and coffee shops repeatedly go out of business at the existing commercial development.
454	NbrhdCtr	We request that you NOT create a small commercial center in this residential area as proposed. It will draw more folks to an area with geography that makes safe roads a real challenge when there are already several such centers within a 1-2 mile radius.
455	NbrhdCtr	What is being done to change land use zoning to encourage more construction of deli stores like David and Suzan Galt's "The Little Store" for Area 93? <a href="http://www.cedarmill.org/news/914/littlestore.html">http://www.cedarmill.org/news/914/littlestore.html</a> - at the corner of SW 90th Ave and Leahy Road
456	NbrhdCtr	Do NOT allow commercial development of Bonney Slope West (Area 93), as it will be further congest Thompson, create unsafe cut-through traffic, and disturb the peace and quiet that we specifically chose in our neighborhood and take great pains to maintain.
457	NbrhdCtr	No commercial buildings. We don't need another dry cleaner or coffee shop. We've already got one at the corner of Thompson and Saltzman and the coffee shop has gone through two owners. There's not enough business to sustain one. If we add more housing, maybe we can get the Tazza Cafe location rented one more but don't bring in duplicates with what's only a quarter mile down the road.
458	Other	I would like to see this get done ASAP. We have been strung along way too long.
459	Other	Bike and Pedestrian access use critical. Develop access that keeps it off of Saltzman and Thompson
460	Other	We all want to have the opportunity to connect to sewer system. Our septic systems... are very old and subject to failure.
461	Other	I live on Thompson Rd, plan to stay in my house, concerned how it would impact our home and us.
462	Other	Sewer in Creek area? -CWS-
463	Other	Planning taking a long time.
464	Other	Good start. I'm assuming the translation plan will include site plan refinement tempered by public and property owner input.
465	Other	Get this done in quick and efficient way.

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
466	Other	Received a letter with idea of including property as part of Area 93 planning. She's concerned about that idea, because she wants to stay in place, and doesn't see the benefit of being included in Area 93. She's concerned about the potential for a road to be directly behind her property.
467	Other	Extend the planning area down to Thompson.
468	Other	Extend planning area down to Thompson to eliminate orphan lots and enable improving Thompson Road.
469	Other	All the new land surfaces added Area 93 will increase runoff down to Salzman Road and the small culvert- has this been thought about in the early conceptual studies?
470	Other	
471	Other	As property owners in Area 93, we would like planners to ensure that existing homes that are currently on septic systems and inadequate water systems are given the opportunity to hook into the new sewer and water systems. We don't want developers allowed to plan their new subdivisions in such a way that existing property owners who have not sold to developers are left with aging, obsolete systems.
472	Other	I have lived in this area long enough to have seen many plans and developments take hold. I regret to say that I have little faith in planners doing what is best for the community at large. More often than not, the plans benefit the developers rather than the people who live in the region. I urge that this time, in the matter of Area 93, no de facto plans are made without thoroughly investigating all potential impacts on the roads, schools and community.
473	Other	What is being done to combine Area 93 into a new city? Area 93 needs to be combined into West Haven-Sylvan, West Slope, Raleigh Hills, Garden Home, and Metzger.
474	Other	Sewer - will be required and when? As development occurs
475	Other	Route for sewer?
476	Other	Stormwater - will there be a regional facility - it will follow standards - they will be changing
477	Other	How can developer plans change?
478	Other	Expand notice area
479	Other	Does DLCD or LUBA have veto power over the PLAN?
480	Other	Would be good to form a community advisory committee. Lots of feedback at this meeting but need more forums for input.

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
481	Other	The landowner backing Bauer Highland cleared trees and pushed stumps plus limbs - backing homes and Bauer Highlands Commons area. The stump berm up to 6 ft height and width is a fire hazard. This needs to be cleared and addressed in new development
482	Other	Develop the Park (THPRD) across from Findley Elem. Since the lots are so small for homeowners. THPRD has the land purchased, but no plans for a park yet. Small lots = need lots of parks.
483	Other	How will H2O flow be restricted to prevent culvert overflow onto Road on Saltzman and wash out down stream properties?
484	Parks	THRPD needs to be at these meetings. Their involvement with the parks and the corridor are critical to the development of the area.
485	Parks	No - Three acre park south of creek near Thompson Rd
486	Parks	Yes
487	Parks	Yes
488	Parks	Yes-but save the old house somehow. (Re: THPRD's undeveloped park at intersection of Thompson and Saltzman roads.)
489	Parks	Yes
490	Parks	No-lots of nearby parks not yet developed, the creek will require open space instead develop parks THPRD already has.
491	Parks	No! There are many other planned park spaces in nearby areas.

