



# Summary of Public Input on Route Selection for Southwest Corridor Light Rail

*August 6, 2018*



## SUMMARY OF PUBLIC INPUT ON ROUTE SELECTION FOR SOUTHWEST CORRIDOR LIGHT RAIL

---

This document is intended to inform the Southwest Corridor Steering Committee in its consideration of the final route (called the Preferred Alternative) for the proposed Southwest Corridor light rail line. It summarizes input that relates to route selection gathered from:

- Comments submitted upon release of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on June 7, 2018 through the public review period which ended July 30, 2018.
- Input heard at hearings, open houses, information sessions and other meetings (not including the Community Advisory Committee's recommendation, which is included in a separate document)

A summary of the outreach and notification conducted during this period is provided in Appendix A.

Input unrelated to route selection is not summarized below, including comments on routes or transit modes previously considered but not recommended for study in the Draft EIS by the Steering Committee. Additional summary of commonly mentioned themes beyond the route proposal is summarized in Appendix B.

All comments submitted on the project during the Draft EIS review period will be published in the Final EIS, which will include responses to substantive comments.

### SOURCES OF PUBLIC INPUT

Comments were received online through comment forms on the project website, by mail, through email, by phone, on comment cards and through oral testimony. A summary of demographics and feedback from participants in the project's two open houses is provided in Appendix C.

Approximately 1,015 comments were received including:

- 482 web comments (109 web comments were received through a star rating survey that allowed participants to rate the initial route proposal on a scale of one to five; the remainder were open ended comments)
- 146 emails
- 33 letters (includes 3 letters/petitions signed by multiple individuals)
- 354 comment cards

All of the input received was read by staff and tagged for relevant content. Since participants decided what information to share, not every comment discussed the initial route proposal or indicated support or opposition for alignment alternatives under

consideration. For this reason, it is impossible to summarize what all participants think about any particular topic. Instead, this summary identifies the topics raised most by participants and how many times an issue was discussed. Any assumptions about the level of support for an alignment are based on the number of participants who mentioned that choice in their comment, not a percentage of total comments received.

Demographic information was received from some participants. A summary is provided in Appendix D.

## **GENERAL SUMMARY OF INPUT ON LIGHT RAIL ROUTE OPTIONS**

Much of the public input relates to the initial route proposal presented in March 2018 and included in the Draft EIS. In general, input was supportive of the Initial Route Proposal. However, there are three portions of the alignment where concerns were raised. In Southwest Portland, people who commented on the choice between an in-Barbur alignment and an I-5 adjacent alignment. In this same area, concerns were raised to the initial route proposal Refinement 2 (Taylors Ferry I-5 Overcrossing). The input also includes concerns with Refinement 4 (Barbur Undercrossing) in Tigard. Concerns about the refinements are explained further in the “Summary of Input by Segment” section below.

A notable amount of public input is related to concerns about traffic flow on Barbur Boulevard, especially where light rail would be located in Barbur. Some of this input advocates for an alignment adjacent to I-5 instead, and some opposes the project altogether. Several of the comments incorrectly base their opposition to Barbur alignments on the claim that the project would remove lanes on Barbur; the project retains four through lanes on Barbur south of Naito. Others incorrectly based their opposition on the assumption that the I-5 adjacent alignment would have fewer business impacts; DEIS analysis indicates more residential and business displacements with the I-5 adjacent alignment (B-4) compared to the initial route proposal.

Many comments addressed the potential displacement of the Village Inn restaurant located at Bridgeport Village. That issue does not affect route selection and so is not discussed in this document, but is addressed in staff’s recommendation on the Preferred Alternative.

## **GENERAL SUPPORT**

Since many who commented were not asked their position on the project, we can’t say with certainty how many people support or oppose the project. However, approximately 25 percent of participants clearly indicated support for the initial route proposal or for light rail in general. Some participants used a star system to rate the project on a scale of 1 through 5 (one is lowest rating and five is the highest). Of the 109 participants in the rating survey, 47 percent rated the initial route proposal five or four stars.

Participants who supported light rail mentioned environmental benefits, improvement to individual commute times and congestion reduction and the primary reason for support.

