



G R E A T P L A C E S

SW Corridor Plan

**Draft public involvement report: March 2014
activities in the refinement phase**

May 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

This page is intentionally left blank.

DRAFT

Contents

Project outreach	1
Southwest Corridor Design Workshops.....	2
Summary of results	2
Title VI overview	5
Input collection and analysis.....	5
Overview of input about the proposed removal of 15 corridor design options	6
Overview of input on the eleven (11) groups of transit design options.....	8
Appendix A.....	22
Complete Data Set of Responses to Questions 1 through 4.....	22
Appendix B	43
Corridor Design Workshops: Event evaluations and demographic information summary ..	43

Draft Public Involvement Report: March 2014 activities in the refinement phase

In March, 2014 the Southwest Corridor Project staff conducted three corridor design workshops with the goal of collecting input from the public regarding the different transit design options currently under consideration to inform the draft refinement phase recommendation to the steering committee. In addition to the corridor design workshops, staff participated in two general project outreach events to create public awareness of the Plan and the refinement phase public involvement opportunities. This report summarizes the community engagement and outreach processes as well as the public input analyzed by staff.

Project outreach

Staff participated in a Transit Fair to increase the Southwest Corridor Plan’s visibility, especially among limited English proficiency groups. The Transit Fair took place on Sunday, March 16 at St. Anthony Catholic Church in Tigard. This event was a joint effort with TriMet, Washington County, the City of Tigard, and Tigard Walks. The main goal of the event was to inform the public, especially limited English proficiency Latino and Vietnamese groups, about current transit and transportation planning efforts including the Southwest Corridor Plan.

St. Anthony was selected as the location because it attracts large numbers of people, especially from the two identified groups, on Sundays. Metro staff brought information about the Plan that was translated into Spanish and Vietnamese, and hired an interpreter who spoke Vietnamese (staff handled communication in Spanish) in order to effectively communicate with members from these two groups. Staff talked to numerous members of the public and invited them to attend the corridor design workshops and to stay in touch with the Southwest Corridor Plan.

On Wednesday, March 19, staff participated in a tabling event at the Oregon Health and Science University (OHSU) with TriMet and Portland Streetcar to bring visibility to the Southwest Corridor Plan, provide information about transit planning and services, and raise awareness for public involvement opportunities including the Corridor Design Workshops. Stationed in the middle of the Veteran's Affairs – OHSU sky bridge, staff engaged with late morning and early afternoon foot traffic, informing approximately fifteen (15) interested members of the public per hour for three (3) hours.

Southwest Corridor Design Workshops

There were three (3) public Corridor Design Workshops and one Corridor Design Workshop held for Implementation and Development Southwest (ID Southwest), a subcommittee of the steering committee charged with advising the steering committee on the implementation of opportunity projects related to the plan.

The first Southwest Corridor Design Workshop took place in Portland on Wednesday, March 12, at the Wilson High School cafeteria. Forty-four (44) attendees signed in. Staff shared information about all the transit design options under consideration, especially the 15 options that were flagged for potential early removal. After a short presentation, the attendees broke up in small groups facilitated by staff to discuss in detail the transit design options of each one of the four specific corridor segments: (a) downtown Portland to Burlingame, (b) Burlingame to the Tigard triangle, (c) Tigard triangle to Bridgeport, and (d) Bridgeport to downtown Tualatin. The attendees' input was collected in comment cards and in notes taken by designated staff.

The second Southwest Corridor Design Workshop took place in Tigard on Wednesday, March 19, at Tigard Town Hall. Twenty-one (21) attendees signed in. The information shared and the workshop format was the same as in Portland: a short presentation followed by small group discussion and input collection.

The third and final Southwest Corridor Design Workshop took place in Tualatin on Thursday, March 20, at the Tualatin Police Department. Fifteen (15) attendees signed in. The information shared and the workshop format was the same as in Portland and Tigard: a short presentation followed by small group discussion and input collection.

Additionally, the ID Southwest meeting at the Multnomah Arts Center in Southwest Portland included Corridor Design Workshop activities including a short presentation and small group discussion and input collection. Of the eighteen (18) members who attended, four (4) comment cards from public members were returned.

Summary of results

The following summary describes ranges of public support for each of eleven (11) corridor segments in terms of options liked and disliked.

Options 1a through 1i: Tie-in to existing transit

There was great variation between likes and dislikes among the eight (8) options in this segment, and the margins between the two choices were narrow. Option 1b (SW 4th Avenue) was the most liked and had the widest margin over the dislikes.

Options 2a through 2d: South Portland to Burlingame

The medium tunnel option (2b) generated both the most likes and dislikes, although the likes more than doubled the dislikes. Option 2d (Hillsdale via Barbur) generated the second largest number of likes, and the third largest number of dislikes, but the margin between both positions was low. Option 2c (Barbur) was also liked, but it had a narrowest margin between likes and dislikes. Option 2d (Hillsdale via Barbur) received the second largest number of likes, with few dislikes.

Options 3a through 3c: Burlingame to Barbur Transit Center

The long tunnel option (3a) generated the most likes, dislikes, suggestions and questions. The margin between likes and dislikes was wide, with the likes being almost three times the amount of the dislikes. Option 3b (Barbur) generated the second largest number of likes, dislikes and suggestions, but the margin between likes and dislikes was narrow. Option 3c (Adjacent to I-5) generated the lowest number of likes and dislikes, but more people disliked it than liked it, with a narrow margin.

The favorable responses to Option 3a (Long tunnel – exit at Barbur Transit Center) are consistent with the responses to the question of whether it should be removed from further study: a significant majority of respondents asked for this option to continue to be studied. Based on this input, staff withdrew the proposal to remove Option 3a at this point in the study.

Options 4a through 4e: PCC area – BRT options only

Options 4a (Circumferential around North End) and 4d (New bridge) generated the same amount of likes and dislikes, with a wide margin in favor of the likes. Option 4b (Front door) generated a lower number of likes, but its margin in favor of the likes was also wide. Options 4c (Circumferential around South End) and 4e (Haines bridge) generated more dislikes than likes, both with low margins. This input is consistent with the recommendation of removing option 4c (Circumferential around South End) from further consideration.

Options 5a through 5d: PCC area – BRT/LRT options

Option 5d (Tunnel via Capitol Highway) received the largest number of likes, the second largest number of dislikes and tied for the most suggestions. The margin of likes over dislikes was large for option 5d. Option 5c (Tunnel via Barbur) received the second largest number of likes and no dislikes, but its number of likes was slightly less than the option 5d margin. Option 5a (Barbur) received the third largest number of likes and the most dislikes, and the margin of likes over dislikes was narrow.

Options 6a through 6c: Tigard Triangle

Option 6a (68th/70th Avenues couplet) received the largest number of likes and the second largest number of dislikes, with a one-vote margin in favor of the likes. Option 6b (68th/69th Avenues couplet) was tied in number of likes and dislikes. Option 6c (68th Avenue two-way) did not receive any likes or dislikes on its own. The combined options 6a through 6c received more dislikes than likes, but with a narrow margin. Option 6a received the most suggestions.

Options 7a through 7f: OR-217 crossing

Option 7b (Beveland North) received the most likes by a wide margin, and only one dislike. It also received the most suggestions and the only questions. Option 7a (Clinton to Tigard Transit Center)

received the second largest number of likes and the most dislikes, but the margin in favor of the likes was wide. Option 7c (Beveland South) received the third largest number of likes and no dislikes, and one suggestion.

Options 8a through 8c: Downtown Tigard

Option 8c (Wall to WES alignment) received two likes, one dislike and two question. Option 8a (Hunziker) received two dislikes, one question and two questions. Options 8 combined received the most suggestions. Option 8b (Commercial) received no likes, dislikes, suggestions or questions.

Options 9a through 9g: Tigard to Durham

Option 9d (WES alignment to 85th) received the most likes and no dislikes, suggestions or questions. Option 9b (WES to Tech Drive to I-5) received the second largest of likes and one dislike, but it had a narrow margin. Option 9c (WES alignment to 72nd) and combined options 9e (Hall to Bonita to 74th) through 9g (Hall to 85th) received the third largest number of likes and no dislikes. Option 9f (Hall to Durham) received the third largest of likes (two) and one dislike, with a narrow margin. Option 9g (Hall to 85th) received no stand-alone likes, dislikes, suggestions or questions.

Options 10a through 10d: Bridgeport Village

Option 10c (72nd Avenue) received the most likes and one suggestion. Option 10d (Parallel to I-5) received the second largest number of likes and one suggestion. Options 10 in general received the third largest number of likes and one suggestion. No responses were entered for options 10a (Upper Boones Ferry Road) and 10b (Bridgeport Road via 72nd).

Options 11a through 11e: Tualatin

Both options 11c (Out & back via Boones Ferry) and 11d (Adjacent to I-5 & behind Nyberg Rivers) received the most likes, and no dislikes, suggestions or questions. Option 11b (WES connection via Boones Ferry) received the same number of likes and dislikes, and one suggestion. Option 11e (Mohawk park & ride) received one like and no dislikes, suggestions or questions. Options 11 in general received one suggestion. Option 11a (WES connection via 85th) received two dislikes only.

The most significant items among the data collected are:

- Only three options originally proposed for early removal received more than 10 comments each from the public: option 3a (Long tunnel – exit at Barbur Transit Center; 61 comments); option 1i (South Waterfront – long structure; 19 comments); and option 4c (Circumferential around South End of PCC Sylvania; 10 comments)
- Public comment on each of the other 12 options proposed for early removal ranged from six comments to none
- Three options originally proposed for early removal received more likes than dislikes in the public comment: options 9d (WES alignment to 85th Avenue; four likes and one dislike; 11d (Adjacent to I-5 & behind Nyberg Rivers; three likes and one dislike); and 11e (Mohawk Park & Ride; one like and no dislikes). Given the low number of comments in support of these options, they were included in the recommendation to remove from further study

- Option 3a (Long tunnel – exit at Barbur Transit Center) received strong support in the public input collected: 42 likes and 19 dislikes. Option 3a was originally proposed for removal from further consideration, but based on public input staff withdrew that recommendation and the option continued to be studied
- There is no clear preference in the public input received for how an HCT project should tie in to existing transit in downtown Portland

Title VI overview

The total number of members of the public who attended the corridor design workshops and registered their presence in the official sign-in sheets was eighty (80): forty-four (44) in Portland, twenty-one (21) in Tigard, and fifteen (15) in Tualatin.

Staff asked the attendees to voluntarily fill out demographic information cards and event evaluation cards. Thirty-one (31) people returned the demographic information cards (19 in Portland, 6 in Tigard and 6 in Tualatin), and twenty-nine (29) people returned event evaluation cards (17 in Portland, 7 in Tigard and 5 in Tualatin).

Overall, the majority of attendees who filled out voluntary demographic reporting cards were 51 years of age and older, male, white, and had high levels of formal education (four years of college or post-graduate studies or degrees). Please refer to Appendix B for the detailed demographic report.

In terms of their opinions about the events, the majority of attendees indicated that they felt that the workshops were “worthwhile” (21) and “somewhat worthwhile” (6). The majority also marked that they “strongly agreed” (13) and “somewhat agreed” (12) with the statement: “I felt the meeting encouraged my input and I felt listened to.” Please refer to Appendix C for the detailed event evaluation report.

Input collection and analysis

The main tool used to collect input from the public at the corridor design workshops was a comment card that asked four questions:

1. What design options do you like and why?
2. Which design options do you think might provide significant advantages and disadvantages and why?
3. Do you agree with the proposal to remove the flagged design options? Why/why not?
4. Are there other design options that we should consider? If so, what are the advantages and disadvantages for those options?

A total of sixty-nine (69) comment cards were collected at the workshops (out of 80 people who signed in): forty-one (41) in Portland, twenty (20) in Tigard and eight (8) in Tualatin. Additionally there were four (4) comment cards submitted from the ID Southwest meeting and four (4) additional comments on the corridor design options submitted via email for a total of seventy-seven (77) comments. Staff at each small group discussion table also took notes on comments made verbally by members of the public. The notes are also analyzed in the final public comment report.

Analysis of the input collected consists of:

- a. Coding each comment according to the specific design option(s) that it refers to
- b. Grouping all coded comments by each design option
- c. Interpreting the content and meaning of the comments
- d. Examining the entire set of comments by design option groups to determine how the majority of participants responded

Please refer to Appendix A for the detailed responses to the four questions compiled from the comment cards, emails and discussion notes.

Overview of input about the proposed removal of 15 corridor design options

At the corridor design workshops, staff presented to and discussed with the public the fifteen (15) transit design options flagged for removal, based on the opportunities and constraints analysis conducted using design criteria only. At the small table discussions and in the comment cards submitted, the public had the opportunity to provide input by answering the question: “Do you agree with the proposal to remove the flagged design options? Why/why not?”

