



# GREAT PLACES SW Corridor Plan

## Survey summary: draft purpose and need statement for the refinement phase

January 2014

### PROJECT PARTNERS

Cities of Beaverton, Durham, King City, Lake Oswego, Portland, Sherwood, Tigard and Tualatin, Multnomah and Washington counties, Oregon Department of Transportation, TriMet and Metro

# Survey summary: Southwest Corridor Plan draft purpose and need statement for the refinement phase

---

## Contents

Executive Summary.....	2
Overview .....	3
Title VI Overview .....	3
Survey questions, response statistics, and key takeaways.....	4
Appendix A.....	10
Coded individual comments from Question 4 .....	10
Coded individual comments from Question 6 .....	13
Coded individual comments from Question 10.....	15
Coded individual unrelated comments or comments expressing concerns.....	18
Appendix B.....	211
Title VI statistics .....	211

## Executive Summary

The draft purpose and need statement for the refinement phase of the Southwest Corridor Plan opened to public feedback on Nov. 7 and closed 17 days later on Nov. 24. Feedback was gathered through an online survey that was posted to the project website, emailed twice to the interested parties list, and advertised through the project’s Facebook and Twitter accounts. The survey consisted of ten questions on the statement, plus five additional Title VI questions (for required demographic information tracking). Survey results are not meant to be statistically significant. Participants answered a general question to evaluate current support for the contents of the draft statement, submitted comments about what they saw as missing, submitted their own questions about the statement, and provided general feedback and improvement ideas. The following is an overview of main takeaways from the public survey. Project staff will use the public input to calibrate the purpose and need statement and use it to evaluate the design options being considered during the refinement phase of the Plan.

The purpose and need statement that results from this refinement phase will be used to begin National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) work. The public will have an additional opportunity to comment on the purpose and need during the scoping period of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

## Overview

- There were 66 survey participants.
- The majority (78%) of respondents indicated **the draft statement currently represents the true purpose and need** for high capacity transit (HCT) investment in the Southwest corridor.
- Nearly one third (29%) of respondents expressed concerns about HCT such as costs, safety, crime, traffic congestion and neighborhood change.
- The majority of suggested additions and comments to the draft purpose and need statement include greater clarification regarding **specific focal points of interest and connections** (i.e. OHSU, Bridgeport Village, etc.), and **greater commitment to bicycle, pedestrian, and active transportation needs**.
- The most common questions related to **project time frames**, issues of **social justice and fairness**, and **funding and costs**.
- Additional important questions included how HCT may affect **traffic and congestion**, and which **focal points** are or will be guiding underlying considerations (i.e. OHSU, Bridgeport Village, etc.).
- Concerns were expressed regarding four main issues: **funding and costs** associated with an HCT project in the corridor, **effects on safety** (especially regarding perceptions that transit improvements will bring crime into suburban neighborhoods), **effects on development** (especially regarding perceptions of density), and **effects on traffic congestion**.
- Over half (53%) of respondents entered a Southwest Portland zipcode.
- The survey had no or low participation from Beaverton, Durham, King City, Lake Oswego, Sherwood, or Tualatin.

## Title VI Overview

- Survey participants were more than 75% male.
- Survey participants were highly educated. The majority of participants have a post graduate education. There were no participants who have received a high school degree or less.
- The largest participant minority was Hispanic/ Latino, representing just under 10% of respondents.
- There was little or no representation from populations self-reporting as African, American Indian/ Native American/ Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Black/ African American, Slavic, Middle Eastern, or other races.
- Nearly all of the participants have participated in a community meeting in the past, with more than half indicating they participate at least “fairly often.”
- There were no participants under 21 years of age.

## Survey questions, response statistics, and key takeaways

<b>Question 1</b>			
What is your zipcode? (required)			
<b>Zip codes</b>	<b>Area</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent of survey total</b>
97201, 97205, 97219, 97221, 97225, 97239	Southwest Portland	35	53%
97223, 97224	Tigard	12	18%
97202, 97206, 97209, 97210, 97212, 97213, 97214, 97218	Portland (all other areas)	11	16%
97062	Tualatin	3	5%
97222, 97267	Clackamas County	2	3%
97034	Lake Oswego	2	3%
97140	Sherwood	1	2%
<b>Total responses</b>		<b>66</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Takeaway</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over half of respondents entered a Southwest Portland zipcode.</li> <li>The survey had no or low participation from Beaverton, Durham, King City, Lake Oswego, Sherwood, or Tualatin.</li> </ul>			
<b>Question 2</b>			
How well do you think the draft purpose and need statement currently represents the true purpose and need for high capacity transit investment in the Southwest corridor?			
<b>Response options</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent of total responses (58)</b>	
Not well	13	22%	
Well	29	50%	
Very well	16	28%	
Answered question	58		
Skipped question	8		
<b>Takeaway</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nearly 80% of respondents indicated the draft statement currently represents the true purpose and need for high capacity transit investment in the Southwest corridor (either “Well” or “Very well”).</li> </ul>			