Many supporters of the initial route proposal mentioned the need for light rail in the Southwest Corridor.

## **NO PROJECT**

The Draft EIS includes an evaluation of the proposed project in comparison to a “No Project” alternative. Since many who commented were not asked their position on the project, we can’t say with certainty how many people support or oppose the project. However, approximately 20 percent of comments submitted during the public review period clearly stated opposition to the project (either in this location or to light rail generally), and that position was also heard at public events. Some participants used a star system to rate the project on a scale of 1 through 5 (one is lowest rating and five is the highest). Of the 109 participants in the rating survey, 45 percent rated the initial route proposal one or two stars.

The reasons given for opposition to the project include:

- Avoiding direct effects to residences or businesses
- Traffic impacts
- General opposition to light rail
- Lack of support for project need
- Disagreement with SOUTHWEST Corridor as a location for light rail; preference for a different location
- Preference for an entirely different route, investment in other transportation options such as bus service and/or freeway expansion, or waiting for future technology such as autonomous vehicles
- Concerns about local increases in crime
- Concern with the project cost

## **SUMMARY OF INPUT BY SEGMENT**

### **Segment A**

The initial route proposal calls for light rail on Barbur (Alternative A1), applying Refinement 1. Input in full support of the overall initial route proposal is advocating for that alignment.

Specific input received on Segment A route selection was primarily supportive of the Barbur alignment as well, predicated on an improvement to the Ross Island Bridgehead also occurring. Suggestions on the Bridgehead improvement range from safer pedestrian crossings of Naito Boulevard to a full reorganization of the bridge access system. Some

input supports Alternative A2-BH (Naito with Bridgehead Configuration), with little input in support of Alternative A2-LA (Naito with Limited Access). Reasons for supporting a Naito alignment were proximity to the National University of Natural Medicine (NUNM) and South Water Front, desire for improved pedestrian and bike infrastructure on Naito, opportunity for redevelopment and concerns about traffic impacts in the vicinity of SW 4th Street and Caruthers St.

### **Ross Island Bridgehead project**

Approximately 20 percent of all comments received support a Ross Island Bridgehead improvement project, separate, but coordinated with light rail. They were supportive because of the project's potential to reduce traffic, increase pedestrian safety, and reconnect the adjacent Lair Hill neighborhood. The vast majority of these comments were received from students or faculty at the National University of Natural Medicine (NUNM). These comments indicated that NUNM would benefit from the bridgehead reconfiguration through increased accessibility and safety, especially for pedestrians. They also voiced strong support for a Naito improvement project.

### **Design Refinement 1**

Input on Refinement 1 is complex. The input is mostly focused on how bikes, pedestrians and traffic would navigate through the area with light rail moving out of and back into Barbur, with the balance of input opposing the Refinement but suggesting that those circulation concerns are the main issue. Those who support the Refinement mention concern about construction impacts to the Highway 10 overpass at Barbur and historic significance of the viaducts.

### **Marquam Hill connection**

Input on the Marquam Hill connection options will be summarized in a future document before that decision is made.

## **Segment B**

The initial route proposal calls for light rail in Barbur until Barbur Transit Center, where it switches to running adjacent to I-5 until the city limits (Alternative B2), applying Refinement 2 so that the light rail uses a separate structure north of the Barbur-Capitol bridge ("Crossroads") instead of south of Crossroads in order to cross I-5. Input in full support of the overall initial route proposal is advocating for that alignment.

### **In-Barbur/I-5 Adjacent options**

Comments specific to the Segment B route selection were split between support for an in-Barbur alignment (B1, B2, B3) and an I-5 adjacent choice (B4), with a slight majority supporting I-5 adjacent. Input includes concerns about how traffic will function in the Barbur/I-5 corridor.

Comments received in support of in-Barbur alignments cited improved infrastructure and safety for cyclists and pedestrians most often as their reason for support. Other reasons included, improved livability in the area, improved access and visibility of stations

(including ADA accessibility), redevelopment potential in the corridor, and this choice being supportive of Barbur Concept Plan.