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG</b> - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i>	
2	Topic	Comment
492	Parks	Possibly depends on if there are already houses there.
493	Parks	No?/Yes? How many other parks are in the area?? Or are to be developed??
494	Parks	Maybe - better location buffered by greenspace and away from high traffic road (Thompson).
495	Parks	Connect the South Park to the Bronson Creek greenway. Don't cut it off (as show by plan) with street. It should "flow' into the open space network and be connected.
496	Parks	Yes, with trail access!
497	Parks	No need for park.
498	Parks	We are good as is.
499	Parks	Not necessarily- doesn't THPRD already own land on Western border of Area 93?
500	Parks	Yes
501	Parks	Yes, but integrate park with stream corridor - the entire stream is a virtual park that Tualatin Hills should buy and oversee.
502	Parks	No
503	Parks	Yes-there are no other parks in that area (near my property).

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
504	Parks	Smaller park areas on creek use Bailes/Findley Pond of big natural area. Creek and banks and x number of feet of banks will be protected but maybe too steep to use as a park in much of the proposed park area.
505	Parks	No - Next to Thompson is a bad location.
506	Parks	No - too close to Thompson and Bonny slope Park.
507	Parks	No - Park should be on Bronson Creek.
508	Parks	No - Too close to existing homes, increase noise and traffic/possible ↑ crime/homeless camps.
509	Parks	No.
510	Parks	No, better place for homes.
511	Parks	No should be homes there.
512	Parks	No - on busy road.
513	Parks	No - We live in the area designated for a park. Don't want picnics happening in our backyard - or front yard.
514	Parks	No - Thompson is too busy.
515	Parks	Yes - If you pay market value previously established in past tax years.

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
516	Parks	No - there is already a park near there.
517	Parks	No-Impedes private property.
518	Parks	Have a pocket park with basketball area and skate park for diversity of what available north of freeway and dirt bike trail.
519	Parks	No! It's on my property and this is the first I've heard of it.
520	Parks	Maybe - Adjacent to planned greenspace is better.
521	Parks	Ok if THPRD pays market value.
522	Parks	Should be another South Park that is west of current proposed.
523	Parks	No parks.
524	Parks	No parks near main road.
525	Parks	Parks - move the street along the north edge of the Rectangular park to the South edge so the park is connected to the open space system.
526	Parks	I would add a small trail head park on the South end of the bridge/trail to counter balance the park on the Northern side.
527	Parks	Yes to a park. We don't have one in this area; the nearest is the Bonnyslope park which is a long walk with intermittent sidewalks.
528	Parks	I expect a park with dog park and protected wetlands to make up 20% of Area 93 development. This was missed in earlier developments and would demonstrate broader benefit to new and existing neighborhoods.
529	Parks	Area 93 needs parks, trails to connect to the Wildwood Trail, sidewalks, bike lanes, removal of English Ivy, and lower speed limits on nearby Washington county roads.
530	Parks	Concern about over-crowding of facilities (existing rec centers)
531	Parks	Concern about park & trail locations impacting individual owners disproportionately
532	Parks	Make sure there are small neighborhood parks - more like pocket parks