Survey summary: Southwest Corridor Plan draft purpose and need refinement

<b>Question 3</b>		
Do you notice anything missing in the draft purpose and need statement?		
<b>Response options</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent of total responses (56)</b>
Yes	37	66%
No	19	34%
Answered question	56	
Skipped question	10	
<b>Question 4</b>		
What would you add to the draft purpose and need statement that you see is missing?		
<b>Response options</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent of survey total (66)</b>
Answered question	35	53%
Skipped question	31	47%
<b>Response categories*</b>	<b>Total**</b>	
Clarification of focal points and connections	6	
Greater commitment to bicycle/ pedestrian/ active transportation	6	
Other	5	
Notes regarding the time frame, project methods, and/or process	4	
Greater commitment to improving the corridor for automobiles/ traffic volume	4	
Greater commitment to social justice/ fairness	3	
Set cost parameters and/or explain funding	3	
Address issues of safety and risk	2	
Specify improvements to transit service	2	
Greater emphasis on light rail	2	
Concerns / unrelated comments	6	
*Individual responses available in Appendix A.		
**Each participant response coded in up to three categories.		
<b>Takeaway</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The most popular additions to the draft purpose and need statement include greater clarification regarding specific focal points of interest and connections (i.e. OHSU, Bridgeport Village, etc.), and greater commitment to bicycle, pedestrian, and active transportation needs.</li> <li>• There were 29 comments identifying potential additions to fill in the gaps of what participants saw as missing from the draft statement.  <u>These comments are available in Appendix A.</u></li> </ul>		

Survey summary: Southwest Corridor Plan draft purpose and need refinement

<b>Question 5</b>		
Are you left with questions after reading the draft purpose and need statement?		
<b>Response options</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent of total responses (53)</b>
Yes	37	70%
No	16	30%
Answered question	53	
Skipped question	13	
<b>Question 6</b>		
What questions do you have after reading the draft purpose and need statement?		
<b>Response options</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent of survey total (66)</b>
Answered question	23	35%
Skipped question	43	65%
<b>Response categories*</b>	<b>Total**</b>	
Time frame/ process	6	
Social justice and fairness	5	
Funding/ costs	4	
Effects on traffic/ congestion	3	
Focal points	3	
Complete streets	2	
Word clarification	2	
Roles of partners	1	
Effects on development	1	
Concerns/ unrelated questions or comments	4	
*Individual responses available in Appendix A.		
**Each participant response coded in up to three categories.		
<b>Takeaway</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The most popular questions about the draft purpose and need statement were related to project time frames, issues of social justice and fairness, and funding/ costs.</li> <li>• Additional important questions included how HCT may affect traffic and congestion, and which focal points are or will be guiding underlying considerations (i.e. OHSU, Bridgeport Village, etc.).</li> <li>• From 23 responses, less than half were practical questions from the public about the draft statement. Other responses either expressed concerns or were unrelated comments (separated for coding and review - see page 17) or they were useful as general comments about the draft (and therefore added to Question 10 responses for coding and review - see page 14).</li> </ul>		