About 2/3 of comments were specific about the in-Barbur alignment option preferred. Most of those supported staying on Barbur for the entirety of the outer Portland segment of the route (B1). It received four times as much support as the option to depart from Barbur at the Barbur Transit Center (B2), and the option to leave Barbur at 26th was not specifically mentioned in the comments received.

Comments indicating support for the I-5 alignment (B4) cited traffic concerns as the reason for this preference. Other reasons cited were increased noise, higher cost, negative impacts to the streetscape of Barbur and the livability of adjacent neighborhoods and higher displacements of property owners relative to the I-5 alignment. Unfortunately, some of these concerns were based on incorrect information. Several comments indicated that traffic on Barbur would worsen after construction of the system because of a reduction in travel lanes on Barbur Boulevard. Designs studied in the DEIS do not include a reduction of travel lanes on Barbur in section B. The DEIS also indicates that the I-5 adjacent alignment (B4) results in more business and residential displacements than the initial route proposal. Similarly, option B4 has a longer transit travel time than the initial route proposal.

#### **Design Refinement 2/Crossroads**

Robust input was received on the Crossroads area, with Refinement 2 in particular the subject of major concerns or explicit opposition:

Overall the public input on Refinement 2 highlights the existing circulation problems in the Crossroads with its complex street pattern and high volumes of auto traffic already creating congestion, difficulty in making desired movements and conflicts with pedestrians and bicycles. Specific concern was raised about function of the Taylor's Ferry and Capitol Highway intersection with this refinement. In general public input does not clearly support a desired option at the Crossroads, instead conveying a longstanding desire for a major overarching improvement. Some input expresses an interest in maintaining the southern structure in the unrefined Alternative B2 and some input supports staying in Barbur through Crossroads as in Alternative B1. Others point to the need for a new bicycle and pedestrian bridge over I-5 in this area. Little of the input opposes the unrefined Alternative B2 design.

Comments in opposition to Refinement 2 site anticipated residential and business relocations as a reason for their position. Another concern expressed frequently was the design's potential impact to Woods Creek park and the headwaters of Woods Creek. Others mention the height and visual impact of the light rail structure over I-5 and the potential for cold weather closures due to ice. Several of the comments submitted incorrectly base their opposition to Refinement 2 due to a misunderstanding that light rail would run in Taylors Ferry Road from Capitol Highway westward to Tigard or would displace businesses on the south side of Taylors Ferry.

Comments in support of Refinement 2 mention reduced costs, construction impacts, business impacts and visual impact. Others suggest greater opportunities for redevelopment in the West Portland Town Center.

#### **Portland Community College (PCC) connection**

Input on the PCC Sylvania connection options will be summarized in a future document before that decision is made.

### **Segment C**

The initial route proposal is based on Alternative C2 (Ash to Railroad) with three refinements applied. It calls for light rail to cross from north to south under Highway 99W around the Portland-Tigard city limits, then travel to a station on 68<sup>th</sup> Avenue before turning south along the 70<sup>th</sup> Avenue alignment (Refinement 4), before turning west along Elmhurst (Refinement 5) and traveling along the east side of Hall Boulevard to a station near the freight tracks (Refinement 6), then continuing southeast along those tracks to the terminus at Bridgeport Road. Input in full support of the overall initial route proposal is advocating for that alignment.

Most specific comments on route selection in Segment C are in support of the initial route proposal, with notable opposition from property owners directed affected by Refinement 4 as well as the Village Inn.

#### **Design Refinement 4**

Some input supported Refinement 4. By the numbers, a significant number of people indicated their opposition. A petition received against Refinement 4 contained 226 signatures.

The most common reason cited in comments supporting the refinement was improved access to the proposed light rail line with a station at 68th and Pacific Highway. Many comments also expressed a need for pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure to support access to this station from the north and west. Other comments noted development opportunities, cost and time savings, fewer visual and noise impacts, improved station spacing, and preservation of residential property as reasons for supporting this refinement.

Input in opposition pointed to existing business displacement and impacts to property owners. Some mentioned potential noise, vibration, visual and habitat impacts. Others identified increased traffic, access to stations and a concern that a station near 99W is less compatible with the City of Tigard's vision for the Tigard Triangle.