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
533	Parks	Acquisition of park lands - how will this occur?
534	Parks	Pocket parks are only good for toddlers - limited audience
535	Parks	Public tennis courts/basketball courts should be included in the plan
536	Parks	Do not want a park on our property.
537	Parks	Parks: There are very few parks in the area east of Bethany Blvd - maximize the opportunity to add parks in the new area - there are virtually none to the south of Thompson also.
538	Parks	Please keep the park previously proposed (item 5 off Thompson).
539	Parks	Need a "Big" park in Bonny Slope West that will take 1/4 of Bonny Slope West area. We need green space!!
540	RdImpr\$	It would be nice to have continuous sidewalks on Thompson & Laidlaw.
541	RdImpr\$	We all want to have the opportunity... to have our gravel road paved.
542	RdImpr\$	Sidewalks.
543	RdImpr\$	Sidewalks
544	RdImpr\$	Infrastructure cost for Laidlaw, Thompson and Marcotte as well as all internal infrastructure must be paid for by land-owners/developers. Land price will just need to be lower.
545	RdImpr\$	All residents of the area should benefit from the improvements (sewer, water, sidewalks) - not just big builders that have purchased the land from investors.
546	RdImpr\$	Has anyone thought about making the developers responsible for paying for the building of schools & road improvement the new homes instead of waiting for the crisis and then raising taxes on the long time home owners to finance these projects? As for myself and my neighbors, we are AGAINST this development as it will increase our costs and lower quality of life in Washington County.
547	RdImpr\$	Not enough \$ will be generated by homes in Area 93, won't fund Thompson & Laidlaw
548	RdImpr\$	How much would supplemental SDC be, what would it cover?
549	RdImpr\$	Spend local TDT in local area
550	RdImpr\$	CSD is unfair - puts cost on homeowner should be as part of mortgage
551	RdImpr\$	What % of transportation funding comes from developer?

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
552	RdImpr\$	SDCs may be comparatively small compared to expensive homes
553	RdImpr\$	Road widening of Thompson Rd is necessary but it will lower the property values of homes near the water facility. This is near Hibbard Road. The homes along Thompson will be negatively impacted by noise and generally poor aesthetics.
554	RdImpr\$	Please require <u>sidewalks</u> from Findley to Bonney Slope Park
555	RdImpr\$	Net zero means Area 93 needs to pay for this?
556	RdImpr\$	Pass the cost to developers
557	RdImpr\$	To make this addition to Wa. Co not harm the rest of the county. The charges above the SDT will need to bring in about \$68 million. These are only 160 acres, much of it can not be developed. The extra costs per developed acre or housing unit will need to be fair more than in North Bethany, right?
558	RdImpr\$	Promises were made in bringing in Area 93 that existing residents of WA. CO. would not subsidize infrastructure in 93. SDCs collect in Area 93 need to pay for entire infrastructure impacts of 93 development. If SDCs in 93 end up higher than SDCs in North Bethany so be it.
559	RdImpr\$	This will impact land values-but why should any owner get \$400-800/acre for land and pass dev. Costs on to others.
560	RdImpr\$	We should ignore people who would impose on SDC's out of (spite?) Be honest about costs.
561	RdImpr\$	Will developer pay for road improvements?
562	RdImpr\$	Developers should bear more costs related to site/road improvements, longer term impact on neighborhoods plus infrastructure.
563	School	School impacts a concern - potential school siting - school district not there yet in their planning
564	School	Middle school need - Stoller overloaded, other middles not
565	School	What is outcome of school district notice?
566	School	Minimize density to avoid school overcrowding
567	School	How does school district site?
568	School	Could land be zoned Institutional to hold it for school? Not done unless School District already owns.
569	School	SDC for schools -school board makes this decision

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
570	School	Community is in support for an elementary school in Area 93
571	School	Proposing an elementary school - 10 acres
572	School	No Bond funds now
573	School	Looking @ two sites
574	School	Existing schools are already over capacity
575	School	Bvtn School District should push back
576	School	Development should consider school capacity
577	School	Safe Routes to school
578	School	Potential Boundary changes
579	School	Stability with new development - boundary - surety
580	School	Existing schools are already over capacity
581	School	Schools over capacity a reason to decrease density
582	School	Other states require development to build schools - what's the process to have this done?
583	School	School Board policy addressing overcrowding
584	School	Consider busing kids to schools that have capacity
585	School	Consolidate Summa program to one facility
586	School	Option Tera Nova as an alternate
587	Schools	Schools act as community gathering areas.
588	Schools	My child's classroom is already too crowded.
589	Schools	Findley School is too crowded already!
590	Schools	I'm concerned about overcrowding in schools
591	Schools	Schools are overcrowded.
592	Schools	My children's schools Stoller & Jacob Wismer are severely over crowded!
593	Schools	I am also very concerned about the already over-crowding of the schools and how this development is planning to mitigate the already serious issues that exist.
594	Schools	As for schools, where are these kids going to go to? There's no room for more portables at Findley Elementary or at Stoller. There will be no local school option for these families.