Survey summary: Southwest Corridor Plan draft purpose and need refinement

<b>Questions 7 and 8</b>		
Would you like someone to get back to you regarding your question?		
<b>Response options</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent of total responses (24)</b>
Yes*	9	38%
No	15	62%
Answered question	24	
Skipped question	42	
*Contact names and emails were collected from those requesting a response. Responses will be delivered through an updated Frequently Asked Questions document and distributed to the interested parties list and those who submitted their contact information for a response.		
<b>Takeaway</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The majority of respondents skipped this question.</li> </ul>		
<b>Question 9</b>		
Do you have any additional comments or suggested improvements to the draft purpose and need statement?		
<b>Response options</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent of total responses (25)</b>
Yes	13	50%
No	12	50%
Answered question	25	
Skipped question	41	
<b>Question 10</b>		
Additional comments or suggested improvements to the draft purpose and need statement:		
<b>Response options</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent of total responses (66)</b>
Answered question	23	35%
Skipped question	43	65%
<b>Coded response categories*</b>	<b>Total**</b>	
Define focal points/ connections in the statement	4	
Provide greater focus on light rail	2	
Explain more about the plan's desired/ intended effects on development	2	
Make additional environmental commitments	1	
Set cost parameters and/or explain funding in the statement	1	
Make commitments to reducing commute travel time/ increasing frequency of transit service	1	
Include language with greater commitment to bicycle/ pedestrian issues	1	

Survey summary: Southwest Corridor Plan draft purpose and need refinement

Make commitments to improving the corridor for automobiles	1	
Less commitment to expanding automobile capacity	1	
Make commitments to increasing frequency of transit service	1	
Improve general clarity of the document	1	
Concerns/ unrelated questions or comments	6	
*Individual responses available in Appendix A. **Each participant response coded in up to three categories.		
<b>Takeaway</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The most popular comments were about further definition and identification of focal points for transit service and connections (i.e. OHSU, Bridgeport Village, etc.).</li> <li>• There were 15 comments and suggested improvements from the public about the draft statement. Other responses either expressed concerns or were unrelated comments (separated for coding and review - see page 17) or were questions about the draft (and therefore moved to Question 6 responses for coding and review - see page 12).</li> </ul>		



Survey summary: Southwest Corridor Plan draft purpose and need refinement

<b>Concerns*, or unrelated** public comments submitted via purpose and need survey</b>		
<b>Section submitted</b>	<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Percent of total responses per section of submission</b>
From Question 4 (RE: What is missing)	6	17% of 35
From Question 6 (RE: Public questions)	7	30% of 23
From Question 10 (RE: Comments/ suggested improvements)	6	26% of 23
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>29% of 66</b>
<b>Coded response categories</b>	<b>Total**</b>	
Funding/ costs	6	
Effects on safety	6	
Effects on development	6	
Effects on traffic congestion	5	
Other	4	
Time frame/ process	4	
Concern about bicycles, pedestrians, and/or trails	2	
<p>*The “concerns” category represents comments that did not pertain to the purpose and need statement, yet expressed concerns about HCT such as costs, safety, crime, traffic congestion, and neighborhood change.</p> <p>**The “unrelated” category represents participants whose comments refer to issues outside of the purpose and need statement refinement and/or outside of the Southwest Corridor Plan scope.</p> <p>***Each participant response coded in up to three categories.</p>		
<b>Takeaway</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nearly one third (29%) of those surveyed expressed concerns about HCT such as costs, safety, crime, traffic congestion and neighborhood change.</li> </ul>		

## Appendix A

### Coded individual comments from Question 4

What would you add to the draft purpose and need statement that you see is missing?				
Key: Coded response categories				
Clarification of focal points and connections	Greater commitment to bicycle/ pedestrian/ active transportation	Other	Greater commitment to improving the corridor for autos/ traffic volume	Notes regarding the time frame, project methods, and/or process
Set cost parameters and/or explain funding	Greater commitment to social justice/ fairness	Address issues of safety and risk	Improvement to transit service	Greater emphasis on light rail
Coded response categories	Comments			
				More commitment to light rail spelled out.
				Need to encourage development of attractive centers with businesses that folk will want to use (retail, banking, restaurants etc)
				Road and intersection improvements to deal with traffic congestion which continually polls as the number one concern by residents.
				I still think Sherwood needs to be a part of this system. It's contiguous to Tualatin.
				Consideration of potential impacts of autonomous vehicles.
				More people are driving cars so you need to put money into more and better roads
				The thesis mention the importance of connecting downtown to Tigard/Tualatin but not to the neighborhoods in between. I know it's implied, but not all will read it that way.
				Specific discussion of equity- particular communities/income groups that are most in need of improved access
				I believe there should be a focus on the need for light rail as opposed to options such as bus rapid transit. The right of way requirements and maintenance needed for a BRT line makes it a nonsensical choice over the durability of a light rail line. Not to mention, light rail does a better job at spurring development than BRT.
				A need for re-evaluating future travel demand projections given changing travel behavior.
				Pedestrian and bicycle network within a half mile of all stations must be mandatory, both to make transit use the logical choice in the corridor, as well as to commercially activate pedestrian zones around transit stations.
				1. The transit emphasis is currently on providing a more comfortable