#### **Design Refinement 5**

Comments received specific to Refinement 5 center around the impact to existing homes and businesses. Input in support sites the negative impacts that Ash alternative (C2) would have upon Beveland area businesses and recent public and private investments in SW Beveland Street. Input also mentions lower cost and improved travel time with Refinement 4. Input in opposition discusses the impacts to the residential community and individual



properties as well as concern about tree removal, loss of habitat, noise and vibration impacts.

#### **Design Refinement 6**

Input also includes concerns about how the station location in Refinement 6 will relate to Main Street and WES, including pedestrian connectivity across Hall, and on the amount of business and employee displacement that it would create. Such input generally does not advocate for the Ash Avenue alignment, due to its displacement of unregulated housing, but rather advocates for minimizing the adverse effects of Refinement 6 on the existing industrial district. Other priorities mentioned in comments received about the downtown Tigard area included preserving existing affordable housing, minimizing residential displacement, protection of wetlands, downtown redevelopment opportunity, and reducing construction cost and traffic impacts on Hall Blvd.

#### **Railroad/I-5 options**

Input received was supportive of the Railroad alignment options primarily because of the impact to the businesses along I-5 incurred by the alternative. Other reasons for this support include reduced cost, access by Tigard residents and transit dependent people and support for the Tigard Triangle Strategic Plan. Input opposed to the railroad alignment also emphasized business displacement concerns and traffic impacts on SW Bonita Road.

#### **Bridgeport Station**

A considerable amount of input was received in support of the Village Inn and redesign of the Bridgeport station to keep this business in its current location. A total of 340 comment cards voicing support for the Village Inn were received in addition to a petition containing approximately 3,850 signatures.



## **APPENDIX A: DISTRIBUTION, NOTIFICATION AND OUTREACH EVENTS**

### **Physical distribution**

Wire-bound copies of the Draft EIS, including appendices, were placed in 11 locations in and around the project area:

- Metro's office
- TriMet (downtown ticket office)
- City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (Development Services Center)
- Seven libraries throughout the project area (Hillsdale, Capitol Hill, Tigard, Tualatin, Portland State University, Portland Community College – Sylvania, National University of Natural Medicine)
- St. Anthony's Catholic Church in Tigard, which serves as a gathering place for the Spanish and Vietnamese speaking communities

### **Physical notification**

A notification postcard was mailed to letter carrier routes covering physical addresses approximately one-quarter mile of the alignment options studied in the Draft EIS, which went to around 11,000 mailboxes. The postcard included the website address, the times and locations of open houses and the public hearing, and the closing date of the public comment period. The postcard included a message in Spanish.

Letters were sent to the listed owners of properties that could experience a full or partial acquisition under any alignment studied, including those affected by design refinements only. The letter provided the electronic and physical locations of the Draft EIS, and a special phone number for them to contact Metro with questions. The letter included a message in Spanish, Vietnamese, Russian, Chinese and Korean with a number for a multilingual hotline.

Newspaper advertisements announcing the Draft EIS availability plus the time and location of a public hearing ran for several weeks after the June 15 Notice of Availability (NOA) date in eight local newspapers. Three papers were culturally specific periodicals and two advertisements (Tilde Noticias and Phuong Dong) were published in other languages (Spanish and Vietnamese).

### **Outreach activities**

During a period starting just before the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) release, and continuing through the close of the public comment, staff attended or hosted 33 community meetings and events attended by over 650 people, including:

- Two open house events

- Two public hearings
- One multilingual event/hearing
- Four information hours with staff
- 24 association, commission or organization visits

In addition, staff fielded approximately 35 phone calls from the public during this period.

### **Public hearings**

The following is a summary of testimony received at the two public hearings held during the DEIS comment period.