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
595	Schools	This build out needs to be slowed down until it's first figured out how to make it safe for increased traffic and a plan for where the kids will go to school. Build the new schools first because there's no room in the existing schools.
596	Schools	I expect additional elementary, middle and high schools to be built. All current schools are overcrowded and using portables presently.
597	Schools	I live on NW Loriann Dr very close to where Arbor Homes plans to build their development. What I have not seen is a plan for the traffic and additional children being put into an extremely overcrowded school system. Again - overcrowding in schools and budgetary concerns are already a problem. Adding more non-property tax payers and hundreds to thousands more children is certainly not a welcome issue to deal with for people already in these neighborhoods.
598	Schools	I live in Thompson Highlands and am very concerned about the impact of Area 93 on local traffic as well as further overcrowding in our already full elementary and middle school. What are your plans to mitigate these concerns? Thank you in advance for your response.
599	Schools	I am writing to express my concerns about the planning process for Area 93. I live in the immediate area that will be impacted by an increase in density and traffic in the region. Over the years, I have witnessed horrible overcrowding at Findley elementary school - my daughter attended 1st grade at Findley when classes ballooned to accomodate a 20% growth in students. Since 2005, the local schools have been riding a rollercoaster of increased students and decreased funding. Now, developers want to continue this plan, putting a huge burden on both taxpayers and students. Both Findley and Bonny Slope are currently over crowded, as is Stoller Middle School. High density development in Area 93 will only make this situation much worse.
600	Schools	I support the idea of a K-5 school w/in Bonny Slope West.
601	Schools	Please make sure that the existing school boundaries are not affected due to new construction
602	Schools	Get a school site or bus the kids to far away schools with capacity. No more overloading current school facilities
603	Schools	Support for Elementary school in Area 93
604	Schools	Concerned about this project's impact on local school enrollment.
605	Schools	All of the local middle schools are overflowing with students (beyond capacity).
606	Schools	Plan School District well before housing development
607	Schools	We need to reserve space for a middle school in Area 93. Local middle schools are full.
608	Schools	The developers should be required to build a school before any more homes are added to the area.

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
609	Schools	Findley Elem. is already over-full with all 5th grade in portables. We need a plan for where new students will go <u>before</u> any homes are built.
610	Schools	What schools will the students attend?
611	Schools	Over crowding of schools is another real issue.
612	TrafficOutArea93	Concerned that the county is allowing more development in our little valley but some long term planning is not being addressed - such as fixing Saltzman permanently, not just a Band-aid, so all the new traffic can safely flow.
613	TrafficOutArea93	Saltzman Road from Bayonne to Laidlaw is far below standards for construction traffic or increased residential traffic. It must be moved to align with NW 130th before any development begins in Area 93.
614	TrafficOutArea93	Please also consider widening Thompson Road to include a turn lane, bike lanes, and sidewalks on Thompson Road from Bonny Slope Park to Findley Elementary. Our children walk to Findley elementary school and there is only about 100 yards of sidewalk needed for them to walk safely on Thompson Road to school. Bonny Slope is less than a mile away, yet we can't walk there with the high speed cars drive and no sidewalks. Cars go 45 miles an hour there and with more homes developed, it will only get more dangerous for the children and bikers There are also many, many bikers on Thompson (they bike up to Forest Heights and Skyline) and it is very dangerous to pass the bikers on Thompson Rd. since the road is windy and cars can't see oncoming traffic around the corners. Thompson Rd. desperately needs a turn lane, bike lanes, and sidewalks to the schools from the neighborhoods.
615	TrafficOutArea93	We'd also like sidewalks and bike lanes - Thompson (between Findley Elementary and Bonny Slope Park) is dangerous with cars going 45 miles per hour and no sidewalks and curvy roads for bikers and cars trying to pass.
616	TrafficOutArea93	Also the current proposal will create several "shortcuts" through residential neighborhoods for commuters seeking to avoid traffic congestion around the Saltzman/Thompson intersection, potentially leading to dangerous speeding through quiet neighborhoods with kids.
617	TrafficOutArea93	We ask that NW Hibbard Drive not be extended across NW Thompson Road, as described in the Area 93 proposal. This would seem to encourage pass-through traffic to use NW Hibbard Dr. as a connector to NW Creekview Dr and NW Welsh Dr as a cut-through route between NW Saltzman and NW Thompson Roads, which would increase traffic and compromise the safety of the residents living and playing on those neighborhood streets.