Survey summary: Southwest Corridor Plan draft purpose and need refinement

			<p>commute for day-trippers from the outlying suburban areas getting to downtown. Greater emphasis should be placed on serving the Portland neighborhoods the transit project will pass through. Otherwise it is simply a giant scar carved through SW Portland.</p> <p>2. A major emphasis should be placed on reducing traffic volumes. If the project does not accomplish this, it should be scrapped.</p> <p>3. The project needs to serve OHSU and Hillsdale. See #1 above.</p>
			Needs of people with mobility issues taking mass transit or needing special additional transit options.
			Active transportation. The purpose and need should have more about encouraging active transportation which includes (but is not limited to) bicycling and walking. Active transportation has many benefits for the community, a few of which are: Better public health, reduced pollution, low cost with high benefits, and increased livability & property values.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the project needs to connect not just Tualatin and Tigard, but also SW Portland, to the central city</li> <li>- in addition to providing access to housing, the plan should also support the Metro 2040 centers policies as well as the "Healthy Connected City" strategy in the Portland Plan, supporting a mixture of housing, commercial and public land uses</li> <li>- beyond being multi-modal, the plan should strongly promote activate transportation</li> <li>- the corridor has significant safety issues for multiple modes and the project should address these</li> </ul>
			It is missing an emphasis on improving livability in Portland neighborhoods that are currently being adversely impacted by all of the car traffic. It also primarily focuses on Portland Center City, while Marquam Hill (OHSU/VA) and PCC represent two very high use areas that are functionally neglected by many potential alignments of the plan.
			The language and intent of the statement needs to put a stronger emphasis on the true purpose of this concept: moving people to and from Tigard/Tualatin and Portland. Quick and efficient transit needs to be better projected as the primary goal, not one of many goals. For instance, an emphasis on housing in the corridor should take a back seat to the movement of people.
			Detailed numbers of historic transit growth in the corridor along with future forecast if nothing done vs if HCT is implemented.
			The most important issue for this project to address is fixing the two bridges on Barbur so that cyclists can ride on Barbur w/o putting their lives at risk. Nothing else should be done til that problem is fixed.
			This planning is a significant opportunity to reduce the environmental impact of past development. It should be stated explicitly that the purpose of this plan includes reduction of air pollution, reduction of stormwater runoff, and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.
			Under project purpose, add as a project aim, "Improve transit service headways and travel time".
			Entire neighborhoods are entirely without transit due to the lack of

Survey summary: Southwest Corridor Plan draft purpose and need refinement

			sidewalks; there is a need to connect residences to the transit network to serve more of the southwest population
			funding sources, steps and timeline for seeing improvements - could there be incremental improvements? and if so, how could they be best prioritized for becoming reality.
			The project needs to directly serve the medical complexes on Marquam Hill together with the many employees, patients and visitors who go there on a daily (seven days a week).
			Constraints section Risk and risk mitigation section
			Differentiate between I5 and 99 traffic problems.
			There are no dollar amounts to evaluate the costs of building or adding to the current transportation systems nor to the operational costs once in place. Citizens had no idea they would be forced to subsidize much of the current system as it cannot pay for its operating costs. No one wants more of that when cost effective transportation does exist when planned right.
			Specifying why 50% ROW is needed for BRT. Buses to Tigard and Tualatin with their own ROW only 50% of the stretch looks not very different to the current state. This will not lead to fast transit. The percentage of ROW should be greater, or BRT should be studied only for lines that augment the main MAX line (i.e. to Sherwood from Tualatin/Tigard).
			Transit service span on many SW corridor areas do not provide a long enough span of service stranding passengers without reliable transport at night.

