

**From:** [Stevens Family Farms](#)  
**To:** [Council Distribution](#)  
**Subject:** Comments for July 16 City Council Meeting  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 16, 2024 5:59:32 AM

---

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Re: Resolution 24-28

I attended the Mayor's Roundtable on June 27, during which I expressed general support for traffic safety improvements at the corner of Stafford and Childs Roads on behalf of the Stevens Family (I am the Managing Member of Stevens Family Farms, LLC). While I reiterate this overall support for the project now, I also request that you not vote on Resolution 24-28 today, given our ongoing concerns. Instead, Stevens asks the draft Resolution be returned to the City Manager for corrections and changes. If you choose to take up Resolution 24-28 today, the Stevens family recommends that the City Council vote No.

Why? Because in your May 21 meeting, the City Manager warned you against referring a measure to LO voters that might fail. As it is now written, Resolution 24-28--and any ballot measure based upon it--should fail.

Our primary concern is that the total area of Stevens Meadows is misstated (thus understating the percentage of land area required by the plan), and the development restrictions written into a 2019 Conservation Easement are unacknowledged. In numerous public documents and plans, Stevens Meadows is described as being 20.5 acres. The reason for this is simple: My grandparents bought this exact parcel from Bill and Ethel Cook in the 1960s. In turn, Stevens conveyed the 20.54-acre parcel to the City in 2003, and it was named Stevens Meadows. This lineage is very clear. The Resolution misstates the area of the park because it lumps that 2003 transaction together with additional ~4.5 acres of land that Stevens conveyed to the City in 2019. But, our 2019 land transfer was for a different purpose, which included improving public access to Stevens Meadows. Indeed, the eastern 1/3 of the smaller 2019 parcel is already zoned for park development under a Conservation Easement, the details of which prohibit the type of development considered for this project and which have been well-known by City and County staff for many months or longer. Specifically, this eastern 1/3 was conveyed to the City to be lightly developed to support greater public access to the adjacent Stevens Meadows – but this Resolution is clear that this area will instead become “the new permanent gravel driveway and access road for park maintenance,” which would limit the intended public access. In Stevens opinion, the draft Resolution misrepresents the letter and spirit of our past transactions with the City and it seems to preclude the Council, Metro, and the County from further modifying the project to accomplish compliance with both Measure X and existing Conservation Easement restrictions on the property in question.

County engineers have ample skills to redesign a project that fits within the footprint and intent of the Conservation Easement over this land. Stevens learned at a May meeting with County engineers that design modifications exist that would minimize slope easement issues, but we have not seen evidence of these in ensuing meetings. The City indicated to the Stevens family after the Mayor's Roundtable that it would convene a meeting with Metro, the County and the City to discuss Stevens' design concerns; no follow-up on that has yet been scheduled.

I ask that you return Resolution 24-28 to the drawing board or vote no.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter and I stand ready to further discuss with the parties in question.

Alex H Johnson

Managing Member, Stevens Family Farms

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

(503) 504-9668