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
618	TrafficOutArea93	Speeding in this area is already a concern. Residents in the neighborhoods which include NW Creekview, NW Welsh, and NW Hibbard Drives have already been in contact with Washington County regarding speeding on those streets. We expect Washington County to continue to support efforts to encourage speed compliance on these neighborhood streets. Any opportunity to use these drives as a "cut-through" to access or avoid congestion into Area 93 would seem to increase the likelihood of speeding on these streets, exacerbating this existing area of concern.
619	TrafficOutArea93	NW Hibbard Drive at risk for being misused as a "cut-through." Residents witness an increase in traffic when construction occurs on NW Thompson Road, as vehicles use these streets (NW Creekview, NW Welsh, and NW Hibbard Drives) as a "cut-through." It is anticipated that this may occur more regularly as traffic increases on NW Saltzman and NW Thompson Roads with ongoing development. Further encouraging traffic traveling in this pattern by extending NW Hibbard Drive into Area 93 or by expanding the route north and south on NW 120th Avenue/NW 120th Terrace risks seriously exacerbating this area of concern.
620	TrafficOutArea93	I am very concerned about traffic that this Area 93 development will bring to the Thompson and Saltzman roads.
621	TrafficOutArea93	First, regarding the traffic. There are no continuous sidewalks on Thompson and I didn't see it in the plans to widen the road, make sidewalks, straighten the road, or anything that may mitigate the huge increase in traffic. I definitely don't want a Commercial area built near Hibbard, this would just make the situation worse.
622	TrafficOutArea93	Cars go around the Thompson curve (at Hibbard) at about 45 mph and about a year ago, a car veered off the road and into the electrical transformer. It knocked out the electricity for the surrounding neighborhoods. It's just a very dangerous stretch of road and a bad idea to increase the volume of traffic. Families that live along Thompson have had their dogs run over and killed by cars barreling down Thompson. My first choice is to really limit the number of houses built in this area to keep traffic to a minimum.
623	TrafficOutArea93	I expect Saltzman and Thompson roads to be widened to support additional traffic from Cornell to Laidlaw, and from 143rd to McKinley. Rush hour and school hours already overload these roads.
624	TrafficOutArea93	I expect traffic flows in Thompson Highlands to be modified to eliminate Hibbard as a major traffic artery. This may include converting the south side Hibbard/Thompson intersection into Thompson Highlands to a pedestrian only exchange.
625	TrafficOutArea93	As an eighteen year Thompson Heights resident, I've seen this lovely farming-low density area become a "sea of homes." There has been no improvement in the roads. Tens of thousands of new residents are using the same farm roads that were here 50+ years ago.