The July 19<sup>th</sup> public hearing hosted 36 speakers. 15 of the speakers directly stated they were in support of the project moving forward. A major theme amongst supporters of the project were the benefits of public transportation beyond the mode itself - including the active transportation infrastructure, access to jobs, and the provision transportation options for future generations. There were an array of concerns expressed in opposition to the project as well, the most prominent being a suspicion that ridership was overestimated in the DEIS and in many cases; concerns about high project costs accompanied this view. Another common assertion of speakers who were opposed to the project was that Southwest Corridor light rail would not relieve traffic issues. Both supporters and people opposed to the project voiced concerns for the preservation of community gathering places. Several speakers voiced their support for the preservation of the Village Inn restaurant.

The July 26<sup>th</sup> public hearing hosted 11 speakers. The majority of speakers were generally supportive of light rail as a transportation option. Only one speaker was directly opposed to the proposed route. A few speakers expressed support for heightened WES operations in lieu of a new MAX rail line. The most prominent theme of the hearing was the opposition to negative impacts on small businesses; the Village Inn was called out specifically in three separate testimonies. Other concerns included gentrification and housing affordability, traffic, and active transportation infrastructure to improve safety.

### **Open house events**

Two open house events were held during the DEIS public comment period. A summary of those events and information about participants is included as Appendix C.

## APPENDIX B: OTHER AREAS OF DISCUSSION

A significant number of comments suggested more improvements to support safe cycling and walking in the Southwest Corridor as well as comments about property acquisition, traffic and communities. A number of comments received in opposition to the initial route proposal or to light rail in general identified alternative transportation investments or different destinations/routes. That nature of input is summarized here.

### Active Transportation

A significant number of the total comments received, about 17 percent, requested improvements for pedestrians and cyclists in the Southwest Corridor. Many of these comments asserted that the DEIS's consideration of these modes of transportation was inadequate and that they call for more upgrades to bike and pedestrian infrastructure in project designs. Some were specific to alignment choices like Refinement 2, others specific to geography, like connection of Tigard Triangle to downtown Tigard. Comments frequently noted that current conditions are unsafe for these modes of travel in the southwest corridor, and the light rail project should include upgrades along the proposed route and in station areas.

Suggestions mentioned most included:

- Continuous, upgraded bike lanes and sidewalks along the entire length of Barbur, as well as streets leading to Barbur
- Bike and pedestrian upgrades on the Barbur-Capitol bridge (“Crossroads”)
- A new multimodal connection from the Crestwood neighborhood in Southwest Portland across I-5 to Barbur.
- Upgraded bicycle and pedestrian connections to PCC, Multnomah Village, Hillsdale, and the area north of 99W near the proposed 68<sup>th</sup> St station
- Improved pedestrian connectivity between the Hall St. station and Main St. in Tigard
- Multimodal connectivity between the Tigard Triangle and downtown Tigard as well as within the Triangle

### Acquisitions, Displacements, and Relocations

Comments frequently expressed concerns regarding property acquisitions, displacement, and relocation of current tenants and owners who would be impacted by the light rail alignment. Concern was expressed about a variety of locations in all route segments and included both residential properties and businesses. Because acquisitions would be required at many points along all of the proposed route options, this concern was widespread. Three locations that received the most attention in comments were the terminus of the line in Bridgeport Village, the area around Refinement 2 (Taylor’s

Ferry/Crossroads), and the area along Highway 99W near Refinement 4 (Barbur Undercrossing).

## **Communities**

Many comments addressed the effects light rail might have on communities in the southwest corridor. Many comments expressed the need to maintain affordability in communities, especially affordable housing. There were also comments that suggested prioritizing equitable outcomes for groups like people of color, the elderly, and people living with disabilities. Preserving the feel or atmosphere of the neighborhoods that the proposed line would pass through was another topic some comments addressed.

Comments that expressed support for the project often cited increased community livability, urban design, and improved connectedness. Other comments noted the belief that access to amenities and services would improve in their community with a new light rail line.

Some comments were opposed to the project because they were worried that the light rail line might divide neighborhoods bisected by the route. Others were concerned that light rail would have a general negative impact on their community or hurt livability.

