



Follow up from April 6, 2016 Southwest Corridor Steering Committee meeting and community forum

Approximately 70 people attended and contributed to good discussion and dialogue at the April 6th Southwest Corridor Steering Committee meeting and community forum at the Southwest Community Center. Below are written responses to questions submitted by participants, input from event comment cards and results of “dot voting” on interactive posters at the event.

1. Responses to questions submitted by forum attendees

If you put more buses from 53rd to PCC aren't you going against your desire to reduce traffic on local roads? Those bus hubs would allow more traffic.

Buses would not travel on SW 53rd Avenue. The bus hub concept assumes buses would use SW Capital Hwy/49th between Barbur Blvd and PCC just as they do today. The SW Corridor project is currently proposing to provide a paved connection for cyclists and pedestrians on SW 53rd between the transit station at Barbur and the school.

The exact routing of any additional bus service in the area is still to be determined. The [HCT Technical Evaluation: Direct and Indirect Connection Options to PCC Sylvania](#) (p. 25) includes an estimate of the number of buses each hour on Capitol Highway, Lesser Road and Haines Street for each alternative connection analyzed. The bus hub option, as currently designed, would increase bus service on Capitol Highway and Lesser Road but eliminate it on Haines Street. The TriMet shuttle option would substantially increase bus service on all three roads. The aerial tram and the tunnel options would leave bus service on those roads at the existing frequency.

Effects on local roads are one of the trade-offs for the Southwest Corridor Steering Committee to consider in recommending how to best improve transit service to PCC Sylvania. A light rail tunnel or an aerial tram connection would have less impact on local roads than increased bus service (bus hub, TriMet shuttle or even BRT). However, improved transit to the Sylvania campus along with travel demand management by PCC should also reduce car traffic on local roads as well. The federally-required Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will include an evaluation of traffic impacts and possible mitigations, although it is unlikely to study every local roadway in the project area. We recommend submitting a written or oral comment during the EIS public scoping period (anticipated to occur in August – September 2016) if you wish the project team to evaluate traffic effects on particular local roadways.

What kind of overpass will be built over I-5 between 53rd and Tigard Triangle. Will it accommodate buses 44/78/97 as well as LRT?

Two options are being considered to get buses between the Tigard Triangle and PCC Sylvania. These buses could include the line 78, which connects Tigard and PCC today, plus other potential new bus line

extensions or bus shuttles to improve access to the campus. One option includes a new bridge for buses from the western campus entrance at SW G Street and SW Lesser Road over I-5, which would connect to the proposed light rail transitway as it crosses over I-5. Buses could share the light rail transitway running along the west side of I-5 to the northern Tigard Triangle area. The other option would not construct a new bridge for buses, instead allowing buses to follow their existing path along Lesser Road and the Haines/Atlanta Street bridge over I-5. Both options are proposed for further analysis.

Regarding the tram option, how can you be sure on the cost?—thinking of OHSU tram.

Cost estimates for the aerial tram are very approximate and are based off the OHSU tram. Preliminary designs are needed to scale a tram to the neighborhood and provide a more accurate cost estimate. Further design would be undertaken if the aerial tram is selected by the Southwest Corridor Steering Committee to be studied in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Can PCC build parking structures of multiple levels?

A parking structure is allowed at PCC subject to the requirements of the Zoning Code and conditions of development approval.

What are the demographics of Tigard/Tualatin residents who attend PCC?

The project team does not have information about student demographics. According to 2014 data from PCC, approximately 1,900 Sylvania students live in Tigard and Tualatin zip codes.

If sidewalks are built on SW 53rd would the roadway itself be paved and what would be the total width including sidewalks?

Improvements on SW 53rd Avenue have not been designed yet and we would seek input from the neighbors and PCC students and faculty about the design. Improvements would likely include a paved road and safe place for bicyclist and pedestrians.

Conceptual designs were prepared in Spring 2015 and shared with neighborhood groups to help refine the concepts. Detailed design will occur during the DEIS process, starting later in 2016 and carrying through 2017. Final roadway and sidewalk widths will be determined in final design and can vary based on factors such as parking availability and existing local road and sidewalk width.