### Coded individual comments from Question 6

What questions do you have after reading the draft purpose and need statement?				
Key: Coded response categories				
Time frame/ process	Social justice and fairness	Funding/ costs	Effects on traffic	Complete streets
Focal points	Word clarification	Effects on development	Roles of partners	
Coded response categories		Comments		
				Specifics as to the destinations (colleges or universities, shopping destinations, major employment centers, industrial areas) that will be the focus of high capacity transit planning. Accepting that there are options as to the mode and routes, what critical destinations are to be linked with high capacity transit.
				Will the inner section of the corridor be given the due consideration which usually given to more suburban parts?
				Given that this project, like other transportation projects, directs where likely development is to occur, it is prudent to focus on more fiscally-responsible infill projects in the core rather than more sprawl-light projects in the suburbs. Should transit be a driver of development in the suburbs, those municipalities must provide the corresponding bike, pedestrian, and zoning changes to make walking and cycling time-competitive and rewarding.
				Why emphasizing "reliability" for motorized vehicles? Everyone (should) expect to spend more time traveling during peak hours. "Predictable" is more important than "reliable", and any projects that expand motor vehicle capacity should be done to make traffic predictable, but not to size roads for no congestion during peak demand periods.
				Cost, where money is coming from, ridership, amount of tax subsidy required for operations. Lots of basic hard information is missing. This seems to be mostly a sales pitch.
				Will there be any study of, and attempts to mitigate, the unintended negative consequences of the SW Corridor Plan (for example, if a Barbur alignment shunts auto traffic onto neighborhood streets and an already over-congested Rt 5)?
				When will the two bridges on Barbur be fixed so that cyclists are not endangered when they ride on Barbur? Right now there are many would-be cycle-commuters in SW Portland who do NOT ride downtown b/c they feel they are putting their lives in jeopardy by having to bolt into heavy traffic on the Barbur bridges. We need equity in transport options on Barbur Blvd!
				Under project purpose, the use of the verb "encourage" in "Encourage transit supportive development" sounds weak and prompts questions about will to and means to implement. Will the project partners revise land use regulations and spend capital improvement funds to make such development happen -- and will some entity prod the partners if any of them defaults to

Survey summary: Southwest Corridor Plan draft purpose and need refinement

			auto-oriented development? Or, will it be business as usual planning, permitting, and capital spending, in the hope that the nebulously identified "private sector" will develop accordingly? Lastly, use the more common phrase "transit-oriented development" instead.
			It seems to me that this plan has been greatly influenced by the people who live in the spendy single family homes north of Multnomah and then in Tigard with a big jump over the section of Barbur in between where there actually is a large number of affordable condos and apartments. The people living in this part of the corridor actually have the *least* access to parks, ease of multimodal transportation, etc. They also have the least time/money/energy to spend going to these planning meetings. Who is their voice? The plan seems to skip over their needs and to focus on the wealthier hubs of Multnomah/Hillsdale and then Tigard.
			funding sources, steps and timeline for seeing improvements - could there be incremental improvements? and if so, how could they be best prioritized for becoming reality.
			Costs (construction, operations and maintenance) , ridership, source of revenue, effects on traffic (on and off the alignment), etc. Basically, primary hard information that should have been considered before proceeding this far.
			How will it connect to the next phase? to Sherwood? and beyond.

### Coded individual comments from Question 10

Additional comments or suggested improvements to the draft purpose and need statement:					
Key: Coded response categories					
Define focal points/ connections in the statement	Explain more about the plan's desired/ intended effects on development	Provide greater focus on light rail	Make additional environmental commitments	Set cost parameters and/or explain funding in the statement	Make commitments to reducing commute travel time
Make commitments to improving the corridor for automobiles	Less commitment to expanding automobile capacity	Include language with greater commitment to bike/ ped issues	Make commitments to increasing frequency of transit service	Improve general clarity of the document	
Coded response categories	Comments				
	I was driving toward downtown on Barbur blvd and from Terwilliger to the Beaverton Hillsdale cutoff, it is a pretty narrow 4 lane road with two narrow bridges. Has there been any discussion about what to do with this road?				
	Focus on light rail, as I believe that should be the mode of transportation chosen for the SW corridor.				
	For such an important, and physically constrained corridor, anything short of MAX service to Tigard and Tualatin (in its own ROW) would be unacceptable. Also, there should be serious consideration given to converting the WES ROW to light rail service as an extension of the Red line from the Beaverton TC.				
	Remove all mentions or allusions of needs for expanding automobile capacity.				
	I'd like to see the scope narrowed in a way that implies something more concrete. I realize that specifics are meant to come in subsequent plans, but I think it would produce a more definitive discussion if the question of general direction (high-capacity, dedicated ROW - BRT/MAX/etc versus highway with compensatory foot/bike routes) were more clearly forced into view. I'd also like the question of how this interacts with development along the corridor. Does this mean the SW corridor becomes a dense housing corridor? Do new town centers get created? Or, do we acknowledge that, beyond a certain point, the character of the area becomes more spread out.				
	How Sherwood residents will access mass transit in Tualatin. Don't know if included here, but we don't take Beaverton line into Portland because if you arrive in the middle of the day there is no parking. Parking to take a bus would be a huge issue in Sherwood too. Especially in Old Town due to new apartments under construction.				
	Don't forget frequency when establishing purpose & need. High frequencies of transit make transit much more usable for the general population.				