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
626	TrafficOutArea93	Improving the roads/widening roads is something that is not addressed when new developers come into the neighborhood. Traffic is becoming a major issue out there.
627	TrafficOutArea93	In addition, traffic in this area is unsafe with the current developments in place . Even with minor improvements to the road going up Thompson, cyclists, pedestrians and drivers alike are at risk daily due to poor roads, no sidewalks and disappearing cycling lanes. The curved portions of roadways on both Saltzman and Thompson are unsafe in their current configuration. More traffic will make these roads even more unsafe and side roads will be used as cut-throughs to alleviate traffic. Surrounding neighborhoods will be impacted by increased volume, creating problems and potential dangers throughout the region.
628	TrafficOutArea93	Please also straighten out Thompson Rd, add bike lanes, a turn lane, and sidewalks all the way to Findley on both sides of the road all the way to Bonny Slope Park.
629	TrafficOutArea93	Impacts to Saltzman a concern.
630	TrafficOutArea93	Increased crashes @ Bethany / W. Union since MSTIP Project finished plus speeding too
631	TrafficOutArea93	Saltzman / Thompson back-ups
632	TrafficOutArea93	Not enough N - S routes
633	TrafficOutArea93	Sound walls for south side of Thompson
634	TrafficOutArea93	Realignment of Thompson / Kenny: do this before THPRD park develops (MSTIP)
635	TrafficOutArea93	Where is the right-of-way line now vs. proposed?
636	TrafficOutArea93	Bottlenecks @ nearby intersections: Saltzman / Thompson, Saltzman / Laidlaw
637	TrafficOutArea93	Safety of walking to school - Findley
638	TrafficOutArea93	Look at broader area traffic impacts
639	TrafficOutArea93	What are plans for US 26
640	TrafficOutArea93	School transportation
641	TrafficOutArea93	Prioritize sidewalk improvements - Thompson - Saltzman to Co. line not incremental approach - do it earlier
642	TrafficOutArea93	3 - lane road may cause speeding on Thompson
643	TrafficOutArea93	We are not shown in Area 93 boundary! We are between the boundary and NW Thompson Rd - "No Mans Land." And when Thompson is widened, we are losing a substantial portion of our front lawn!!! Thank you!

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
644	TrafficOutArea93	I heard Area 93 was to have 'no impact' to the existing county. Not sure what this means but surely there will be increased traffic into & out of A93 → How is this impact being addressed?
645	TrafficOutArea93	My house is just outside Area 93 and I'm concerned how this planning process is addressing the increased traffic and impact on roads OUTSIDE of A93. Laidlaw plus Saltzman Rds area already unsafe in many areas.
646	TrafficOutArea93	Concerned about traffic at these higher densities. Not pleased at increasing Thompson to 3 lanes.
647	TrafficOutArea93	Please prevent Welsh/Hibbard from becoming a pass through option.
648	TrafficOutArea93	I am very concerned about safety on Thompson Rd specially on NW 120th to Hibbard and livability from larger lots to proposed high density housing also lack of school capacity.
649	TrafficOutArea93	Thompson Rd is <u>extremely</u> curvy w/ no sidewalks dangerous for bikers and children. We need it straightened out w/ a turn lane, bike lanes and sidewalks all the way from Findley Elem to Bonny Slope Park.
650	TrafficOutArea93	Make Saltzman straight for safety between Findley Elem and Laidlaw. It's very dangerous.
651	TrafficOutArea93	When will the transportation impacts to Saltzman Road be addressed?
652	Trails	Generally good idea and location.
653	Trails	Support. Increased access for bicycles using <u>safe trails</u> should be a priority for this community due to the large concentration of families with small children.
654	Trails	Yes - linking trails across WA County good, healthful living for families w/o additional noise plus traffic (cars).
655	Trails	Yes
656	Trails	Only if trails can be maintained-who will do this?
657	Trails	Yes! Best location.
658	Trails	Trail on north side of creek.
659	Trails	Yes.
660	Trails	Yes - As many trails as possible.
661	Trails	Yes, great location.
662	Trails	Yes, wife loves to walk.
663	Trails	Yes - keep it near the stream. Pedestrian and bike crossing is good.
664	Trails	Side streets should be wide enough for bicycling to the path in a safe manner.

	D	E
1	<b>AREA 93 - COMMENT LOG - <i>updated Nov. 25,</i></b>	
2	Topic	Comment
665	Trails	Trail - good idea, but North side of creek is more flat (20% plus grade on S. side).
666	Trails	Bike lanes and walking path the length of Laidlaw - not in chopped up pieces as developments go in.
667	Trails	Add walking / bike trails.
668	Trails	The trails are great.
669	Trails	Concerned about putting trail in natural area - leave it for animals
670	Trails	Don't put trails on both sides
671	Trails	Put trails on both sides - very important
672	Trails	Do not want bike or walking path along Ward Creek.
673	Trails	Do not want bike or walking path on our property. Do not see any reason for this.
674	Trails	Creek access for the public plus trails would be great. We are a walking community. Thank you for asking for our feedback.