The analysis of responses to this question indicates there is public support for removing the majority of the fifteen (15) transit design options recommended, with two exceptions:

1. Option 3a – Long light rail tunnel from Hillsdale to the Barbur Transit Center, via Multnomah Village. This long tunnel option received the largest number of comments: fifteen (15). Eight (8) of those comments agreed with the recommendation to remove this option from further consideration, and seven (7) disagreed. The following is a sample of the comments in agreement and disagreement with the removal recommendation:
 - “Yes [agree to remove] – we want to minimize construction cost/ time/ complexity. For “long tunnel” connecting Hillsdale to Multnomah, I am not sure who it would really benefit. Connecting Barbur residents and businesses to downtown and Eastside seems a much higher priority. Increased bus service from Multnomah [Village] to Barbur should meet Multnomah resident needs –don’t think it’s a high growth or redevelopment area in planning docs?”
 - “Don’t remove long tunnel option, it’s a very imp[ortant] [a]lternative to I-5 and Barbur. Let’s take some traffic off those two so they can flow more smoothly.”
 - “Remove it. It misses key nodes at Terwilliger Fred Meyer, Safeway, and Barbur Transit Center.”
 - “Keep Burlingame to Barbur option A. [It] can reduce traffic issues on Barbur, serves establish[ed] neighborhoods of people who value walkability.”

Based on the closely split public input received, staff is withdrawing the recommendation to remove the long tunnel design option from further consideration at this point.

2. Option 11a – WES alignment to 85th Avenue. Only one person commented on this option and disagreed with the recommendation to remove it from further consideration.

Analysis of the input on the other options flagged for removal shows the following:

- A. The transit design option that received the second largest number of comments (13) was Option 1i – South Waterfront long structure. Out of 13 comments, 11 agreed with the removal recommendation and two disagreed.
- B. The transit design option that received the third largest number of comments (5) was Option 4c – Circumferential around the south end of the PCC Sylvania campus. Five (5) comments agreed with the removal recommendation and none disagreed.
- C. The public submitted comments on seven (7) other transit design options, but in smaller numbers: two (2) or one (1) comments per option. All these comments agreed with the recommendation to remove the following options from further consideration:

Option 7e: Parallel to 72nd	
Agree	2
Disagree	0
Option 7f: Irving to Hunziker	
Agree	2
Disagree	0
Option 9a: 72nd Ave.	
Agree	1
Disagree	0
Option 9d: WES alignment to 85th	
Agree	1

Disagree	0
Option 9e: Hall to Bonita	
Agree	2
Disagree	0
Option 9g: Hall to 85th	
Agree	1
Disagree	0
Option 11d: Adjacent to I-5 behind Nyberg Rivers	
Agree	1
Disagree	0

- D. The public did not submit any comments on four (4) transit design options in the Southwest corridor:
- Option 1a: 4th and 5th Ave. couplet
 - Option 8a: Hunziker
 - Option 10b: Bridgeport Rd. via 72nd Ave.
 - Option 11e: Mohawk Park & Ride
- E. Finally, seven (7) additional comments from the public, captured in the comment cards, referred to all the transit design options in the corridor. Five (5) of those comments agreed with the recommendation of removing all the 15 options. One (1) comment disagreed with

removing all the options, and another indicated that the commentator “neither agreed nor disagreed.”

Overview of input on the eleven (11) groups of transit design options

For the purposes of presenting to and discussing the transit design options with the public, Southwest Corridor Plan staff divided the options in eleven (11) segments that correspond to the following geographic areas and modes:

1. Options 1a through 1i: Tie-in to existing traffic
2. Options 2a through 2d: South Portland to Burlingame
3. Options 3a through 3c: Burlingame to Barbur Transit Center
4. Options 4a through 4e: PCC area – BRT options only
5. Options 5a through 5d: PCC area – BRT/LRT options
6. Options 6a through 6c: Tigard triangle
7. Options 7a through 7f: OR-217 crossing
8. Options 8a through 8c: Downtown Tigard
9. Options 9a through 9d: Tigard to Durham
10. Options 10a through 10d: Bridgeport Village
11. Options 11a through 11e: Tualatin

The responses to questions 1 (What design options do you like and why?), 2 (Which design options do you think might provide significant advantages and disadvantages and why?) and 4 (Are there other design options that we should consider? If so, what are the advantages and disadvantages for those options?), submitted by the public, were read, coded and grouped according to these segments. The responses were then analyzed based on the following criteria: if they liked an option, disliked an option, made suggestions on an option, and/or had questions about an option. Based on the content, some responses were assigned to more than one criterion.

The following summary of input provided on the transit design options per segment presents this analysis and includes representative comments in each of those four (4) criteria. Responses to question 3 (Do you agree with the proposal to remove the flagged design options? Why/why not?) are presented in the section immediately before this one):

1. Options 1a through 1i: Tie-in to existing transit:

This group of options received a total of 46 comments, which fall in these categories:

Option	Like	Dislike	Suggestions	Questions
1a	2	4	4	1
1b	6	1	3	1
1c	1	3	1	-
1d	3	-	-	-
1e	1	-	1	-
1f	2	-	-	3
1g	-	1	-	2
1h	4	1	1	2
1i	4	2	1	1
1a-g	-	-	2	1
1 d-g	1	1	1	1
1 a-d	1	-	-	-
Total	24	13	14	12

The top three options that responders liked were:

- First: option 1b (SW 4th Avenue)
- Second: tie between options 1h (South Waterfront – short tunnel) and 1i (South Waterfront – long)
- Third: option 1d (SW 1st Avenue)

Responders disliked the following options the most:

- First: option 1a (SW 4th and 5th Avenues couplet)
- Second: option 1c (SW 4th Avenue to 2nd Avenue)
- Third: option 1i (South Waterfront, long).

Responders had the most suggestions about:

- First: option 1a (SW 4th and 5th Avenues couplet)
- Second: option 1b (SW 4th Avenue).

Option 1f (SW Naito Parkway) generated three (3) questions. Options 1g (Extended SW Naito Parkway to Steel Bridge) and 1h (South Waterfront – short tunnel) generated two (2) questions each.

There was great variation between likes and dislikes among the eight (8) options in this segment, and the margins between the two choices were narrow. Option 1b (SW 4th Avenue) was the most liked and had the widest margin over the dislikes. Options 1h (South Waterfront – short tunnel) and 1i (South Waterfront – long) were the second most liked ones, but their margins over the dislikes

were narrow. Option 1d (SW 1st Avenue) was the third most liked option, and it did not receive any dislikes. Some of the representative comments entered for options in this segment include:

- Option [1]A along Caruthers: Support for taking this option off the table – re: trucks, also the exit at 405 is a huge bottleneck, and part of the reason for backup up 26th all the way to Terwilliger. Even taking out one lane for a rapid bus is a terrible idea. Agree. Would also require reconstruction as W and E bound lanes are not at same height.
- Use Naito rather than Barbur out of downtown. ROW along Barbur is too narrow for dedicated LRT or BRT without being destructive to the surrounding neighborhood. [Options 1a – 1g]
- Makes sense to remove [1]I – out of the way, lots of structure.
- I think ignoring Macadam is an oversight. [Options 1h, 1i]
- Naito/1st also congested in PM. Why not use 10th? Project is a bust if you don't serve OHSU. [Options 1d – 1g]

2. Options 2a through 2d: South Portland to Burlingame:

This group of options received a total of 90 comments, which fall in these categories:

Option	Like	Dislike	Suggestions	Questions
2a	10	6	4	3
2b	25	11	4	3
2c	9	7	7	4
2d	11	3	2	-
2a-c	2	-	-	-
2	-	-	1	1
Total	57	27	18	11

The top three options that responders liked were:

- First: option 2b (Medium tunnel – exit at Bertha)
- Second: option 2d (Hillsdale via Barbur)
- Third: option 2a (Short tunnel – exit at Hamilton).

Responders disliked the following options the most:

- First: option 2b (Medium tunnel – exit at Bertha)
- Second: option 2c (Barbur)
- Third: option 2a (Short tunnel – exit at Hamilton).

Responders had the most suggestions about:

- First: option 2c (Barbur)

- Second: tie between options 2a (Short tunnel – exit at Hamilton) and 2b (Medium tunnel – exit at Bertha).

Option 2c (Barbur) generated four (4) questions.

Options 2a (Short tunnel – exit at Hamilton) and 2b (Medium tunnel – exit at Bertha) generated three (3) questions each.

The medium tunnel option (2b) generated both the most likes and dislikes, although the likes more than doubled the dislikes. Option 2d (Hillsdale via Barbur) generated the second largest number of likes, and the third largest number of dislikes, but the margin between both positions was low.

Option 2c (Barbur) was also liked, but it had a narrowest margin between likes and dislikes. Option 2d (Hillsdale via Barbur) received the second largest number of likes, with few dislikes. Some of the representative comments entered for options in this segment include:

- Tunnel to OHSU-Hillsdale-Barbur Blvd. Close Terwilliger to autos. Encourage development at Barbur/ Terwilliger. Buy land to avoid gentrification of rentals off Barbur. [Option 2b]
- Tunnel will be good for OHSU users, but not for the rest of us, especially if good bus service on Barbur is reduced too much. [Options 2a and 2b]
- Combo of [2]C and [2]D seems to be the best.
- Is a tunnel feasible? Geologically? [Options 2a and 2b]
- You need to provide access to Hillsdale and Multnomah by skirting near them, not destroying them by trying to get right into their centers. [Options 2b and 2d]
- Tunnels present policy questions. Trade-off for development. [Options 2a and 2b]

3. Options 3a through 3c: Burlingame to Barbur Transit Center:

This group of options received a total of 84 comments, which fall in these categories:

Options	Like	Dislike	Suggestions	Questions
3a	34	12	4	8
3b	10	8	4	-
3c	1	3	2	4
Total	45	23	10	12

The ranking of the three options that responders liked the most, in descending order of preference, was:

- First: option 3a (Long tunnel – exit at Barbur Transit Center)
- Second: option 3b (Barbur)
- Third: option 3c (Adjacent to I-5).

The ranking of the three options that responders disliked the most, in descending order of dislike, was:

- First: option 3a (Long tunnel – exit at Barbur Transit Center)
- Second: option 3b (Barbur)
- Third: option 3c (Adjacent to I-5).

Responders had the most suggestions about:

- First: tie between options 3a (Long tunnel – exit at Barbur Transit Center) and 3b (Barbur)
- Second: option 3c (Adjacent to I-5).

Option 3a (Long tunnel – exit at Barbur Transit Center) and 3b (Barbur) generated eight (8) questions.

Option 3c (Adjacent to I-5) generated four (4) questions.

The long tunnel option (3a) generated the most likes, dislikes, suggestions and questions. The margin between likes and dislikes was wide, with the likes being almost three times the amount of the dislikes. Option 3b (Barbur) generated the second largest number of likes, dislikes and suggestions, but the margin between likes and dislikes was narrow. Option 3c (Adjacent to I-5) generated the lowest number of likes and dislikes, but more people disliked it than liked it, with a narrow margin.

The favorable responses to Option 3a (Long tunnel – exit at Barbur Transit Center) are consistent with the responses to the question of whether it should be removed from further study: a significant majority of respondents asked for this option to continue to be studied. Based on this input, staff withdrew the proposal to remove Option 3a at this point in the study.

Some of the representative comments entered for options in this segment include:

- The tunnel(s) is (are) less disruptive, serve Hillsdale and Multnomah Village, offer better travel time, and might be cheaper. [Option 3a]
- Tunnel -too expensive. Not needed by the SW Corridor. Too risky. No new bridge (per Tualatin citizens of TSP). \$ from Portland; they've been told the cannot afford more debt. [Option 3a]
- Stay on Barbur where higher apts/ bldgs can be built -do not lose any lanes for cars. Move to narrow not eliminate lanes. Just no diet lanes on Barbur. [Option 3b]
- Any light rail or bus rapid transit dedication on Barbur Blvd. Surface is unacceptable. These two concepts take up lanes of traffic whether the train or bus are there or not. It takes up too much available traffic area. Regular bus would better serve Barbur. [Option 3b]
- Starting in the Burlingame Fred Meyer area and heading west/south...I believe the Barbur light rail or BRT is appropriate within the Barbur R/W. I drove this area - including on the freeway - to view/consider possible corridors. Although it initially seemed that the land between Barbur and I-5 would be ideal for a corridor, I had to dismiss that concept because of the freeway interchanges (exits/entrances) at Terwilliger, Multnomah Blvd. and Barbur Blvd. The existing ramps / bridges seemed to provide overwhelming obstacles. [Option 3c]

4. Options 4a through 4e: PCC area – BRT options only:

This group of options received a total of 35 comments, which fall in these categories:

Options	Like	Dislike	Suggestions	Questions
4a	10	1	-	-
4b	6	1	-	-
4c	1	4	-	-
4d	10	1	-	-
4e	2	4	-	-
4a-c	1	1	-	-
4a-e	1	-	-	-
4	3	1	1	-
Total	34	13	1	-

The top three options that responders liked were:

- First: tie between options 4a (Circumferential around North End) and 4d (New bridge)
- Second: option 4b (Front door)
- Third: option 4e (Haines bridge).

Responders disliked the following options the most:

- First: tie between options 4c (Circumferential around South End) and 4e (Haines bridge)
- Second: tie between the remaining options 4a (Circumferential around North End), 4b (Front door) and 4d (New bridge).

Responders entered only one suggestion for the entire set of options 4.

Responders entered no questions about the entire set of options 4.

Options 4a (Circumferential around North End) and 4d (New bridge) generated the same amount of likes and dislikes, with a wide margin in favor of the likes. Option 4b (Front door) generated a lower number of likes, but its margin in favor of the likes was also wide. Options 4c (Circumferential around South End) and 4e (Haines bridge) generated more dislikes than likes, both with low margins. This input is consistent with the recommendation of removing option 4c (Circumferential around South End) from further consideration.