## **Traffic: Other**

Several specific locations were mentioned when participants expressed concern about the light rail project creating worse traffic conditions. Those streets and locations mentioned most are listed below:

- Barbur Blvd.
- Taylor's Ferry
- Capitol Highway
- Highway 99W
- South Portland area (SW Moody, SW Kelly, etc.)
- Bridgeport Village
- Lower Boones Ferry Rd
- Terwilliger Dr
- Hall Blvd
- 72<sup>nd</sup> Ave
- Traffic beyond the terminus in Tualatin

## **Prefer Other Investments**

There were numerous comments that indicated a preference for different transportation investments. Many comments focused on the cost of building light rail. The most common alternative proposed was expanding and improving existing roadways or building new roadways. Others felt that expanded bus service or bus rapid transit would be more cost effective or that improving existing public transit should be a priority. A few people preferred additional cycling or pedestrian infrastructure or addressing social issues.

Comment reasons cited for preferring a different transportation investment:

- The belief that light rail would increase traffic congestion and that driver behavior was too hard to change
- The notion that dwindling ridership and changing transportation technology, including autonomous vehicles and ride-sharing, will make light rail obsolete
- The belief that light rail is an inflexible investment
- The prospect of displacements and gentrification caused by light rail construction
- A concern that the proposed light rail line would not be fast enough to attract riders
- The concern that light rail would result in increased crime and that it is incompatible with the demographics of those living in the southwest corridor
- A position that not enough evidence was presented to demonstrate positive outcomes from the investment
- The prospect of environmental hazards, like snow and ice, being greater in the southwest corridor than in other parts of the Portland Metro region

## **Prefer different destination**

Some participants suggested a different destination or route for light rail. The vast majority of comments requested a southern extension of the proposed route down to Wilsonville or Woodburn. Others requested that the route to continue to Sherwood or deeper into Tualatin beyond Bridgeport Village. An eastbound Kruse Way route alternative was also suggested by a few respondents. There was one respondent who felt the terminus should be in Tigard. The majority of respondents in this category were proponents of light rail as a whole but wanted to expand service locations.





## **APPENDIX C:**

### **DEIS OPEN HOUSE - MEETING EVALUATION AND PARTICIPATION**

Two open houses were held during the DEIS Comment period. The first event was at a local elementary school in Southwest Portland on June 2, 2018. The second event was held at the Tigard Public Library on July 12, 2018. Both events were in the evening from 6 to 8:30 p.m. to support the most local participation. Approximately 80 individuals attended the two events.

Between fourteen and eighteen staff members attended each event. This resulted in a high staff to attendee ratio. Staff interviewed after these events said they were well organized and offered opportunity for individual attendees to ask questions and engage in prolonged conversations with staff.

A meeting evaluation form and demographic questioner was provided to every meeting attendee upon their arrival. These forms provide an opportunity to understand who attended and how they felt about the events. There were a total of 67 evaluation forms submitted, which is an approximately 84 percent participation rate.

#### **Demographics**

Of the respondents who shared their age, 4% were between the ages of 18-24, an additional 4% were between the ages of 25-34, 11% were between the ages of 45-54, the majority were between the ages of 55-64 (47.1%), 21.6% were between the ages of 65-74 and 5.9% were 75 years or older.

There were a total of 11 unique zip codes represented by respondents. 97219 (SW Portland and Lake Oswego) represented a major majority at 50% of respondents indicating that as their zip code. 97233 (North Tigard, Metzger) was the second most popular selection at 18.5%. 97224 (Tigard, Durham) and 97239 (South Portland) each accounted for 8% and the other 7 zip codes had 2 or fewer respondents.

95.9% of evaluation respondents identified as being White. One respondent identified as Asian or Asian American and one additional identified as Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin.

52.3% of respondents identified as Female and 47.7% identified as Male.

7.5% of respondents stated they had a disability and 92.5% said they did not.

#### **Meeting Evaluation**

95.2% of respondents either Agreed (50%) or Strongly Agreed (45.2%) that the meeting was worthwhile. Three respondents (4.8%) cited their experience as Neutral.

Respondents were also asked if they felt encouraged to share input and if they felt listened to. 47.5% of respondents said they Strongly Agreed, 34.9% said they Agreed, and 17.5% responded they felt Neutral.