Survey summary: Southwest Corridor Plan draft purpose and need refinement

	<p>As a Portland resident, who will undoubtedly be contributing heavily to the funding for such a project, I would very much like to see an emphasis on how it improved livability in the city and its neighborhoods. I have nothing against improving commute times for suburban commuters, but any project that worsens livability in the city will only increase the migration to the suburbs and end up worsening the problem in the long run. Ideally, by improving Portland's livability, it will remove some of the demand on a commuter system as people will want to live closer to where they work.</p>
	<p>The statement is unclear on the project's commitment to reducing travel time over the projected future travel times.</p>
	<p>I didn't see, maybe just missed it, any discussion on initial costs vs. long term operating cost that w [incompleted sentence]</p>
	<p>Be explicit about reducing stormwater runoff, air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.</p>
	<p>As a cyclist commuting from Beaverton to LC College 15 years ago, it took many dedicated attempts, near-misses, and sheer stupidity before I found a safe route to cross both Barbur and i-5. Even so, the route involved one of the most dangerous intersections in town (Multnomah Blvd/GardenHome @ the Market Pub). Going under Barbur/i-5 is a great option, but I've found many people don't know about it. And now w/ the new Safeway, the intersection at Capitol and Barbur is much riskier. Another bad sections is the Barbur / Taylor's Ferry / i5 complex. I've known people to sell their bicycles after a few attempts to navigate that section and just last week saw a woman cyclist nearly paralyzed in fear contemplating her options to continue on to Tigard. Somehow, she was on the sidewalk at the Pronto Prints place - to get over to the bike lane, she'd have to cross the traffic getting on to the hwy; and the sidewalk didn't continue on the other side. Or should could play pedestrian and try to run/ride to the other (wrong) side of Barbur, and head south, again crossing lots of lanes, to continue south on Barbur going against traffic. I couldn't watch.</p> <p>Please don't only focus on the areas that are already OK: multnomah, Tigard, etc. in order to make incremental improvements. That's easy. I know it's attractive. You can boast about how much better they are. But what would really make a difference is if you tackle the intersections that are true non-starters for cyclists.</p>
	<p>This project needs to much better serve the communities it passes through as it carves its way from Tigard to the downtown core. As currently conceived, this looks like a project primarily designed to make commuting from the outlying suburbs more comfortable. Not only will Portland Southwest Neighborhoods not support this, you can probably expect strong opposition unless the focus changes.</p>
	<p>I feel unable to get enough info out of the draft to identify the important parts that I'm commenting on or agreeing to.</p> <p>It is a confusing mix of unnecessary historical info that is distracting, along with (probably) the important issues, diluted by endless partnership-type language. I don't mean to be overly critical, but honestly if I click that I agree the draft properly represents what I think should be done, am I agreeing to, for example, that 50% or more of hwy 99 is dedicated to bus lanes? If that decision has been made already, just say it. If not, bullet it out so we know what we are agreeing to.</p>
	<p>Having spoken with hundreds of people on the issue of mass transportation, I find</p>



Survey summary: Southwest Corridor Plan draft purpose and need refinement

		<p>they want more buses and systems that reach deeper into the neighborhoods to get people to work and home without having to drive or walk 2 or 3 miles to reach a bus. There is great disbelief in the reliability of the Metro leadership as being political people wanting their way without caring about the people and what they want. It's the idea that Metro knows best, when in fact it does not. The overrun costs on Wes, the need to keep subsidizing these forms of transportation are not lost on the public. The people know that other states and cities have transportation that works, pays its way and they want better than what they have seen occur in much of the Portland area and Milwaukie, etc. They really want some integrity with talk and dollars matching.</p>
--	--	---