Some of the representative comments entered for options in this segment include:

- [4]A (N side of PCC) and [4]D (New bridge to Tigard Triangle) I like these because they do not disrupt neighborhood.
- PCC area. Any option that provides access to "Heart of PCC" or "front door". Provides high visibility of transit to young people. Provide incentive to ride transit over driving. [Option 4b]
- Good to remove alignment [option 4]C in PCC Area.
- Avoid lesser-Haines intersection it does not serve. Improve ped-bike along Haines but no more transit. [Option 4e]

- BRT/ LRT: Avoid 99 W interchange. [All options 4]

5. Options 5a through 5d: PCC area – BRT/LRT options:

This group of options received a total of 50 comments, which fall in these categories:

Options	Like	Dislike	Suggestions	Questions
5a	9	6	1	-
5b	6	1	1	-
5c	12		-	-
5d	16	3	2	-
5b-d	2	1	-	-
5	2		2	-
Total	47	11	6	-

The top three options that responders liked were:

- First: option 5d (Tunnel via Capitol Highway)
- Second: option 5c (Tunnel via Barbur)
- Third: option 5a (Barbur).

Responders disliked the following options the most:

- First: option 5a (Barbur)
- Second: option 5d (Tunnel via Capitol Highway)
- Third: tie between options 5b (Short tunnel via Barbur) and the combined options 5b through 5d.

Responders had the most suggestions about:

- First: option 5d (Tunnel via Capitol Highway)
- Second: tie between options 5a (Barbur) and 5b (Short tunnel via Barbur).

Responders entered no questions for the entire set of options 5.

Option 5d (Tunnel via Capitol Highway) received the largest number of likes, the second largest number of dislikes and tied for the most suggestions. The margin of likes over dislikes was large for option 5d. Option 5c (Tunnel via Barbur) received the second largest number of likes and no dislikes, but its number of likes was slightly less than the option 5d margin. Option 5a (Barbur) received the third largest number of likes and the most dislikes, and the margin of likes over dislikes was narrow.

Some of the representative comments entered for options in this segment include:

- Good travel time, excellent PCC access. [Option 5d]

- I personally don't see an advantage for having a stop on Capitol Hwy - which is apparently only possible in option D - but then, at the expense of a possible station at 53rd or 55th. The negative impact of congestion, visual and noise pollution along this residential street (Capitol Hwy.) overwhelm the minor benefits. If one considers a radius of pedestrians served by a stop, then the alternative routes would provide better, equal or at least nearly equal opportunity while vehicular opportunities (Park-and-Ride) would certainly be greater with option "B". [Option 5d]
- OR BRT/LRT to PCC --> C seems to be best option to campus + beyond. A is too problematic to traffic on Barbur. [Options 5a and 5c]
- Concern about security if new paths from transit through neighborhoods. [Option 5a]
- Options 6a through 6c: Tigard triangle

6. Options 6a through 6c: Tigard Triangle:

This group of options received a total of 11 comments, which fall in these categories:

Options	Like	Dislike	Suggestions	Questions
6a	3	2	2	-
6b	2	2	1	-
6c	-	-	-	-
6a-c	1	3	1	-
Total	6	7	4	-

The top three options that responders liked were:

- First: option 6a (68th/70th Avenues couplet)
- Second: option 6b (68th/69th Avenues couplet)
- Third: combined options 6a through 6c (68th Avenue two-way).

Responders disliked the following options the most:

- First: combined options 6a through 6c
- Second: tie between options 6a (68th/70th Avenues couplet) and 6b (68th/69th Avenues couplet).

Responders had the most suggestions about:

- First: option 6a (68th/70th Avenues couplet)
- Second: tie between options 6b (68th/69th Avenues couplet) and combined options 6a through 6c.

Responders entered no questions for the entire set of options 6.

Option 6a (68th/70th Avenues couplet) received the largest number of likes and the second largest number of dislikes, with a one-vote margin in favor of the likes. Option 6b (68th/69th Avenues

couplet) was tied in number of likes and dislikes. Option 6c (68th Avenue two-way) did not receive any likes or dislikes on its own. The combined options 6a through 6c received more dislikes than likes, but with a narrow margin. Option 6a received the most suggestions.

Some of the representative comments entered for options in this segment include:

- The idea of having couplets is better than one wide road. [Options 6a and 6b]
- Couplets increase cost. [Options 6a and 6b]
- Make sure Tigard Triangle is served [Options 6a through 6c]
- What about 2-way on 69th? [Options 6a through 6c]
- Concern about expanding 68th – becomes a cut-through. [Options 6a through 6c]

7. Options 7a through 7f: OR-217 crossing

This group of options received a total of 31 comments, which fall in these categories:

Options	Like	Dislike	Suggestions	Questions
7a	8	3	1	-
7b	9	1	3	2
7c	7	-	1	-
7d	-	-	-	-
7	-	-	1	-
Total	24	6	6	2

The top three options that responders liked were:

- First: option 7b (Beveland North)
- Second: option 7a (Clinton to Tigard Transit Center)
- Third: option 7c (Beveland South).

Responders disliked the following options the most:

- First: option 7a (Clinton to Tigard Transit Center)
- Second: option 7b (Beveland North).

Responders had the most suggestions about:

- First: option 7b (Beveland North),
- Second: tie between options 7a (Clinton to Tigard Transit Center), 7c (Beveland South) and combined 7 options.

Option 7b (Beveland North) generated two questions.

Option 7b (Beveland North) received the most likes by a wide margin, and only one dislike. It also received the most suggestions and the only questions. Option 7a (Clinton to Tigard Transit Center) received the second largest number of likes and the most dislikes, but the margin in favor of the

likes was wide. Option 7c (Beveland South) received the third largest number of likes and no dislikes, and one suggestion.

Some of the representative comments entered for options in this segment include:

- I like option b -Beveland north because it seems like it impacts the least buildings and people. [Option 7b]
- Option "A" Clinton best because A most direct segment between downtown Tigard and other segments to. B passes through central area at Tigard Triangle and more surface parking at WinCo, providing opportunity for more convenient grocery shopping and urban redevelopment/ transit-oriented development. HCT along "A" Clinton would make more likely "third places" I can meet people at in this part of the SW Corridor, adding an option to Portland itself. [Option 7a]
- [Option 7]C. Beveland South seems to be most cost effective.
- Loss of industrial businesses – will go somewhere else b/c no industrial lands. [Option 7a]
- Are we locked into the existing T[ransit] C[enter] location? [Option 7b]

8. Options 8a through 8c: Downtown Tigard:

This group of options received a total of 11 comments, which fall in these categories:

Options	Like	Dislike	Suggestions	Questions
8a	-	2	1	2
8b	-	-	-	-
8c	2	1	-	2
8	-	-	2	-
Total	6	1	3	3

Responders only liked option 8c (Wall to WES alignment).

Responders disliked these options the most:

- First: option 8a (Hunziker)
- Second: option 8c (Wall to WES alignment).

Responders had the most suggestions about:

- First: options 8 combined
- Second: option 8a (Hunziker).

Responders had the same number of questions about options 8c (Wall to WES alignment) and 8a (Hunziker).

Option 8c (Wall to WES alignment) received two likes, one dislike and two question. Option 8a (Hunziker) received two dislikes, one question and two questions. Options 8 combined received the most suggestions. Option 8b (Commercial) received no likes, dislikes, suggestions or questions.

Some of the representative comments entered for options in this segment include:

- Large expansion occurring w/ Roy Rogers/River Terrace. [Option 8c]
- C - "constraint:"doesn't serve library/municipal offices – but if it is a regional line, doesn't need to serve every little thing (local service could accomplish this). [Option 8c]
- Constraint for Hunziker: people use it as a back-up road for 99W when the latter gets too congested. [Option 8a]
- Downtown Tigard -Ped and bike improvements on Hall are paramount regardless of alignment. [Options 8 combined]
- Is it cheaper to go on new street NW of Ash? [Option 8a]

9. Options 9a through 9g: Tigard to Durham:

This group of options received a total of 19 comments, which fall in these categories:

Options	Like	Dislike	Suggestions	Questions
9a	1	1	-	1
9b	3	1	-	-
9c	2	-	-	-
9d	4	-	-	-
9e	1	-	-	-
9f	2	1	1	1
9g	-	-	-	-
9e-g	2	-	-	2
Total	15	3	1	4

The top three options that responders liked were:

- First: option 9d (WES alignment to 85th)
- Second: option 9b (WES to Tech Drive to I-5)
- Third: tie between options 9c (WES alignment to 72nd), 9f (Hall to Durham), and combined options 9e (Hall to Bonita to 74th) through 9g (Hall to 85th).

Responders entered one dislike each for options 9a (72nd Avenue), 9b (WES to Tech Drive to I-5), and 9f (Hall to Durham).

Responders entered one suggestion about option 9f (Hall to Durham).

Responders had the most questions about:

- First: combined options 9e (Hall to Bonita to 74th) through 9g (Hall to 85th)
- Second: tie between options 9a (72nd Avenue) and 9f (Hall to Durham).

Option 9d (WES alignment to 85th) received the most likes and no dislikes, suggestions or questions. Option 9b (WES to Tech Drive to I-5) received the second largest of likes and one dislike,

but it had a narrow margin. Option 9c (WES alignment to 72nd) and combined options 9e (Hall to Bonita to 74th) through 9g (Hall to 85th) received the third largest number of likes and no dislikes. Option 9f (Hall to Durham) received the third largest of likes (two) and one dislike, with a narrow margin. Option 9g (Hall to 85th) received no stand-alone likes, dislikes, suggestions or questions.

Some of the representative comments entered for options in this segment include:

- I urge retaining a "WES" connection via 85th for further study as a Tualatin resident, impacts to either Cook or Tualatin Community Park don't trouble me. Also, had disagreement with Tualatin's removal of bridge from its long range plans. [Option 9d]
- Opt[ion 9] b and [options 9]e/f allow enhancing.
- I prefer BRT over LRT because it's cheaper. I like transit going down Hall and Durham. A lot of Tigard High School students will use it. [Option 9f]
- I don't think 72nd Ave. would be good through residential area or commercial S/ o Bonita Rd. [Option 9a]
- Cost of HCT on Hall would be high. [Combined options 9e through 9g]

10. Options 10a through 10d: Bridgeport Village:

This group of options received a total of 9 comments, which fall in these categories:

Options	Like	Dislike	Suggestions	Questions
10a	-	-	-	-
10b	-	-	-	-
10c	5	-	1	-
10d	4	-	1	-
10	2	-	1	-
Total	11	-	3	-

The top three options that responders liked were:

- First: option 10c (72nd Avenue)
- Second: option 10d (Parallel to I-5)
- Third: options 10 in general.

Responders did not enter any dislikes for this segment.

Responders had one suggestion each for options 10c (72nd Avenue), 10d (Parallel to I-5), and options 10 in general.

Responders did not enter any questions for this segment.

Option 10c (72nd Avenue) received the most likes and one suggestion. Option 10d (Parallel to I-5) received the second largest number of likes and one suggestion. Options 10 in general received the

third largest number of likes and one suggestion. No responses were entered for options 10a (Upper Boones Ferry Road) and 10b (Bridgeport Road via 72nd).

Some of the representative comments entered for options in this segment include:

- Bridgeport Village option [10]C and/or [10]D and park and ride station circle because 1) potential for transit-oriented development 2) additional urban development/ redevelopment in vicinity of TOD 3) traffic calming in concert with TOD.
- Like elevated station at Bridgeport Village -make it safer for peds, trains and bicycles. [Options 10c and 10d]
- About Bridgeport Village options C and D, DON'T do flyover w/ elevated station. This would be fundamentally anti-urban, repel potential users of transit, and surrender the urban -or potentially urban realm to cars and auto "levels of service". Otherwise, I prefer C over D. I'd reconsider flyover/ developed station if the TriMet park and ride lots were redeveloped into transit-oriented developments (TODs) w/ public concourses at the same levels as the station. About potential station " circles/ ovals, I strongly support the one at the SW Boones Ferry and Lower Boones Ferry Roads and as close second, the TriMet park and ride lots circle. [Options 10c and 10d]
- High capacity transit needs to reach Bridgeport Village. [Options 10 in general]
-

11. Options 11a through 11e: Tualatin:

This group of options received a total of 14 comments, which fall in these categories:

Options	Like	Dislike	Suggestions	Questions
11a	-	2	-	-
11b	2	2	1	-
11c	3	-	-	-
11d	3	-	-	-
11e	1	-	-	-
11	-	-	1	-
Total	9	4	2	-

The top three options that responders liked were:

- First: tie between options 11c (Out & back via Boones Ferry) and 11d (Adjacent to I-5 & behind Nyberg Rivers)
- Second: option 11b (WES connection via Boones Ferry)
- Third: option 11e (Mohawk park & ride).

Responders entered two dislikes each for options 11a (WES connection via 85th) and 11b (WES connection via Boones Ferry).

Responders entered one suggestion each for options 11b (WES connection via Boones Ferry) and 11 in general.

Responders did not enter any questions for this segment.

Both options 11c (Out & back via Boones Ferry) and 11d (Adjacent to I-5 & behind Nyberg Rivers) received the most likes, and no dislikes, suggestions or questions. Option 11b (WES connection via Boones Ferry) received the same number of likes and dislikes, and one suggestion. Option 11e (Mohawk park & ride) received one like and no dislikes, suggestions or questions. Options 11 in general received one suggestion. Option 11a (WES connection via 85th) received two dislikes only.