Have any business developers made specific proposals for the Town Center (Barbur/Capitol Highway)?

We are not aware of any developer proposals for the Town Center.

Did campus access options include an analysis of impact on students with disabilities?

Not specifically at this early project planning stage, but as the project moves forward we will collect and use information related to students with disabilities in our planning and design efforts. TriMet includes design and planning input from our Citizens For Accessible Transit Committee. Anything built will be compliant with Americans with Disabilities Act.

Why are we even considering these two horse and buggy options? The future is driverless cars and they will be available in mass before any of these can be completed.

Autonomous technology continues to develop and presents future opportunities to augment transit choices within our urban environments. It is our position that it is likely many years before they are in

the market place and many more years before we have a fully autonomous fleet of private cars, freight and public transit. The region is predicted to continue growing with 400,000 new residents by 2035 and our project purpose is to accommodate travel for all persons in ways that preserve roadway capacity during that timeframe.

Further, it is unclear how driverless cars would improve the current and projected levels of traffic congestion on I-5 and Barbur Boulevard, which are the causes of unreliable and lengthening travel times. Many of the benefits related to driverless cars in terms of improving roadway throughput would require complete adoption of an automated fleet, a process that may take many years.

When you consider that the cost of express buses is just a fraction of the cost of a train, how can you support the choice of a train? Buses are also much more flexible than a train.

Please see [Staff Recommendations for May 2016 Decisions and the Southwest Corridor High Capacity Transit Mode Comparison](#) which explain the reasons for the staff recommendation, most notably that a bus rapid transit system would already be at peak hour ridership capacity within ten years of opening (year 2035). The regional travel demand model projects high ridership demand in the Southwest Corridor—greater than any existing MAX line ridership except the Blue line. For this and other reasons (preserving transit mall capacity and superior ridership, travel time, reliability and lower operating cost per passenger), staff recommend light rail as a better long term invest in spite of the greater construction cost.

Where are you going to get the money for this? And how much?

The project will apply to the Federal Transit Administration's New Starts funding program and request a 50% match of capital cost. The remainder of the funding will come from local sources including contributions from state and local jurisdictions and a regional bond measure. The total construction cost will be determined by the transit alignment ultimately selected after the publication of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, known as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). The LPA selection process is anticipated to occur in March through June 2018.

Which aspects (distance, locations, etc) take priority financially?

We interpret this question as asking about what components of the Southwest Corridor Plan would take precedence when deciding between costs, such as whether to build a tunnel to PCC Sylvania or reach Bridgeport Village. These are complicated decisions with many components, including transit performance, land development potential, access to transit, engineering risk and impacts on communities and the environment. There is no set order of precedence for navigating these trade-offs, but the Southwest Corridor Steering Committee makes recommendations guided by the adopted project Purpose & Need, analysis and advice from project staff and, for the final alignment decisions, the federal Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Does Metro have any plans for venues that could be placed on/near PCC campus to drive additional ridership on weekends, evenings, summer that would increase use for tunnel to PCC? PCC programs for music, theater, medical, special events, etc?

Metro has no such plans at this time.