### Coded individual unrelated comments or comments expressing concerns

Unrelated comments or comments expressing concerns						
Key: Coded response categories						
Funding/ costs	Effects on safety	Effects on development	Effects on traffic congestion	Other	Time frame/ process	Concern about bicycles, pedestrians and/or trails
From	Coded response categories			Comments		
Q 4				You liberals want us to pay for mass transit for poor and bring crime and drugs to our neighborhoods and this will do nothing for the 90% of the people out there paying the price and who still wont be able to use mass transit and it will actually take away roads for cars.		
Q 4				I am not convinced that there is a need for a southwest corridor transit project at all. The draft purpose and need statement says that there will be more people moving to the area who will demand more transit. Therefore we have to densify neighborhoods and provide more transit. Obviously the people who live in southwest now are satisfied with the level of transit service they have, or they would move. And I don't hear anyone clamoring for more density, more apartments, and more condominiums.		
Q 4				How they will alleviate the overcrowding on 72nd and Hall that is already there and will get much worse if they take away lanes of traffic...ALSO how they will prevent crime and drugs from coming in that always comes with the low income housing they want this project to help create...this project will destroy my homes value as I am between 72nd and Hall and it will make my drivetimes even worse not better...		
Q 4				Light rail and street cars should not be used in the southwest corridor. In fact, the entire state of Oregon needs no more expensive light rail projects. \$1.5 billion could buy over 700 luxury Marathon buses built just north of Eugene, Oregon. The Red Electric Trail needs to be built today. Metal-studded tires need to be banned because they destroy roads. The whole area in and around Portland needs more parks and trails. The Willamette Shore Trolley needs to be closed and turned into a trail for pedestrians and bicyclists from Lake Oswego to the South waterfront.		
Q 4				It appears that all that is really being considered in the plan is either light rail or buses on dedicated rights of way. Like many SW Portland residents, I drive a service vehicle for my employment and can't use transit. I did use transit (buses) to commute from SW Portland to downtown Portland for 14 years while I worked for a large employer downtown, so I know about bus commuting. I had to walk 3/4 mile to/from Barbur Transit Center each day to take the		

Survey summary: Southwest Corridor Plan draft purpose and need refinement

				<p>number 12 buses to/from downtown. I was willing to accept the extra 1-1/4 hour per day over the time it would take to drive to work and park downtown only due to the extreme expense of parking downtown.</p> <p>Many commuters don't work downtown, but your proposed solutions assume that most commuters want to go there. You also cling to your "European" ideas of everyone happily biking or walking to work, then picking up a few groceries on the way home to prepare that evening's meal. THIS ISN'T EUROPE!!! Our cities are more spread out. We need more direct highways to places OTHER than downtown. Beltway freeway networks work well for many American cities, and they would work here as well.</p>
Q 4				<p>What you people who are intent on ramming this HCT down our throats seem to be missing is that if you take a lane or 2 of Hall or 72nd, then the car traffic will be even less reliable and much longer and the REALITY IS MANY MANY MANY MORE PEOPLE TAKE CARS THAN BUS OR TRAIN AND IT IS THOSE PEOPLE IN CARS THAT WILL BE PAYING FOR YOUR TRAIN/BUS AND WILL BE GETTING SCREWED!!!!!!</p>
Q 6				<p>Why do you insist on land management planning as opposed to placing a good system in and allowing business and individuals to buy and sell property according to zoning and city planning as opposed to fostering nests of apartments and crowded living. Oregonians came here or developed the lands quite well until Senator Schumer and Neil Goldschmidt decided this area should copy what is in New York. With a much smaller population, one that enjoys nature a lot, this east coast image does not fit here in Oregon. But some insist and persist on forcing crowded living and making people pay for it. Why do you persist when people do not want it like you are proposing? At such high costs?</p>
Q 6				<p>Why are you people trying to RAM this HCT down our throats so crime can come into our lives and our car commutes will get even worse?</p>
Q 6				<p>Why are you pushing light rail and bus rapid transit so hard when residents in this area don't really want it? Do you have another agenda?</p>
Q 6				<p>When will the Red Electric Trail be built? When will the Willamette Shore Trolley be turned into a pedestrian trail? When will more trail and parks get built? When will lower speed limits be put on SW Vermont Street and SW Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway? When will the Red Electric Trail get built? Students need safe routes to Wilson High school and employees need a safer route to OHSU via the Red Electric Trail.</p>
Q 6				<p>What was the result of the region-wide vote concerning whether we would like to have increased density or a responsible expansion of the urban growth boundary? 50-50? 60-40? 40-60? You can't answer the question because that vote was never held. The issue was never presented as simply as that to the people who live here now. Instead densification keeps getting pushed on us by Metro and the staff at</p>