Some of the representative comments entered for options in this segment include:

- [Option 11]C is better because: space available for storage there (at end). Could extend later. Walk to WES isn't that far. Not many transfer between WES and bus or LRT.
- Of options into downtown Tualatin, favorite is [11]D (least impacts).
- [Option 11]B – stations could serve both commercial and WES.
- [Option 11] B into downtown Tualatin won't work – not space for dedicated HCT lanes near library.
- Why doesn't B keep going south along Boones to provide S side service? take up less space for end of line in downtown (300' approximately). build "destination" retail or residential above line. [Option 11b]

Other comments: In addition to the comments indicating likes, dislikes, suggestions and questions about specific HCT design options, members of the public also entered 186 of comments that do not refer to the options. These comments were read and categorized by either geographic or subject areas. The following is a list of the categories in which these comments fall:

Other comment categories	
Barbur	3
Barbur concept plan	3
Benefits	3
Bridgeport	3
BRT	6
Bus service	16
Congestion	2
Connectivity	7
Cost	7
Disadvantages	7
Hamilton	2
Hillsdale	6
LRT	4
Multnomah	2
Naito	1
OHSU	4
Oppose the project	2

PCC	11
Questions	5
Road capacity	7
Safety	2
Suggestions on project	46
Tigard	6
Tualatin	6
Tunnels	9
Undetermined	16
Total	186

All these comments are available for review, marked as “other,” in Appendix A.

Appendices

- A. Complete data set of responses to Questions 1 through 4
- B. Corridor design workshops event evaluations and demographic information summary

Appendix A

Complete Data Set of Responses to Questions 1 through 4

Responses to Question 1

Portland CDW March 12	
What design options do you like and why?	
Segment	Comment
2a, 2b	Don't like tunnel -too expensive
2c	Like elevator on Barbur to OHSU
2c	Like option C if it maintains existing car lanes
2d	I support a tunnel -medium from downtown to Burlingame without a Hillsdale Station. Create a Capital Hill- Multnomah transfer station and run BRT/ regular bus from there. BUILD A FULL INTERCHANGE AT 25th AVE TO REPLACE the Spring Garden on ramp to Taylor Ferrys off ramp (make it a viaduct to connect to Spring Garden and provide access to upper Tuyon District at 30th.
2c	Short tunnel that enters immediately south of downtown and comes back to surface at Hamilton. Less disruption to neighborhood along Barbur. Longer tunnels do not serve.
1a-g	Use Naito rather than Barbur out of downtown. ROW along Barbur is too narrow for dedicated LRT or BRT without being destructive to the surrounding neighborhood.
1b	Aligns well with 4th Ave and can connect to existing light rail lines
1d	Good connection to light rail lines and existing light rail on First Ave.
1e	Good connection for BRT to Naito along river
1c	Prefer BRT options, but not opposed to LRT.
1b	Option b or c in the tie-in area.
2a	Short tunnel would be important to serve OHSU
2d	Option d into Hillsdale is absolutely critical. Hillsdale is a Town Center and is a key targeted growth area
1b	4th good for BRT and or train could connect. I support the option that links the Max, street cars, and current bus services that will link all modalities to new connections
1e	Extending LRT to Blue/ Red Line is a wonderful idea. For people who live in SW and work on the East side, it is currently hard with transfers to get bus downtown and then catch train sensibly. I mean it would be bad to take LRT/BRT downtown, then bus, then Blue/ Red Line. Distance of 1st to 4th/5th/6th is VERY walkable and should not be a barrier. Other concerns about Hawthorne Bridge, etc. I am not equipped to judge.
2	Need to serve both upper and lower OHSU
2c	Do not restrict traffic on Barbur
2a, 2b	Note that Veteran's Hospital has plans to double in size. Talk to the VA.
2b	Of the options, like the OHSU tunnel extended to Hillsdale best.

- 2b Do it right and build the medium tunnel. Costly but best, fastest serves Hillsdale the "heart" of SW Portland
- 1a, 1b Out of downtown a or b use 5th and 6th
- 2a, 2b Tunnel and elevator to OHSU (the double elevator, like the Tram, is limited) the tunnel/ LRT can expand capacity -even though it also has an elevator.
- 1a-g Barbur over Naito
- 1a Downtown stay more centered (4th/5th)
- 2b Tunnel and elevator to OHSU (the double elevator, like the Tram, is limited) the tunnel/ LRT can expand capacity -even though it also has an elevator.
- 2b Tunnel to OHSU-Hillsdale-Barbur Blvd. Close Terwilliger to autos. Encourage development at Barbur/ Terwilliger. Buy land to avoid gentrification of rentals off Barbur.
- 2a, 2b Tunnel will be good for OHSU users, but not for the rest of us, especially if good bus service on Barbur is reduced too much.
- Other Without estimates of cost and the time to complete it's not realistic to choose! Much prefer bus to light rail anywhere.
- 2b, 2d BRT: Barbur- Cap. Highway-Bertha through Hillsdale or second short tunnel to Hillsdale
- 2a-c The subway from downtown to OHSU, (or 2nd choice bus to OHSU via Barbur with elevators/ walkways to OHSU)
- 2b I think that a tunnel from downtown, through OHSU to Hillsdale and via Bertha to Barbur Blvd the out Barbur on surface. Bertha has a wide easement can be used.
- 2c Don't use Barbur from downtown to Terwilliger- bridge may not hold weight.
- Other Keep the #12 bus on Barbur Blvd.
- 2b Tunnel OHSU and HD w/o mort
- 2d BRT up Cap Hwy
- 2b Even though it would cost more, I am in favor of the long tunnel under OHSU through Hillsdale.
- 2a-c I like the OHSU tunnel option but I am also impressed with the Barbur option to elevator connection to OHSU. These both serve an important employer!
- 2b Like tunnel to Hillsdale- no congestion on the surface routes. Inner South neighborhoods already well connected.
- 2b Tunnel to OHSU and Hillsdale serves most important areas while avoiding the empty "woods" section and would not require bridge replacement and would not reduce capacity in the Naito to Hamilton St. section (and further south)
- 2a, 2b Direct/ efficient connection to Marquam Hill/ OHSU (tunnel) as it is a valid option for commuters. OHSU/ VA are adding more employees all the time, the VA is planning a new 300,000 sqft hospital in addition to existing... so need will only grow. Traffic in Homestead/ Lair Hill/ Fairmount is already horribly impacting neighborhood livability and needs to be addressed
- 2b Tunnel to OHSU from downtown, elevator surface, an OHSU to Hillsdale tunnel w/station/ elevator at Town Center, tunnel to Barbur via Bertha and a surface station. Develop Park n Ride in Hillsdale within 1/4 mile of Town Center. Construct sidewalk, Red Electric and other trails, and bike lanes to effect access to the station
- 5d First priority option d on BRT/LRT map
- 4a, 4d Second priority option a and d on BRT only map.
- 5d These serve PCC also Lesser Road which is very narrow and highly trafficed already. First priority has fewer sharp bends will facilitate fast travel. Option D has a deep tunnel -least disruptive engineering constraints.
- 4a, 4d A (N side of PCC) and D (New bridge to Tigard Triangle) I like these because they do not disrupt neighborhood
- 3a LRT long tunnel
- 3a Long tunnel (move people fast and forget about trendy little stops on Barbur)
- 3b, 3a Keep long tunnel!! Gets us to our villages w/out making traffic worse on Barbur. We should do nothing that impacts traffic negatively on Barbur.

- Other Circulator busses w/ light rail seems to be a very practical option in many situations
- 3a Burlingame to Tigard. Long tunnel would service those existing villages
- 3b, 3a Barbur would help develop the historic Barbur area
- 5b PCC Area. LRT option B seems most reasonable. It gives access to PCC with a direct route and less tunnels.
- 5d Option D is also good because it serves 49th street
- 3a Gurlingame to Barbur. Less disruptive to Barbur, enhances walkability of neighborhoods
- 3b Stops would revitalize over time, but somewhat speculative. I like revitalizing Barbur neighborhoods
- 5c Front door to college = safety, convenience, more riders, good combination of cost and PCC access
- 5d Good travel time, excellent PCC access.
- 5c, 5d Lots of neighborhood access for either
- 3a A long tunnel. The corridor concept plan is a construct that can be supplanted with a better idea, a tunnel. The true history of Barbur is a strip Hwy like Rt 66 it is functioning well under that historic model.
- 3b Barbur is an escape if or when I-5 is colsed not putting LRT on Barbur could insure that no traffic lanes are removed from Barbur.
- 3a The more limited stations on the tunnel it could be a win for getting better sw circulation busses that would funnel riders to the LRT transit stations
- 3a Gets you around Terwilliger bottleneck
- 3b, 3c Alignment has only 2 potential villages Burlingame and Crossroads. Cross Roads best option and better fit for option a.
- 5b, 5c Best service for PCC
- 3a The tunnel under Multnomah Village is probably the least obstructive to available traffic possibility.
- 2b Portland to hillsdale tunnel makes sense to avoid further crowding of Barbur.
- 4b, 5b-d PCC area. Any option that provides access to "Heart of PCC" or "front door". Provides high visibility of transit to young people. Provide incentive to ride transit over driving
- 3a If capacity can not be added to Barbur.
- 3b Only if there is a net add of capacity. If a lane is taken from Barbur this is NOT an acceptable option.
- Other BRT and LRT on Barbur and Capitol only work as net new lanes, do not remove lanes for these new transportation ideas
- 3b Stay on Barbur where higher apts/ bldgs can be built -do not lose any lanes for cars. Move to narrow not eliminate lanes. Just no diet lanes on Barbur.
- 3a There needs to be a tunnel for light rail from downtown Portland to Tigard -this is all that is needed- Tigard-Tualatin can do what they want from there.
- Other Keep Barbur concept plan integrated in the SW Corridor work.
- Additional notes taken at workshop and submitted electronically**
- Other Duane – Hillsdale, one of few areas with all the sidewalks, vice chair of Hillsdale NA. Eric from Homestead – huge opportunity as our neighborhood is getting destroyed by car traffic – we want a direct connection instead of cutting through the neighborhood.
- Other Portland N table: green design options, with opportunities and constraints attached to each option. Dunway park: Three tunnel options: Q: To get to OHSU, why not connect to existing LRT line by building a line directly West towards the river? Could also connect at Lincoln?
- 1a Option A along Caruthers: Support for taking this option off the table – re: trucks, also the exit at 405 is a huge bottleneck, and part of the reason for backup up 26th all the way to Terwilliger. Even taking out one lane for a rapid bus is a terrible idea. Agree. Would also require reconstruction as W and E bound lanes are not at same height.
- 1c Option C SW4th to SW 2nd: Tried to avoid intersections along Option B.

- 1d Option D on SW 1st Ave : would join existing tracks at Morrison (central city plan is expecting more development along the waterfront)
- 1h Option H South Waterfront: Combination “then you aren’t really serving the lower OHSU? Can H start a little bit lower/ mix and match best of options btwn H and I?”
- 1b “From what you are saying, it sounds like Option B is least disruptive and expensive.”
- 1c “ I particularly don’t like C – might cause a lot of disruption for very little benefit”
- Other “Where did the 50% come from for BRT: In Hillsdale is an example of where not having exclusive right of way makes sense.”
- Other “A connection for Barbur and Naito to OHSU would require a walkway: Attendee: That won’t work for me” Staff: could be served by an elevator or a tunnel. Staff: could be served by an elevator or a tunnel.
- Other Nods all around when Matt mentioned that Naito feels largely like a highway, not like a street.
- Other “Are they interested in changing the character? By putting this through, aren’t you reinforcing the split? The devil will be in the details – if there are more crossings and things are slow, signals on both sides, station right there with half block on either side it’s less of a barrier. If designed differently, it can be more of a barrier.” Staff: Yes, if on Naito, we would make it more accessible to the community.
- 2d Option D: Not looking good for LRT – would have to build out to a certain width, wiping out businesses.
- 2d “I strongly BRT on Option D: If you look at the maps from earlier, Hillsdale is a key targeted are fro growth, logical town center. Barbur is a commercial desert, and you’re bypassing a key center that’s already there in all the LU planning. The trade-off though is travel time, especially for outlying people. (better for folks in Hillsdale). So is the driving force to get people into town from Hillsdale, or to get people off I5?”
- Other Shuttle busses on Barbur?: what I have found is it’s impossible to catch up to a train if the busses are more than 10-15 min apart. A: Local service would be adjusted
- 2c, 2d “Combo of C and D seems to be the best”
- 2b “I do not like B: long distance with no getting on or off – not providing ideal service” (agreement among table)
- 2b “Maybe B could be 40 years down the line... but at the moment other options are much more feasible and serves the development that exists”
- 3a, 3b “We don’t need LRT or BRT right through Multnomah Village – right along Barbur, with connections btwn the two, is more useful. “
- Other “OHSU is critical to serve *somehow* – what is most effective?”
- 3a Don’t take the long tunnel option off the table until the traffic impacts of the Barbur alignment options are full evaluated and shared. Reducing lanes on Barbur is not viable.
- 2a, 2b, 3a Why are we even considering anything other than a tunnel given how large a current and future employer OHSU is (and how limited parking is up there)?
- 2c Concern about diversion of traffic onto side streets if Barbur is narrowed between Naito and Hamilton.
- 3a Long tunnel – leave it on the table. HCT is transit first. Shouldn’t be trying to do everything (ie. local LU and stops) with this alignment.
- 2b, 2d A Hillsdale station could be a critical juncture in that it could serve as a bus to rail transfer station for a number of bus lines. These lines could then more efficiently serve area without having to go downtown. Hillsdale tunnel station also preserves TC character and structure
- 3a A Barbur surface alignment would destroy/cause necessary rebuilding of much land use and development on the corridor. Wouldn’t land uses be better served by HCT in a tunnel and then having enhanced/larger capacity buses serving Barbur? - Use Robertson tunnel cost comparisons for current tunnel options. SW Corridor HCT could be phased if necessary.