## Meeting announcement

Respondents heard about the meeting in an array of unique ways. The most popular forms were through community announcements, E-mail, and newspaper publications.


## Suggestions for future meetings

The most common suggestion was to have a presentation. Many people asked for heightened map detail and generally more information. Verbatim comments provided below:


- A timeline for next steps
- Graphics easier to understand, a presentation perhaps?
- Would be good to have short presentation as overview prior to setting the crowd free to wander around
- I would like speakers to speak in a group presentation. Also, I would like a space/fence in front of the easels to keep us a little further away. When one person stands in front - no one else can see.
- A presentation of speakers - 2 or 3 - to refer to displays and brief Q&A. Then, break up to let staff mingle and chat one-on-one, which I liked
- Better Maps (more surface detail)
- Having someone on hand with specific info on the Ross Island Bridgehead portion of the project.
- Better labeling of streets on map exhibits - hard to orient locations
- Need more duplicate exhibits to alleviate crowding
- If the plan includes subsections, bring information on all of the subsections
- I would like the planned route elevated so many people could see. Maybe a mini explanation that repeats
- Overall, good visuals. Need better explanation/display of on-grade vs. overpass impacts representatives were informed, approachable (especially Rory) got questions answered and good discussion - Thank you
- More information on all possible routes

## Graphs:

## Age




## Zip Code



### Race/Ethnicity


Italian American  
2.0%



White  
95.9%

### Gender


No response  
31.3%




Female  
35.9%

Male  
32.8%


Disability




Overall, I believe the meeting was worthwhile:



I felt the meeting encouraged my input and I felt listened to:



How did you hear about today's event?




## APPENDIX D: DEIS COMMENT PERIOD PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS

### Geographic distribution


There were a total of **62 unique zip codes** provided by participants. The largest share was 29.1% of participants who indicated **97219 (SW Portland/Dunthorpe)** as their zip code, the next closest was **97233 (East Portland/Rockwood)** at 12.4% and the only others of noticeable size were **97232 (SE Portland)** and **97224 (South Portland)** at 6.5% and 6.3% respectively. (N=477)

#### Zip Codes



### Age

#### Age




The age demographics were fairly evenly distributed. The most populous group were individuals between the ages of 35 and 44 at 22.6%, the next largest was 55-64 at 19.7% closely followed by 45 to 54 at 17.9%. There was only one participant (0.3%) who selected <18 for their age. 4 participants (1.3%) were 75 years or older and 6% (19) selected the 18-24 age range. (N=319)

**Race/Ethnicity**

298 participants indicated their race or ethnic background - 84.9% identified as White, 6% identified as Asian or Asian American, 3.4% identified as Other, 1.7% identified as Hispanic, Latino, or of Spanish origin, 2% of participants selected 2 or more categories, and 1.3% identified as American Indian/Native American or Alaska Native. (N=298)

**Race/Ethnicity**






## Gender

52.6% of participants identified as Female and 45.8% identified as Male. One participant identified as a Transgender Female, and another as Transgender Male. 3 (0.9%) participants responded as Other. (N=325)


### Gender



## Annual income

The largest portion (22%) of respondents reported having an annual income between a \$50,000 and \$74,999. 18% reported between \$75,000 and \$99,999. 16.2% reported between \$100,000 and \$149,999 and 15.8% reported an annual income greater than \$150,000. 7.9% of respondents

### Annual Income




reported between \$20,000 and \$29,000, 7% between \$40,000 and \$49,000, 5.7% between \$10,000 and \$19,000 and 4.4% reported less than \$10,000 of income annually. (N=228) Note: **Oregon's Median Annual income is ~\$50,200.**

### People with a disability

Of the 35 respondents who responded to the disability question 34.3% identified as having

#### Disabilities



Ambulatory difficulty, 28.6% identified as having hearing difficulty, 14.3% identified as having vision difficulties, 11.4% identified as having difficulties in 2 or more of these areas, 8.6% identified as having cognitive difficulties, and 2.9% identified as having independent living difficulties. (N=35)

*The (N) value denotes the total number of respondents to each question\**