Survey summary: Southwest Corridor Plan draft purpose and need refinement

				Metro who seem to be more interested in padding their resumes with projects that increase density than actually worrying about people who live here. The draft purpose and need statement is just one more example of Metro's pro-density agenda. The statement pre-supposes its conclusion that we need more transit and more density in southwest. It then concludes that we need more transit and more density in southwest. I think that Metro needs to start recognizing and respecting existing development patterns and stop shoving more people into existing neighborhoods. That's a great benefit for developers but it stinks if you own a single family house there now. In reference to the next question, no you don't have to get back to me with an answer because I don't believe your answer will be honest.
Q 6				What are they going to do with all the existing overcrowded traffic on Hall and 72nd if they take lanes away for train or bus...how will we even get to I5 anymore...what are they going to do to prevent more crime and drugs that always comes with HCT and low income housing...you people make me so frustrated...just tell us your plans because I believe you know what you want to do...instead you do little purpose statements and questionnaires designed to creep this crap in instead of just letting all of us hear the truth so we can vote it down!!!!
Q 6				Why the SW corridor planning is even occurring without voter approval? Why is the region continuing to spend millions (without voter approval) on the same controversial planning and projects already rejected in other parts?
Q 10				Let's put this crap in your neighborhood...how do you like that....
Q 10				This is not wanted...you are going to make Tigard a drug/sex/crime haven just like SE Portland...and you will probably tax us to death to do it and in the end our traffic will be worse than before...If Sherwood/Tualatin wants a shorter commute the let them move closer in....why should we pay for their problems...
Q 10				Suspend all of the corridor planning until voter approval occurs.
Q 10				Let this thing ruin your neighborhood and commute, not mine...and you can pay for it and not me!!!!
Q 10				Start over without your rose-colored glasses and look at the problem using common sense, not utopian goals!
Q 10				Of course TriMet is a key partner in making transit a viable alternative for southwest residents.

## Appendix B

### Title VI statistics

<b>Question 12</b>		
Your age (optional)		
<b>Response options</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent of total (48)</b>
20 years or younger	0	0%
21 to 35	13	27%
36 to 50	13	27%
51 to 65	17	35%
66 years or older	5	10%
Total responses	48	
No response (skipped question)	18	
<b>Takeaway</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were no participants under 21 years old.</li> </ul>		
<b>Question 13</b>		
What is your gender? (optional)		
<b>Response options</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent of total (46)</b>
Male	35	76%
Female	11	23%
Total responses	46	
No response (skipped question)	20	
<b>Takeaway</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Survey participants were more than 75% male.</li> </ul>		
<b>Question 14</b>		
What is the highest level of education you have had the opportunity to complete? (optional)		
<b>Response options</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent of total (47)</b>
High school degree or less	0	0%
Some college/technical/community college/2-yr degree	11	23%
College degree/4-yr degree	14	30%
Post graduate	22	47%
Total responses	47	
No response (skipped question)	19	
<b>Takeaway</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Survey participants were highly educated. Nearly 80% of participants have at least a 4-year college degree.</li> <li>The majority of participants have a post graduate education.</li> </ul>		

Survey summary: Southwest Corridor Plan draft purpose and need refinement

- There were no participants who have received a high school degree or less.

**Question 15**

What is your race or ethnicity? Check all that apply. (optional)

Response options	Total	Percent of total (44)
African	0	0%
American Indian/Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	2%
Black/African American	0	0%
Hispanic/Latino	4	9%
Slavic	1	2%
White/Caucasian	40	91%
Middle Eastern	0	0%
Other	2	6%

Total responses	44*	
No response (skipped question)	22	

\* Although there were 44 participants who responded to this question, there were more than 44 races/ethnicities selected because participants could select all that apply.

**Takeaway**

- Over 90% of participants that answered Question 15 are self-reportedly White/ Caucasian.
- The largest participant minority is Hispanic/ Latino, representing less than 10%.
- There was little or no representation from populations self-reporting as African, American Indian/ Native American/ Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Black/ African American, Slavic, Middle Eastern, or other races.

**Question 16**

How often do you participate in community meetings? (optional)

Response options	Total	Percent of total (44)
Very often	13	28%
Fairly often	13	28%
Rarely	19	40%
Never	2	4%

Total responses	47	
No response (skipped)	19	

**Takeaway**

- Nearly all of the participants have participated in a community meeting in the past, with more than half indicating they participate at least “fairly often.”