3b Concern about LU redevelopment arguments for Barbur at the expense of an efficient regional transit line. Buses on Barbur could serve nodes just as well. - LU vision is a streetcar thing vs. a regional consideration. Transit is what is needed to take care of the regional congestion on I-5.

Flip chart notes

1a A – Good to remove for LRT and BRT. Traffic backs up.
1h, 1i H – Will it serve OHSU? (Gibbs). Could H and I be mixed to serve lower OHSU campus
1b B – might be less disruptive and less expensive for LRT?
1h, 1i SW to S waterfront is more circuitous than necessary
1c C – Not favorable
3a Restoring service to Multnomah Village
1f, 1g Naito – need to be designed more like downtown, less like Interstate; unifying vs. splitting
Other Barbur – narrowing with few lanes
Other Possibility – partial BRT and partial LRT?
2d Pro-BRT to Hillsdale (D); could compromise travel time
2c, 2d PRO – C and D
2b Anti-B – Too long without stations!
2d Anti-D – only serves Hillsdale, limits options
3a Why remove the long tunnel? Cost?
2c How would OHSU elevators work? Would this impact the synagogue?
1i Makes sense to remove I – out of the way, lots of structure
1a, 1b A and B: huge traffic problem; Could we fix 26 too?
1d-g Good not to just study 4th/5th/6th as they're very congested and people will walk
1d-g Naito/1st also congested in PM. Why not use 10th? Project is a bust if you don't serve OHSU
2a, 2b, 3a Is a tunnel feasible? Geologically?
2a, 2b, 3a People come from all over for OHSU – how many would use HCT?
2a, 2b, 3a What's the ridership on the #8 bus?
2a, 2b, 3a consider streetcar loop on Naito N of I-405
2a, 2b, 3a can't choose favorites w/o cost
2a, 2b, 3a Ridership should dictate alignment; ridership most important
1f Can Naito option connect over 5th/6th?
2a, 2b, 3a Group: tunnel better if \$ is no object
2a, 2b, 3a w/ tunnel, can add more trains – elevator has fixed capacity
2c visual impacts of 2 elevators with bridge between
1a-d, 1f Using dedicated 5th/6th transit corridor seems like right place
Other Who owns Barbur in the woods?
Other Hamilton Station – nowhere to park, bad spot for Park and Ride
Other Can you have elevated HCT route above Barbur in the woods?
Other Need shortest travel time per rider?
Other What about transfers? Do they work with tunnels? Isn't a transfer a deterrent?
Other What would happen to buses currently serving Hillsdale?
Other If you tunneled, would you pare back existing service on Barbur?
Other Would Barbur in the Woods still get bike/ped improvements if transit route elsewhere?
2b, 2d Like Hillsdale options. But you miss Barbur and Terwilliger. Important commercially
4a Support serving PCC from North

4a-c Cautious about surface – running on Capitol due to traffic

4e Lots of traffic on Lesser Rd. – AVOID

4 PCC options are more pedestrian friendly and human scale

1f, 1g Losing car lanes on Naito?

1a, 1b Traffic at 4th and Caruthers

1a-g (emphasized with stars) Barbur/Naito – no direct connection to OHSU/SoWa

Other Why not I-5: SoWa ↔ Burlingame?

2a, 2b, 3a Tunnels – geologic uncertainty (\$)

Other BRT: Prefer electric/hydrogen

2c Concern about diversion if Barbur narrowed Natio-Hamilton

Other Like ped. tunnel to/from OHSU

Other Transit speed is important to compete with driving

Other locate Hamilton station south of Hamilton?

2c Designated lanes on Barbur?

2c if HCT on Barbur, avoid taking away traffic lane

2c How does Barbur Concept Plan inform this process?

2c Unless there is major re-engineering, Barbur cannot be used for HCT; keep options A for assessment until [we] can prove additional capacity can be made on Barbur.

3c Would tunnels connect to option C?

3c limited space between Barbur and the freeway

3c Topography around concept C could be issue

3c Why not BRT through a tunnel?

3c Are you looking at park and ride at station areas?

3c Do you know what ridership will be at each of transit stations?

3c New bridge expensive

3c do we know that it is even feasible to do tunnel in SW?

3c As long as we don't lose lane/capacity on Barbur/Capitol Hwy, ok to consider HCT

4b Route right to front door of campus is step in right direction

5a Steep connection to PCC from Barbur/53rd

3a A à I would lose the tunnel.

3a I think it is a good option for future à is faster

3a There wouldn't be service to Multnomah Village

3a You're talking about building for a suburb

3a Good because 2 major destinations

4a A is wonderful

4c C should be removed

4d D less disruptive

5b Concerns about trench tunnel impacts to the neighborhood

3b Concerned about traffic impacts on Barbur

3a Keep HCT in long tunnel and improve bus service on Barbur

Other Need is good circulator buses – TriMet's SEP

Other Existing villages = Multnomah and Hillsdale. Potential villages = Burlingame and Crossroads.

3a Tunnel would bypass bottlenecks

Other Make sure there are good TC with adequate parking

3b B – more economic development potential

Other too many stops=long travel times

Other Fewer stops, the better (to OHSU)

Other Transit service to PCC would be good for traffic

4b Safety is better with the front door option

4e Lesser Rd. is small road – hard to imagine a "bigger" bus there

Other	Not just capital costs but operations and maintenance
Other	Do LRT – have bus circulator to PCC
Other	Safety and security
5a	Barbur option – concerned about ped. connection
5a	Option A with circulator bus
5a	Direct connection is the best
5a	Not much on Barbur in this section
5a	Want the best service to draw the most people
5c, 5d	D is not interesting because of cost. C is more attractive – services further south and to the heart of campus
5c, 5d	Ped. access across I-5 to stations
5c, 5d	Additional traffic/transit at crossroads – FIX CROSSROADS

Tigard CDW March 19

What design options do you like and why?

Segment	Comment
6a	Fig A -68th/ 90th couplet if not 2 way on 69th
7b, 7c	OR 217 crossing c to Wall or " B to Hall and Commercial
9c	Tig South to Bridgeport route C along WES to 72nd and WES
Other	None
4a	I prefer the northern route thru PCC (not thru Haines St.)
5a	And not along i-5 near 60th and Barbur
5b-d	OR tunnel under PCC, under I-5 to Tigard Triangle. ONLY in this area are residentially zoned R-10 properties impacted along ALL of the proposed routes for BRT or trains
9d	If LRT -opt D allows a successful reuse of WES tracks
7a, 7b	A, B
2a, 2b	Also, a suggestion was made to connect the north end of the tunnel with MAX at the South Waterfront. This should be looked at.
3a	Keep the tunnel options until you have better cost estimates and how the bus service would interact with the HCT
Other	Need to ensure that TOD is high quality no more slums. How will this be ensured? Increased density and infill development are not welcome. Better to do without the project than to encourage these problems. Actually more concerned about TOD than the choice of transit route
3a, 2a, 2b	The tunnel options should not be eliminated until good cost estimates are obtained. They are not necessarily more expensive than the surface alignments (especially along Barbur and Naito)
7c	Design C less costly
4a-c, 9d, 10d	BRT through PCC to Tigard Triangle to Tig Transit South on dedicated BRT to WES line to proposed purple 'B' line BRT South to Tualatin through Bridgeport
7a	Clinton to Tigard TC; the wetland intrusion appears minimal
3a	Prefer long tunnel option but with portal located at South Waterfront near west end of new LR bridge. S Waterfront - OHSU -Hillsdale -Multnomah -Barbur TC
Other	Metro, City and TriMet need to do a much better job of educating the public about the very significant economic and social values of transit investment and transit strengthens local economies.
9e-g	Hall Blvd would serve more residential. Better commute out to PDX?
6a-c	Make sure Tigard Triangle is served
9f	I prefer BRT over LRT because it's cheaper. I like transit going down Hall and Durham. A lot of Tigard High School students will use it.
4a	PCC North End: shorter route, faster. Students need mass transit
Other	I like the idea of bus. When you add the dedicated lanes, add additional traffic lanes. Do not take away traffic lanes
6a, 6b	I like the idea of coupling roads

- 7 Must have a third way to get across 217 by car
- 7b I like option b -Beveland routh because it seems like it impacts the least buildings and people
- 4b, 4c PCC -like b and e for buses
- 5c, 5d Prefer c or d -BRT/ LRT
- 9b, 9c Route b from Tigard to Bridgeport (parallel to Hywy S): because it's not real close to our home, and it's along existing right of way. Also route c for similar reasons
- Other NO BUILD OPTION. This entire project is a fiasco and should be stopped NOW. It does not serve Tigard's existing congestion and will only serve to compound the issue. I suggest the westside bypass option.

Flip chart notes

- 6 Concern about expanding 68th – becomes a cut-through
- 6 68th very wide
- 6 What about 2-way on 69th?
- 6 Going S through Triangle – is there a more direct path?
- 7a Option A – Triangle to Downtown – cannot put a signal on Hall. Will need to work with ODOT on the issues
- 7a loss of industrial businesses – will go somewhere else b/c no industrial lands
- 7b Take B from Beveland to Hall and then South on Hall?
- 7b Have platform on Hall, it is close to transit Center
- 7b Are we locked into the existing TC location?
- 7b Haines go straight E to existing park and ride on 99W – run along on existing right of way to downtown
- 7a A – minimal wetland intrusion
- 7a A is high in air
- 7a turns take too much time
- 7a repurpose WES line for HCT
- 6a, 6b couplets increase cost
- 6a, 6b Keeping car lanes is important
- 6a, 6b Why not couplets in downtown?
- 7c Like C – shorter bridge
- 7c Need another bridge that allows cars
- 7b B – lowest impact to buildings
- 7b boot out TriMet – form own local transit
- 7b WES does not work
- 7b Tigard does not get amount of service for taxes fees paid
- 7b Build B on pylons
- 8a Hunziker – steep hill there
- 8a Hard to get railroads to agree to transit
- 8a Is it cheaper to go on new street NW of Ash?
- 8a Why not use Farro Creek as an HCT alignment?
- 8c C: Is there enough ROW on WES line?
- 8c C: would it make WES redundant?
- 8c Large expansion occurring w/ Roy Rogers/River Terrace
- 9e-g Are there land use/wetland issues on Hall?
- 9f Concern that field along Hall and Durham will be rezoned for high density housing – not desirable
- 9a A: So not enough residences on 72nd?
- 11d Hug I-5 ROW. Save on costs. No utility impacts. don't disregard early operation advantages
- 11a A – redundant (WES)
- Other More weight on the feasibility of alignments than the places we want to serve

Other Circles on the map aren't the same as BCP

Other Should be looking at the system, where this is a component.

Other Should plan the bus service with the HCT instead of after the fact

Other Stop looking at traffic congestion as the problem to solve

Other Tunnel could avoid the surface impacts/relocation costs

Other Not just high density places but places for transfers or other access points

Other Should consider the East Side Connector

Other Tunnel portal at PML Bridge (Porter St) to OHSU/long tunnel south = 3 travel options

Other For every \$ spent on transit – greatest benefit to the public – we haven't done a good job of explaining the public benefit. Local \$ spent locally

Other social and economic benefit

Other mobility choices

Other auto dependencies

Other SWC could help with other improvements

Other safety, ped x-ings, RIB connectivity, 405 access

Other tunnel avoids these potential improvements

Other importance of serving and identifying the station communities and places to service

3a if we do the tunnel, still need to improve Barbur

Other There is risk in trying to do everything

Other Multnomah and improvements on Multnomah = easy access and walkable

Other Is there a partial hybrid I-5 and Barbur Bertha South area

Other Crossroads – tough traffic – opportunity BTC to Capitol Hwy

Other Glad Haines is coming off

Other Alignments need to get to the PCC campus

Other Capital – shared facility (streetcar like)

Other PCC vision and redevelopment opportunity

Other Tigard, PCC, OHSU – places you want to serve

Other HCT should be coordinated with PCC bus shuttles

Other Milwaukie line cost comparable to long tunnel

2a, 2b, Tunnel consideration for OHSU still needed

3a Use of ROW for I-5 near N. Tigard – not good.

Other Tunnel would still allow for bus on Barbur

Other SE 17th example of disruptive surface alignments

Other Placemaking can still occur on Barbur with other than transit money.

Other How do we assure that transit related dev. and stations are of high quality? Don't like Rockwood.

Other Frequent service and connections important to improve transit ridership in SW.

Other This project is too line focused, not system need focused.

2b OHSU/Hillsdale good opportunity for tunnel station.

Other PCC area has residential areas surrounding it. This is the most disruptive location of alignment in Portland.

Other How many busses, how frequent of busses on BRT, esp. on Haines, Lesser?

4d Don't like elevated HCT bridge above street level in Haines/Barbur area

5c, 5d Prefer tunnels because of above bullet point

Other PCC needs to be served but not so that it is slow from Tigard to DT Portland

Other Too slow transit/too many stops to Portland

Other Too much focus on alignments

Other Don't lose sight of need to serve smaller centers too (not just OHSU/PCC).

What design options do you like and why?