2. Comments from event comment cards

- Metro is expecting an additional one million people moving to the area by 2020 if an article in the Oregonian was correct. This drives a need for more transportation to get to the new industries and communities being built and services needed from PDX to Tualatin. The need to plan for this and education will be needed so build it now while it is affordable.
- 21% is not much increase at today’s loan costs to build for future size of PCC campus. The expected growth with new classes could also drive new industries near the campus, so I would agree to 21% increase. Plan for future!
- Please don’t exclude the Crossroads from the further study area. This intersection is already so complicated that adding light rail will make it impossible to navigate. It is supposed to be a town center, an asset not an additional impediment.
- I appreciate the shuttle connection to PCC as the most viable option to provide connection to Barbur Transit and to take vehicles off Capitol Hwy. But the service should also serve the neighbors and Capitol Hwy needs to be improved/adjusted to carry that additional bus service.
- There are two major destinations on this Corridor, OHSU and PCC. And Metro proposes to miss both of them. Big mistake. This LRT line is “forever” and short term finances are being used to justify bad design. Corridor should first plan the best LRT and then negotiate how much can be afforded in the first phase. The MOS future LRT projects will mostly be extensions.
- Include the Marquam Bridge (a pedestrian bridge in the Taylor’s Ferry Rd Master Plan that crosses I-5 at SW 48th and Alfred) in the pedestrian improvement to support light rail. The only way to get from the Crestwood NA to Barbur by foot is through the “gulch” near 43rd and TFR. For many people that is not a viable option.
- Great job. Lots of hard work and great information. I would still like to see a tunnel or at least something technical directly to the PCC campus that does not use the existing roads.

3. Results from “dot voting” on interactive posters

Feedback on staff recommendations	
<p>Staff recommendation: Remove the light rail tunnel to PCC Sylvania from further consideration</p> <p>I support this recommendation (2 dots) <i>Comments: tunnel is not cost effective. Big impact on neighborhood.</i></p> <p>I’m not sure/Mixed opinion (no dots)</p> <p>I do not support this recommendation (no dots)</p>	<p>Staff recommendation: Select light rail as the preferred high capacity transit mode</p> <p>I support this recommendation (4 dots)</p> <p>I’m not sure/Mixed opinion (no dots)</p> <p>I do not support this recommendation (no dots)</p>

Improving transit options to PCC Sylvania

Option #1: Barbur Blvd. light rail + SW 53rd walk/bike connection to campus

Yes, I think this is a viable option (9 dots)

Comments: still prefer tunnel, prefer tunnel, covered walkway?; appreciate improved ped/bike routes with this approach; yes; use best practices with separated bike and ped facilities on 53rd, not a multi-use path due to the grade

I'm not sure/Mixed opinion (3 dots)

Comments: consider how disabled student can access

I don't think this is a viable option (2 dots)

Comments: Disservice to PCC, LRT should go to campus; Long bore tunnel to exit campus to keep LRT off surface streets and above yards; this solution should be included with the other solutions (ie: do it regardless)

Option #2: Barbur Blvd. light rail + a campus bus hub

Yes, I think this is a viable option (6 dots)

Comments: yes, a transit/busway on Capitol Hwy is needed from PCC to Barbur, include road diet; yes, but minimize property acquisition in the segment west of PCC to Tigard; Good option if the route between Tigard to PCC uses shared overpass with LRT; And the corridor as a whole

I'm not sure/Mixed opinion (1 dot)

I don't think this is a viable option (3 dots)

Comments: too expensive to provide the level of service needed by PCC; more traffic; more traffic and increased buses is outdated transportation

Option #3: Barbur Blvd. + SW 53rd mechanized connections

Yes, I think this is a viable option (2 dots)

Comments: consider disabled students; better than more buses/traffic on roads

I'm not sure/Mixed opinion (3 dots)

Comments: Cost seems to outweigh benefit/usage; may need traffic calming on 53rd between SW Capitol and Barbur to prevent increased car traffic

I don't think this is a viable option (10 dots)

Comments: too expensive for too few users; something on the steep part of 53rd (1 ½ blocks south from Barbur) would make sense, not the whole way; too much construction not enough available service to community; doesn't fit with neighborhood, tram is ridiculous not enough elevation. Too much elevation for motorized walkway

Option #4: Barbur Blvd. light rail + TriMet shuttle to campus

Yes, I think this is a viable option (12 dots)

Comments: Shuttle should be free and open to neighbors from West Portland Park and Far SW as well; yes, but it should include capacity to transport bikes on the shuttle; route to Tigard Triangle should go via new overpass and shared with LRT; with traffic improvements because Barbur/Capitol/Huber/I-5 is a nightmare

I'm not sure/Mixed opinion (no dots)

I don't think this is a viable option (2 dots)

Comments: puts more buses/traffic on the road; need direct access to PCC