Segment	Comment
3a	Retain a deep long tunnel to the Barbur T.C. from a portal in south waterfront (this option has not been considered). There is no need to serve the Barbur Blvd. strip with a high capacity transit. Local bus service is better.
Other	99W all the way to Sherwood -lots of new jobs and growth opportunity. For this you need (1) a park and ride at 124th/ 99W, (2) Linking to: a local East/ West bus loop. WES \$130,000,000 or so! Is excellent; already good as is. Maybe add one later #96 option at noon or so and add one midday to WES if possible. PCC is an important but a lower priority. Tigard can serve the Tigard Triangle with a looped bus.
Other	Ah. Save I-5 for freight. Take ppl via other routes. Salem to Pld via Tualatin on I-5 quickly and often (not just employees). Support the huge aging population to travel during daytime hours and to evening Pld. cultural event
Other	I'm not sure I have favorites in a lot of cases, but I definitely want to see an effective connection between Tualatin and PCC Sylvania campus. (Currently it's a 15 minute drive versus a 1 1/2 hour bus trip). I also travel regularly to Bethany, North Protland, Oregon City -and sometimes to SE 82nd and Division. Being able to take transit in a reasonable time frame to get to those places during the entire day (and into the evening) would help me get out of my car. My last trip to Oregon City by bus took 2 1/2 hr, including walking 1.5 miles to get to the nearest 96 stop. There are days I could get one direction via transit, but not the other, because I need to come or go in the middle of day -and while the 76 is great for going to Beaverton, its not great for commuting farther across the region.
7a	Option "A" Clinton best because A most direct segment between downtown Tigard and other segments to. B passes through central area at Tigard Triangle and more surface parking at WinCo, providing opportunity for more convenient grocery shopping and urban redevelopment/ transit-oriented development. HCT along "A" Clinton would make more likely "third places" I can meet people at in this part of the SW Corridor, adding an option to Portland itself.
9d	I urge retaining a "WES" connection via 85th " for further study as a Tualatin resident, impacts to either Cook or Tualatin Community Park don't trouble me. Also, had disagreement with Tualatin's removal of bridge from it's long range plans.
9d	Keep "early removal" segments along WES alignment between SW Bonita Rd and Tualatin WES station. Don't take default attitude and assume unsuccessful negotiation with Portland and Western Railroad.
10c, 10d	About Bridgeport Village options C and D, DON'T do flyover w/ elevated station. This would be fundamentally anti-urban, repel potential users of transit, and surrender the urban -or potentially urban realm to cars and auto "levels of service". Otherwise, I prefer C over D. I'd reconsider flyover/ developed station if the TriMet park and ride lots were redeveloped into transit-oriented developments (TODs) w/ public concourses at the same levels as the station. About potential station " circles/ ovals, I strongly support the one at the SW Boones Ferry and Lower Boones Ferry Roads and as close second, the TriMet park and ride lots circle.
11d	Tualatin "D" has least impact on existing homes/ businesses. Noise level not a concern.
11b, 11c	"C" much better than B. Do not need WES connection.
	Flip chart notes
10c	Prefer C. D doesn't serve enough. Ust the road already there.
10d	Advantage of D is less elevated track by BPV (because follows I-5)
11b	Why doesn't B keep going south along Boones? to provide S side service. take up less space for end of line in downtown (300' approximately). build "destination" retail or residential above line
11c	C is better because: space available for storage there (at end). Could extend later. Walk to WES isn't that far. Not many transfer between WES and bus or LRT
Other	LRT Advantage = capital costs can be leveraged for Fed. Less operating cost. But need straight segments to load/unload
Other	Local service – needs midday in Tualatin and more direct connections; ie. more 96 service

midday

Other Bridgeport – highly congested

Other People don't want Boones Ferry or Marinazzi widened

Other Bridgeport Park and Ride overwhelmed

Other Need Park and Ride on 99W

Other Will HCT move people out of their homes?

Other 76 is already a good route with good service

9e-g Cost of HCT on Hall would be high

Other Also need to add midday WES

Other Don't want Hall widened across river

11b B into downtown Tualatin won't work – not space for dedicated HCT lanes near library

Other Important to avoid impacts to Tualatin library

Other Good that E (Mohawk) is recommended for early removal

Other want to rethink HCT on 99w in Tigard

Other More frequent and express service on 99W. Look at repurposing 99W median for HCT

11d Of options into downtown Tualatin, favorite is D (least impacts)

Other Utilize railroad ROW around Meridian/Boones Ferry E of I-5

Other Emphasis on transit center in downtown Tualatin

11a A – redundant/character – missing target area

11e E – like route, but don't like structure – provide more access to Cabelas, etc

11b B – stations could serve both commercial and WES

8c C – "constraint" → doesn't serve library/municipal offices – but if it is a regional line, doesn't need to serve every little thing (local service could accomplish this)

Other Faster service generally runs along periphery, local service is more intricate/slower

Other Want rapid transit – don't need many stops

Other No right of way for tunnels in PCC Area.

Other Small neighborhood streets

4a, 4d Alignment A + D best in PCC Area.

Other Underground lava makes tunneling difficult.

5a Transit on Barbur South of Crossroads is land use opportunity – alignment 'A'

Other People only want sidewalks on main roads, not smaller local streets

5a Concern about security if new paths from transit through neighborhoods

3a Tunnel in Multnomah area makes no sense – no land use opportunity

4c Good to remove alignment C in PCC Area.

Other Tunnel requires blasting? Bad

4a-e, 5d Library, school, Holly Farm good destinations but if have to be removed PCC and Crossroads more important

Other What are the current shuttle bus routes and schedule for PCC?

Other Use/upgrade existing urban trail #7

5a New development on Barbur near 53rd would help move out objectionable businesses.

Other P+R near alignment A near 55th a good idea.

4e PCC Alignment E not good, too close to homes, steep drop off on one side.

Other How much use would HCT to PCC get? A lot of these students are part-time and work – in a hurry

ID Southwest March 18

What design options do you like and why?

Segment	Comment
1f	Naito option w/ redevelopment of the West end of Ross Island Bridge

2c	Like elevator/ walkway on some other vehicle to get people up Marquam Hill as long as it doesn't negatively impact Terwilliger Parkway viewshed
5a	PCC -53rd station w/ LRT makes sense as long as there's good ped connections to PCC campus
10c, 10d 10, 11	Like elevated station at Bridgeport Village -make it safer for peds, trains and bicycles Most interested in connecting with Bridgeport Village and Dt. Tualatin
7b	OR 217 Crossing -like "B" even tho I realize environmental impact is high as it develops a corridor in most logical place and provides access between triangle and downtown
8	Downtown Tigard -Ped and bike improvements on Hall are paramount regardless of alignment
4b, 5b	PCC -I like B
3b	Burlingame to Barbur TC -definitely prefer B -keep people on Barbur corridor
8	The one(s) that include downtown Tigard as a major node

Flip chart notes

Segment	Comment
1h-i	Fire station on SW 5 th Ave. and College St. serves South Waterfront. Access to South Waterfront is needed
1d-g	Interest in improvements to Ross Island Bridge
1a	Like option 1a – path of least resistance Tunnels present policy questions. Trade-off for development
Other	Capitol as priority connection for SW Service Enhancement Plan
10d	Impacts of alignment near I-5
11b, 11c	Impacts north of Boones Ferry Road
10	High capacity transit needs to reach Bridgeport Village
9e-g	BRT could work better on Hall, in mixed traffic
8a	Constraint for Hunziker: people use it as a back-up road for 99W when the latter gets too congested
4, 5	Redevelopment opportunities for PCC around their campus
3b	Constraint: restricting left turns on Barbur
2c	Trestles: to address or not to address them?
Other	Travel time is important
Other	People mover – Hong Kong. Other options e.g. elevator
Other	Need for additional bicycle facilities in Hillsdale and on Barbur
Other	Crossroads is an important piece in need of solution
Other	Would be nice to serve Mountain Park
Other	Land vision on alignment maps would be helpful
Other	Bus rapid transit vs. light rail
Other	How to best reach downtown (Tualatin)?
Other	Process is currently focused on cost/benefits
Other	People want to talk about stations because that affects them directly

Electronically submitted comments

What design options do you like and why?

Segment	Comment
4c	Regarding the proposed alignments, please note that Peter and I are pleased that the Haines St route option will finally be removed.
4d	In addition we very much support the option that envisages a new bridge over I-5 to carry hi-capacity transit from PCC into Tigard Triangle.
4, 5	Any plan that includes BRT along Lesser Rd would be very disruptive of homesites and automotive traffic and the traffic load on the Haines St overpass would be dreadful, particularly given the expected increase in traffic caused by the new Walmart.

- 4a, 5d We also support hi-capacity transit on Capitol Highway to connect to PCC, and routed out to Tigard along the north margin of the campus. If the engineers view it to be feasible, we prefer Lt Rail over buses.
- Other Regarding tunnels, we are opposed to cut and fill tunnels because these are very disruptive to local residents. Deep bore tunnels are different, but it seems unlikely that funds for such work will appear for PCC (they are more likely at OHSU-the primary customer).
- Other I'm writing to offer a couple of comments in connection with the maps I reviewed last night and further studied today. I hope you will consider my comments and forward them to others as appropriate. I met David Alres(?) last night who is tasked with evaluating grades of various routes. I think he has a tough job because the grade problems in this area are difficult at best.
- 4d, 5a My motivation for providing these comments is that it appears a major bridge from Barbur Blvd. into the Tigard Triangle would be a catastrophic visual and acoustic problem in my neighborhood. The congestion at the Tigard freeway entrance / exit ramps, 60th Ave., and with the truck by-pass lane doesn't facilitate the train/ BRT corridor well at all. To raise the corridor (to go over this congested area) and then drop drastically into the Tigard Triangle seems to be counter-intuitive. I am reminded of a similar installation where mass transit approaches the Portland airport from I-205. A similar structure would be required on Barbur.
- Other 1. First off, over time, I have seen through a series of maps (conceptual and more refined) a continuing process of developing a well thought-out route. What I am proposing here is a further refinement (a bit more detailed) in the progression of that process. 2. I am only proposing consideration of these ideas within my neighborhood and nearby vicinity. (I'm not attempting to evaluate the entire plan.)
- 3c Starting in the Burlingame Fred Meyer area and heading west/south....I believe the Barbur light rail or BRT is appropriate within the Barbur R/W. I drove this area - including on the freeway - to view/consider possible corridors. Although it initially seemed that the land between Barbur and I-5 would be ideal for a corridor, I had to dismiss that concept because of the freeway interchanges (exits/entrances) at Terwilliger, Multnomah Blvd. and Barbur Blvd. The existing ramps / bridges seemed to provide overwhelming obstacles.
- 3c, 3b However, just past the Barbur Blvd. exit ramp, a wide clear area at 26th Ave. provides an opportunity for the Barbur transit corridor to transition off Barbur and into that R/W on the north side of I-5. This deviation allows an approach and interface with the Transit Center without congestion on Barbur. The interface would either remain along the south side of the Barbur Transit Center, or route deeper into the station along the existing bus structure. The existing pedestrian bridge that crosses I-5 could remain and/or be modified to accommodate the mass transit interface.
- Other I am concerned by the fact the so many nay-sayers are getting in to the heads of those who make decisions and scare them in to thinking they have an overwhelming majority. It is also disappointing when, in government, powerful holdouts can block important projects such as this for the sole reason of prejudice or being misinformed, effectively ending them at the expense of the rest of the region.
- Other I commute to the SW corridor each day and it can be a real nightmare. I try to take the #96 bus as much as possible, but I also drive occasionally as well. No one will deny the importance of roads, but we should not deny the importance of rail either.
- Other The compromises that I have seen made to BRT alignments to keep negative shouters quiet ("We'll just run it in mixed traffic!") scares me. This project should be light rail. Portland made the choice, whether it be right or wrong (that's not what this email is about), to pursue LRT, and that's what makes sense for this corridor to make the system closer to whole. Powell/Division can be BRT (and other future corridors) where it is more suited, but SW Portland should be LRT beyond any reasonable doubt. I hope you also come to that decision. The equipment, operation costs, capacity, and speed, reliability, and more and not what we need for this corridor. I believe BRT has it's place in Portland. Just not along the SW corridor.

Other Another idea I had was how committed was Mayor Cook in keeping the downtown area where it is currently located since it needs lots of improvement. Could you move the entire downtown area over to city hall and the police station on Hall if the HCT were along Hall? The staffers said this wouldn't work...too expensive...but is it if Hall is owned by ODOT and they already have the right of way?

Other I think I heard there are plans to rebuild the core downtown area to multi-level building with housing. I also heard the manager of one housing complex on Hall gave current tenants notice the building will be rebuilt into a five-story complex sometime in the future. If Hunziker is not being used in the HCT plan, then their entire area could be modernized, they wouldn't have to move permanently, and it is still within a half-mile walk for them to take public transportation if local buses served that area. They could also use a path.

Responses to Question2

Portland CDW March 12

Which design options do you think might provide significant advantages or disadvantages and why?	
Segment	Comment
2a, 2b	Tunnel short tunnel too expensive
2a, 2b	Tunnel through very geologically unstable terrain is not good
2c	Like C alignment but keep existing car lanes
2c	Need at least five car lanes from Hamilton South to Terwilliger and back
3c, 3a	The Hillsdale-Multnomah-Crossroads tunnel is a loser not enough water-sewer-storm sewer available to serve the area. I-5 dis
1c	Option C- large impacts on neighborhood without significant benefits
2a	Tunnel option A- serves OHSU directly yet minimizes tunneling costs
3a, 2b	Both medium and long tunnel options serve fewer areas yet have far greater costs.
2c, 2d	C= Barbur path and then continue on Naito w/ appropriate connections to both sides of community (similar to light rail at Seattle to Sea-Tac- the portion down on grade in local communities- NOTE: replace bridge/viaducts on Barbur- at least one viaduct w/ D going up and through Hillsdale (BRT)...
1h, 1i	would seem important for future to look at south waterfront
2b, 2d	Hugh advantages for growth in a town center with the Hillsdale options.
Other	Trains without neighborhood connections like buses are less than effect due to needing to drive.
Other	Trains don't run in ice or snow. Buses run in all types of weather with chains.
Other	LRT, I prefer to BRT because it is harder to take away in the future.
Other	Very very important to make it easy to get from Hillsdale/Multnomah to Barbur if that is the sole focus route - current service makes it not feasible.
Other	Note that SW Portland is <u>not</u> friendly to increased population density nor infill regardless of route option.
2b	Again, the medium length tunnel - avoid Barbur
1a, 1b	The above- 5th and 6th already transit corridors
1a, 1b	Connection to OHSU critical!
1a, 1g	Barbur over Naito - too much bridge traffic @ Hawthorne + freeway entrance.
3a	"Safety" deep long tunnels are just too unsafe, especially if they have stops mid tunnel that access elevators.
2b	Advantages of above - Development of Hillsdale w/ access to OHSU. Ridership to OHSU and downtown. Reduced traffic on Hillsdale except for emergency vehicles.
1h, 1i	I think ignoring Macadam is an oversight

- 2c Options on Barbur - + generally parallel to it are best - WITH improvements for bikes + pedestrians (and access from the adjacent hilly neighborhoods down to Barbur...
- 2b, 2d Options that serve existing neighborhoods/node (like Hillsdale) should be as important as "future desired" (like Barbur)
- 3a, 2b, 2d You need to provide access to Hillsdale and Multnomah by skirting near them, not destroying them by trying to get right into their centers.
- 2b #B (purple line) - tunnel takes the most people to the critical places
- 2 Must serve OHSU
- 2b The longer tunnel (opt.B) would be an advantage, providing more direct service. People want to know they are traveling faster (or at least more reliable) than driving their cars.
- 2c C Barbur seems to have the advantage of not having to build expensive tunnels.
- Other Disadvantage to BRT - adding surface congestion to existing routes
- 2a See above. Serving OHSU is critical because it is Portland's biggest employer & VA Med. Ctr. Wants to expand. The neighborhood adjacent to OHSU & VAMC has mixed-use development potential & would benefit from better transit connections.
- 2c Barbur alignments not ideal for Portland residents. -Not convenient for Marquam Hill Commuters. -reduction of capacity on Barbur will shunt more traffic to neighborhood streets +further decrease livability/safety in the close-by neighborhoods
- 5d, 4a, 4d Options listed above will encourage development of crossroads
- 5d Like deep bore tunnels, but shallow tunnels are too disruptive of existing homes. A tunnel up Cap Hwy to PCC is fine, but LTR should have LTR station on N. side of PCC., and west over I-5 bridge to Tigard
- 3a I am concerned about having a hub in Multnomah Village. This is such a small and crowded space. How big will the hub be and where?
- Other LRT with fewest stops but frequent connections at each station.
- 3b, 3c B (blue) Barbur (BRT, LRT) Seems to propose a dedicated right of way - this Blvd is already so congested, there's no place to "add another lane" without taking out all the businesses already on Barbur - how is that preserving the "historic Barbur" - Crossroads is already a nightmare - adding the items in the "Barbur Concept Plan" i.e. apartments, traffic stops seems impossible - [cut off in copy]
- 5a, 5c OR BRT/LRT to PCC --> C seems to be best option to campus + beyond. A is to problematic to traffic on Barbur
- 3a Enhances already thriving places - less speculative
- 3b Good opportunity, more risk
- 5c, 5d LRT to PCC - higher ridership, helps vitalize adjoining neighborhoods. D also, with even more neighborhood access.
- 3a 1) Less stops faster access to downtown 2) Underground less impact from weather 3) Better access to key existing villages Hillsdale and Multnomah Village 4) Better access to OHSU 5) Would enhance value of Barbur Transit as a great location to park and get to downtown fast. Barbur transit would need to be expanded to 2 or 3 levels for additional capacity. I support a long tunnel. The Barbur Concept Plan is a contrivance that should be scrapped.
- 3a Significant advantage: time, connectivity and mitigates Terwilliger bottleneck
- 3b, 3c Disadvantage impacts other transit through Terwilliger. No real destination/ village location would need to be developed
- 5a Disadvantage poor PCC service
- 3b Any light rail or bus rapid transit dedication on Barbur Blvd. Surface is unacceptable. These two concepts take up lanes of traffic whether the train or bus are there or not. It takes up too much available traffic area. Regular bus would better serve Barbur.
- 4a-c, 5d Really question the Capitol Hwy alignment for light rail South of Barbur Transit Center to PCC and back to Tigard Triangle for the crowding on Capitol it would create.
- 3a For adding capacity if is only way for a net gain

3b	If 2 lanes of auto and local bus service can stay unchanged, and complete new right of way for light rail on bus rapid transit
3a	Topography is almost insurmountable. Remove tunnel to Hills and Mult as that serves only the up hill area most of that would go to Homestead/ OHSU area- the down hill South is left out and too far to access by L and C students and area people
Other	Issue with traffic from I-5 when there are problems/ accidents on I-5

Tigard CDW March 19

Which design options do you think might provide significant advantages or disadvantages and why?	
Segment	Comment
7a	OR 217 Crossing A -too high/ too much \$
9b	Tig. South to Bridgeport Route B -too far from most employment
Other	Avoid round-about intersection ("improvements")
5b	Like purple "b" route thru PCC tunnel
5c	Like blue "c" route thru PCC tunnel
5d	Like pink "d" route thru PCC tunnel. Reduce impact to existing residentially zoned properties
9b, 9e, 9f	Opt b and e/f allow enhancing
3a	The tunnel(s) is (are) less disruptive, serve Hillsdale and Multnomah Village, offer better travel time, and might be cheaper
Other	Make sure traffic and parking is kept out of residential neighborhoods! This is a real problem around MAX stations. Portland and Tigard appear to have different ideas about what this project is supposed to do (serve commuters or serve neighborhoods along the way). These ideas need to be reconciled.
9a	I don't think 72nd Ave. would be good through residential area or commercial S/ o Bonita Rd.
7c	C. Beveland South seems to be most cost effective
9a	72nd route would serve more commercial. Better commute in.
5c, 5d	Tunnel to front door would serve students and faster to Tigard
4, 5	Serving PCC is important. Getting the bus to Main Street would be good
6a, 6b	The idea of having couples is better than one wide road
7b, 7c	Bridge should serve automobiles. Options B or C with full multi mode auto/ car/ cycle would be good
9f	I oppose Route F from Tigard to Bridgeport Village, along Hall and Durham, because our home is close by, and I fear that one or both open fields along Hall would be re-zoned for high-density apartments, which would change the nature of the neighborhood, for the worse.
Other	Light rail has the significant disadvantage of being a fixed location at tremendous cost. Tunnels only compound the expense. With BRT at least the lanes could be used for other transit options

Tualatin CDW March 20

Which design options do you think might provide significant advantages or disadvantages and why?	
Segment	Comment
2a, 2b, 3a	Tunnel -too expensive. Not needed by the SW Corridor. Too risky. No new bridge (per Tualatin citizens of TSP). \$ from Portland; they've been told the cannot afford more debt
Other	B. Security problems leave train overnight parked -would need security guards. We need more busses -they are more flexible in the long run esp. compared to something that runs on a fixed track
Other	Skip Tigard. The just voted no for contemporary transit. I wrote this before I heard our very positive intro by our Mayor. I still think Tigard might be a barrier.

Other	I do think the Bridgeport park and ride should be expanded safer/ marked pedestrian crossings (or an over-the-road option) with the huge new apartments on the wrong side of the street. We already have walking issues and someone is going to get hit
7a	New main street through the Tigard Triangle just for HCT
10c, 10d	Bridgeport Village option C and/or D and park and ride station circle because 1) potential for transit-oriented development 2) additional urban development/ redevelopment in vicinity of TOD 3) traffic calming in concert with TOD.
11b	I disagree with the calling out of the constraint that left turn laws would need to be removed from SW Boons Ferry Rd. at Nyburg St. Drivers can enter and exit Hedges Green strip mall using SW Tualatin-Sherwood Rd, and more importantly a defacto road diet with additional HCT allows for transit oriented development downtown Tualatin -including calmer traffic and a more pedestrian-friendly realm with more business and housing

ID Southwest March 18

Which design options do you think might provide significant advantages or disadvantages and why? Segment	Comment
Other	Need to redesign West Portland crossroads to make it safer for pedestrians and bicycles
Other	It is important to choose an option that could go from BRT to light rail long term
Other	So Ptld to Burlingame -line D as option if we go w/ Barbur but most like B tunnel -but if we choose tunnel, still need to prioritize bike and ped on Barbur
Other	Advantages - The ones that include Downtown Tigard as a major node. Disadvantages - Any that don't include Downtown Tigard as a major node.

Responses to Question 3

Portland CDW March 12

Do you agree with the proposal to remove the flagged design options? Why/ why not? Segment	Comment
1i	Agree- too expensive or impractical
Other	Save the 44 provide critical SW Wilson Multnomah access, especially if you lose the tunnel.
4e	Avoid lesser-Haines intersection it does not serve. Improve ped-bike along Haines but no more transit.
4d	Build a new bridge from PCC to the Triangle.
1h	Should stay in consideration because it serves South Waterfront better than
3a	Remove the long tunnel (Downtown -Hillsdale- Multnomah Village)
1i	Yes.
Other	Yes, costs and numbers served have to take precedent. That said the Maplewood and Hayhurst Multnomah Village area is under served for mass transit. Save money so that bus service can be added to serve those under served areas with pedestrian, bike and bus service.
3a	Yes -we want to minimize construction cost/ time/ complexity. For "long tunnel" connecting Hillsdale to Multnomah, I am not sure who it would really benefit. Connecting Barbur residents and businnessses to downtown and Eastside seems a much higher priority. Increased bus service from Multnomah to Barbur should meet Multnomah resident needs -don't think it's a high growth or redevelopment area in planning docs?
1i	Think option "I" (along South Waterfront) has possibility and should not be eliminated yet. Serves South Waterfront development.
1i	Agree
1i	South Waterfront - yes.
3a	Hillsdale to Multnomah Village -yes
1i	Long tunnel and long bridge definite yes remove
3a	Again -long tunnel not safe.

Other	It's not clear if "removal" if sites noted will have a negative impact on future population of business development in the future and this plan is about the future, not the present. No discussion was had about this.
1i	Yes, other than Multnomah Village.
1i	I do agree with omitting the Downtown to South Waterfront option
2c	Must get closer to a selection. Don't miss the intersection of Terwilliger and Barbur. More development is expected at this intersection
1i	Yes -do not support OHSU properly
3a	Yes -remove long tunnel from Hillsdale to Mult
1i	Yes, the route around South Waterfront seems unnecessary. Ideally you want to just get through the area, and have some busses to connect the intermediate areas.
1i	They sound less cost effective so I support that.
1i	Optom I thru So. Waterfront makes sense if extended out thru "Woods" section rather than connecting up to Hamilton St./ Barbur; it would allow a connection to OHSU on waterfront and tram.
1i	They seem like reasonable decisions
4c	Yes -I agree with removal of Haines St.
4e	I argue for avoiding Lesser Road -Lower Haines St. because of the 90 degree bend at the Lesser/ Haines junction.
4c	Haines St should be removed for reason discussed at length in earlier submissions from Haines St. resident
4c	Agree with removal of Haines St
3a, 1h, 1i	North portal of tunnel should be adjacent to the South Waterfront LRT station
3a	Still like the A option because the point is to move traffic fast with fewer stops but have circulator busses
3a	Don't remove long tunnel option, it's a very imp. Alternative to I-5 and Barbur. Let's take some traffic off those two so they can flow more smoothly
3a	We should still consider Burlingame-Barbur option A thru Multnomah and Hillsdale
3a	Keep Burlingame to Barbur option A can reduce traffic issues on Barbur serves establish neighborhoods of people who value walkability
3a	No. The Barbur Concept Plan was a contrived invention that creates artificial "villages" well 2 real thriving villages exist now Hillsdale and Multnomah Village. Also in terms of historic use Barbur is historically a RT 66 strip hwy. Barbur is getting along well in it existing use mode, maybe add a couple of safe crossings for bike ped
3a	No! Best alignment to serve area w/ connectivity bust best solution to mitigate traffic. Must keep!
3a	No, they should be considered as some have positive merits
3a	I agree with the proposal to remove the Hillsdale to Multnomah tunnel
3a	Remove it, it misses key modes at Terwilliger Fred Meyer, Safeway, and Barbur Transit Center
4c	PCC area - remove Haines Rd. option that neighbors don't like
3a	NO. Unless Barbur can add complete new right of way
4c	Remove C from PC service
4e	Use Haines St bridge. I defer to those in West Port and for SW N.A.s as they live there and their needs are obvious to them
Other	He didn't really get to this

Tigard CDW March 19

Do you agree with the proposal to remove the flagged design options? Why/ why not?

Segment	Comment
3a	I disagree with removing the long tunnel serving OHSU, Hillsdale, Multnomah, and Barbur Transit Center

7a, 7b, 7d, 7f	Agree- d/e/f seem to be hard to cross 217. A route with long bridge is too costly, as b route bridge is too costly
9e	Yes I do agree. Bonita Rd. would not be good for widening for BRT
Other	I do not agree nor disagree
Other	I think 72nd should be reconsidered
Other	Yes on Barbur and PCC agree that Barbur needs to be served
7e, 7f	Route e and f
3a	Keep the long tunnel. Service has to be fast
9e	Yes, especially along Bonita Rd, because it's so close to our home
Other	Yes. Remove them! Remove all options. TOO EXPENSIVE AND DOES NOT SERVE THE NEED

Tualatin CDW March 20

Do you agree with the proposal to remove the flagged design options? Why/ why not?	
Segment	Comment
Other	No 99W is best for Tualatin and our future industrial development
Other	Yes
Other	Agree -move toward efficiency
9a, 9g, 9d	Yes -I DO NOT want to see any road extension of Hall across the Tualatin River. It would have a very negative impact on my neighborhood/ life. I'm not sure I have an opinion on some of the others except that 72nd out of Tualatin through Durham/ South Tigard also looks like it would be best OFF the table
7e, 7f	Yes, it's at highway interchange/ out of the way no man's land near nothing in particular
11d	Yes: Remove: D: HCT should support urban redevelopment not be shunted onto anti-urban I-5
11a	No! Keep: A: See D on reverse of this sheet **Noted in transcription that comment is recorded and considered with answers to Q1.

ID Southwest March 18

Do you agree with the proposal to remove the flagged design options? Why/ why not?	
Segment	Comment
Other	Yes if "1" is preserved; otherwise an emphatic no

Responses to Question 4

Portland CDW March 12

Are there other design options that we should consider? If so, what are the advantages or disadvantages for those options?	
Segment	Comment
2c	New sub option for "C" Barbur -keep viaducts -lower sidewalk to road level so bikes can use without big expense of building new viaducts
3b	Need to be sure to include the improvements (pedestrian, bike, etc.) along all of Barbur (Bertha South to Barbur Transit Center).
Other	Please do as much of the work as possible even if Tigard and South become difficult. SW Portland really needs this. Thank you for sharing info about OHSU development on waterfront.
2c	Covered elevator to serve upper OHSU (see Hong Kong example)
Other	Second short tunnel in Hillsdale. Underground utilities in Hillsdale.
Other	Not at this time
1h-i	If OHSU is expanding services in S. Waterfront area - some better service options to that area are needed (for non-S.Waterfront residents) -and- for the increasing # of residents in that area, they need more ways out. This includes access from "lower" OHSU to "upper" OHSU
2c	Funicular -would serve OHSU and tourism

- Other Yes, from Barbur, a shotr tunnel to near Hillsdale
- Other Tunnel through HD from just West thru to Vermont under Rceke
- Other No- there was good discussion of the options
- Other So. Waterfront to Burlingame via I-5 in exclusive R.O.W. w/ stop and elevator at Corbett St. or Hamilton St.
- 4d, 4e It is important to build new bridge over I-5 from PCC to avoid damage/ stress on Lesser Road
- Other Tunnel costs do not seem so outrageous when compared to land acquisition costs for surface build (consider SE 17th Ave on PMLR)
- Other A lot was discussed about fewer stops on light rail with lots of circulator busses for the cross connections
- Other We seem to have plenty of options for LRT and given our history and deployed infrastructure we should stick with LRT. A new option for the A tunnel rt would be to have a greatly improved bus circulation system that would feed the main stations. This would negate the lower number of station (which is a plus for riders coming from Tigard). As an aside I have spoken with folks that do not take MAX today because it is so slow with so many stops. The tunnel route could help that greatly.
- 4, 5 BRT/ LRT: Avoid 99 W interchange
- Other Over all more traditional busses adds volume of passengers while providing more opportunities for service. It also costs the least. Light rail and bus rapid transit is the least friendly to handicap riders. Consider Hillsdale to Beaverton bus improvements
- Other Although I didn't sit in on the Tigard to Tualatin round table, I believe it would make more total sense to link the Southwest HCT to WES at Tigard. While build a second transit system from Tigard to Tualatin?
- 4d, 4e Do not impact tree forest area at South of Campus. PCC needs good bus service to connect to LRT over Haines or need bridge in Triangle area.
- Other Critical- Getting SW residents up to Hwy 26 and MAX toward Hillsboro Nike/ Intel/ other Westside businesses. Mentioned multiple times to TriMet.

Additional notes taken at workshop and submitted electronically

- Other Critical tunnel portal in north segment has been overlooked. Project needs to evaluate/consider a tunnel portal at south waterfront in the vicinity of SW Porter. There does not need to be a station at south waterfront but this alignment could take advantage of the rail infrastructure coming out of downtown.

Flip chart notes

- Other Can you do a second short tunnel from woods to serve station under Hillsdale and come out near Vermont? or starts near Hillsdale?

Tigard CDW March 19

Are there other design options that we should consider? If so, what are the advantages or disadvantages for those options?

Segment	Comment
Other	Westside bypass offloads majority of burden. The excuse that it is out of your zone of consideration should only speak to the issue that you have selected the wrong area to study. Serve the region not just Portland!
Other 2a, 2b, c4, 5b-d	BRT better than LRT, due to much lower cost and the fact tha tbus routes are easily modified Tunnels are expensive but will move people faster
Other	Tigard and the surrounding cities should split from TriMet and form its own transit agency. TriMet's financial future is doomed
7c	Route C for BRT is best route with less impact and less bridge crossing of Hwy. 217

1h, 1i, 2a, 2b, 3a	Yes, someone tonight suggested the South Waterfront tunnel connection. This uses existing track to connect to downtown, and offers the chance of connections to the Milwaukie line
Other	From PCC Sylvania to Tigard TC: Due west, on dedicated ROW to the North of Tigard Cinemas and to meet 99W West of Dartmouth. Then SW, curving around existing 99W/ 217 interchange to meet alternative A
Other	Go down 99W and not in neighborhoods. Go to Sherwood so Sherwood/ Newberg people don't come into our neighborhood
9b	I would support the I-5 alignment South of Tigard

Tualatin CDW March 20

Are there other design options that we should consider? If so, what are the advantages or disadvantages for those options?

Segment	Comment
7a	No. As long as "A" is refined into a main street, with HCT, through Tigard Triangle, basically a Multnomah Village for Tigard, with development more like 4-story buildings, Northwest Portland (West of I-405)
Other	Cudos. Cudos to Pld for this plan and process. My daughter in LA says different bus companies compete rather than cooperate and coordinate: it's a mess she says
Other	Hook up from 99W tp a new E-W bus loop. Greatly improve the park and ride option on 99W via city \$ for land purchase in an UR leftover fund!!

ID Southwest March 18

Are there other design options that we should consider? If so, what are the advantages or disadvantages for those options?

Segment	Comment
Other	Please consider design options (old or new) that maximize Downtown Tigard as a major node. I'm new to this. I'm starting from a particular focus. With time, my perspective may broaden, but it won't change.

Electronically submitted comments

Are there other design options that we should consider? If so, what are the advantages or disadvantages for those options?

Segment	Comment
Other	Now here's where it gets interesting, from my point of view, because my real concern is what happens south and west of this Barbur Transit Station. In other plans, it appears that mass transit would return to Barbur, then Cross I-5 at Capitol Hwy and later Cross I-5 again near 60th Ave. (At the moment, I am not addressing the options that show connections to PCC, however, I have some ideas in mind if that connection remains important.) I would like to propose keeping the mass transit on the north and west sides of I-5 all the way from the Transit Center to the Tigard Triangle. Here's how: There are two significant freeway exits to address in the continuation of the corridor. (Capitol Hwy and Tigard) Otherwise, this proposed route, which never crosses the I-5 freeway, (no bridges) has ample R/W to accommodate the new corridor. In driving south on I-5 along the transit center, it appears that a train or BRT could dive under the Capitol Hwy. overpass, but at the expense of modifying the southbound freeway off-ramp at Capitol Hwy. The southbound Capitol Hwy. on-ramp could remain unchanged. Initially, grading from the Transit Center appears to be a concern, but I believe that careful planning of the interface could accommodate the needed grade change to allow crossing under the existing viaduct at Capitol Hwy. The S.E. corner of the Transit Station is a significant low point in that area - almost at elevation with the proposed path under Capitol Hwy. The train / BRT route continues southward on the north side of I-5 until we approach the Tigard exit. At this point, a tunnel could bore under the existing Tigard exit ramp, Pacific Hwy. and daylight in the I-5 R/W just south of the southbound freeway entrance ramp. This tunnel elevation should be conducive to interface with the proposed connections into the Tigard Triangle at 69th and/or 72nd Avenues with no impact or congestion in this sensitive area of Hwy. 99 / I-5. If you review my earlier sketches / photos showing a route through the ODOT property in the Tigard Triangle over to the 69th/Atlanta Ave.

intersection, it will be apparent this approach into the Triangle is workable. I really hope this suggestion is seriously considered. All too often, it seems that preconceived ideas (such as the idea that tunnels are too expensive) are used to dismiss alternatives that, if developed, provide much greater benefits. And so I look forward to hearing a response to this proposal. Also, I believe I can provide some expertise in evaluating grading issues. Did I hear correctly that you're attempting to limit a light rail grade to 6.5%? (Please let me know.)

Appendix B

Corridor Design Workshops: Event evaluations and demographic information summary

Total Feedback Received				
Location	Sign ins	Voluntary demographics	Event evaluations	Comment cards
Portland	44	19	17	41
Tigard	21	6	7	20
Tualatin	15	6	5	8
Email	n/a	n/a	n/a	4
ID Southwest	n/a	n/a	n/a	4
TOTAL	80	31	29	77

Event Evaluation: Worth of Event				
Location	Worthwhile	Somewhat worthwhile	Neutral / don't know	Not worthwhile
Portland	13	4		
Tigard	6			1
Tualatin	2	2	1	
TOTAL	21	6	1	1

Event Evaluation: Level of agreement with the statement, "I felt the meeting encouraged my input and I felt listened to"					
Location	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral / don't know	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Portland	9	7	1		
Tigard	3	2			2
Tualatin	1	3	1		
TOTAL	13	12	2		2

Event Demographics: Age				
Location	21-35 years	36-50 years	51-65 years	66 years or older
Portland	2	4	6	6
Tigard	1	2	2	1
Tualatin	1		1	5
TOTAL	4	6	9	12

Event Demographics: Level of Education				
Location	High school degree or less	Some college/2 year degree	College degree / 4-year degree	Post graduate
Portland		1	6	12
Tigard		2	1	2
Tualatin			3	4
TOTAL	0	3	10	18

Event Demographics: Race/Ethnicity and Gender					
Location	Male	Female	White / Caucasian	African American / Black	Hispanic / Latino
Portland	13	6	17	1	
Tigard	6		6		
Tualatin	4	3	6		1
TOTAL	23	9	29	1	1

Comments:
Portland

Event Evaluations: 17

The most important things I got out of today's meeting included:

- Good thinking about alternatives.
- It helped me solidify my choice of options.
- Clarified choices, made decisions supported group's decisions and recommendations.
- Info about new options.
- Explanation on all the options.
- Understanding some options and being able to give input is very important to me.
- Learning details about the HCT options.
- The options being considered.

For future sessions, I would suggest:

- ? Reducing vehicle lanes can help so co tear.
- I liked this format.
- More data on costs, ridership, leverage.
- Getting "options" information out on web site early.
- Different letters for every option through all the maps. A, B, C, D on every one makes it hard to distinguish.
- A little later starting time! 6 pm was tough.
- Smaller tables further apart, less talking up front.
- Quieter room or break-out rooms.
- Focus on Portland alternatives when meeting in Portland, Tigard when in Tigard, etc.

Tigard

Event Evaluations: 7

The most important things I got out of today's meeting included:

- New maps.
- Proposed HCT routes were clarified.
- Can HDT [HCT] serve those along the lines as well as the ends.
- The future of Tigard.
- 217 elevated track is great!

For future sessions, I would suggest:

- Show responsibility and rescope area of study to truly address regional congestion.
- Stimulate more citizen involvement.
- More discussion time, more frequent rotation of tables.
- More Q and A.
- Connect the dots in the employment corridor!
- Tunneling is great but... \$\$\$\$. Use surface streets as much as possible.

Tualatin

Event Evaluations: 5

The most important things I got out of today's meeting included:

- "green" is overemphasized.
- The ability to write my thoughts on the structured yellow/beige comment forms and ask table moderators questions as I wrote and referred to the display boards.

For future sessions, I would suggest:

- Establish goal of speed!!
- Explain why 99W was dropped
- Encourage people to go to Eugene, Bus Rapid Transit is great! TRY IT.
- Start on time.
- It's been 25-30 minutes so far, and 3 moderators have spoken. Too much time! I expected maybe 10 minutes of intro followed by diving into work groups.
- Don't let the "professional citizens" interrupt moderators outside of Q&A.
- The Tualatin Polic Dept. conference room is an inviting, convenient venue. When returning, come here.
- The TriMet moderator overview of the "refinement phase conceptual design options for HCT" map is the most useful portion so far of the meeting info.
- Provide options to continue into Sherwood and serving the industrial areas along the way.